



City of Kenora
Planning Advisory Committee
60 Fourteenth St. N., 2nd Floor
Kenora, Ontario P9N 4M9
807-467-2292

Meeting Minutes
City of Kenora Planning Advisory Committee
Regular Meeting held in the Operations Centre Building
60 Fourteenth St. N., 2nd Floor – Training Room
May 21, 2019
6:00pm

Present:

Wayne Gauld	Chair
Ray Pearson	Member
Robert Kitowski	Member
Bev Richards	Member
John Barr	Member
Tanis McIntosh	Member
John McDougall	Member
Devon McCloskey	City Planner
Kylie Hissa	Secretary Treasurer

Regrets:

Graham Chaze	Member
--------------	--------

DELEGATION:

- (i)** Wayne Gauld, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and reviewed the meeting protocol for those in attendance.
- (ii)** Additions to agenda
 - Sharepoint Access for Committee Members
 - Request for Availability for Second June Meeting
- (iii)** Declaration of interest by a member for this meeting or at a meeting at which a member was not present
 - Andrew Koch declared a direct conflict on file D14-19-05, Kendall House, as it relates to his employment with Gillons Insurance.
- (iv)** Adoption of minutes of previous meeting

The Chair asked the Committee if there were any questions or corrections to the minutes as circulated.

 - Approved as amended: April 16th, 2019 minutes of the regular Kenora Planning Advisory Committee meeting.

- (v) Correspondence relating to the application before the Committee – there was none
- (vi) Consideration of applications for minor variance
- (vii) Consideration of applications for consent
 - D10-19-03, Schussler

Tara Rickaby, Agent
TMER Consulting

Tara Rickaby was joined by Mac Schussler, who retained her to submit the application on behalf of the registered property owners. If approved, the severed lands would be transferred to the owner's son (Mac) and daughter in-law. The Agent explained that currently, the owners of the subject property and the owners north-east of the subject property, who are family members, both use the existing driveway through a private agreement. However, the current owners of the subject property do not wish to grant a registered easement in perpetuity in case of the sale of the abutting property in the future. This situation will remain status quo until the location of the driveway of the new lot is nailed down. The Agent referenced the updated sketch, which was included in the most recent version of the planning rationale, and noted that the proposed lot lines shown is fairly accurate. It may be a little shorter north to south.

The Agent explained that when the Black Sturgeon Lake report came out, there was substantial public consultation. One concern by lake residents was that social crowding was an issue on the lake. From the photos provided, the Agent noted that there won't be site line issues. The Northwestern Health Unit (NWHU) also provided a letter of support and a Fisheries Assessment was provided as part of the application. The Agent noted that the creation of this infill lot will reduce the number of Rural Residential lots to be created during the lifetime of the City's Official Plan, but will not result in the initial number of 142 lots being exceeded, which is the maximum number of RR-Rural Residential lots on Black Sturgeon Lake.

The retained lot will have 21.27 m of frontage on Wyder Drive and the new lot will have 69.41m. Each lot, created and retained, will meet or exceed this minimum. Apart from the severance of the subject property, an easement for access will also be registered in favour of the new lot over a portion of existing driveway and lands north of the existing garage.

The Planner thanked the Agent for the thorough presentation. She highlighted again that the created lot will be approximately 1.31 ha in size and that there was an evaluation of fish habitat. The application had regard for the Provincial Policy Statement and the Environmental Protection zone, shown to the east. She noted that there will be similar areas identified in City mapping for the subject location.

She noted that the NWHU indicated that the severed property will have suitable areas for future septic with imported sand fill and that no public comments had been

received. The Fisheries Assessment report did conclude that fish habitat is present on specific points of the shoreline and recommended a no development zones for two sections as outlined in Figure 6 of the report. It was the Planner's professional opinion that the application be approved, and read the proposed conditions of approval.

The Agent referenced condition 6 within the Planning Report, which requested a site plan agreement. Although she had suggested it, she believed that in case the lot is not developed right away, the EP zone mapping should suffice. That way, they do not need to decide development plans within a year and the consent can still go through.

The Planner stated that she would be agreeable to that. She recommended that the owners hold on to the Fisheries Assessment report so that in future years, they can explain the history of the lot and show the Planning Department the EP areas. The Planner confirmed that the EP map would be zoned accordingly and that in the Official Plan, no development can take place within 120 m without a report.

The Committee agreed to remove the condition (#6).

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application. There were none.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions.

Tanis McIntosh referenced the removal of condition #6 and asked the Planner to clarify how the conditions are monitored throughout the years and if and when ownership changes. The Planner explained that the EP mapping would be flagged at the time of a real estate deal and there would be subsequent questions. Ideally, the Fisheries Assessment report would be shared with new owners, identifying the noted exceptions.

Robert Kitowski wished to clarify that when the Planner presented the report, 10m was referenced for either side of the stream inland; however, the report noted a minimum of 30m inland from the outlet. The Planner confirmed it was supposed to read 30m inland.

Ray Pearson requested more clarification on the easement. He noted that the rationale discussed an easement to get to the new lot but that they don't want it in perpetuity. He asked if they would be eliminating the easement.

The Agent clarified by explaining that the current neighbours to the west use a portion of the driveway as it forks. That is the portion that the current owners do not wish to grant an easement for in perpetuity. She explained that there will be an easement registered in favour of the new lot. Ray Pearson was satisfied with the explanation.

John Barr referenced the recommended no development zones and explained that there would be approximately 20m left of shoreline to use. He asked who would enforce the site plan if the proponent brought on in. The Planner explained that the building permit would be issued on the premise of what is in the site plan. The location

of the dock and the house would be things enforced through a permit; however, as for the potential removal of vegetation, that would be something enforced as the City is out on site.

Wayne Gauld highlighted that there was an amended planning rationale, to ensure the Committee members were aware that the sizes had been increased roughly 1.1 ha (from 1.2 ha to 1.31 ha). The Planner confirmed that it had been an adjustment in the measurement.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion. There was none.

Moved by: Ray Pearson

Seconded by: Tanis McIntosh

That property located at 214-A Wyder Road, Black Sturgeon Lake, Kenora Ontario; described as Part 1 of Plan 23R-8143; being PIN 42143-0196; being application D10-19-03, for consent to sever for the creation of one RR-Rural Residential zoned lot with one retained, each having approximately 72m of frontage and 1.31 ha of lot area be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the planning report as amended; and that the City of Kenora Official Plan and Zoning Maps area updated to display fish spawning habitat with associated Environmental Protection Zoning along the eastern shoreline being 42 m in length, as well as the area of ephemeral stream, being 10 m on either side, 30 m inland.

Carried.

- D10-19-04, Small

Tara Rickaby, Agent
TMER Consulting

Tara Rickaby, Agent, was joined by the owner of the subject property, Randy Small. She explained that this is an interesting application for how the properties were registered, as they have not merged. The only matter outstanding is an easement for access in favour to the farthest north lot. She explained that because the properties are accessed by a provincially controlled highway, under the Official Plan, the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has a right to provide comment and conditions on proposed development. MTO had been approached in 2018 and recognized that existing conditions and use of existing entrance have gone on for a substantial amount of time. They were willing to issue a Mutual Entrance Permit, and it has been approved as of this past week. Existing structures will not change.

The proposed easement will be approximately 6m wide and 75m long. As a condition of approval, requested by the MTO and Mr. Small's solicitor, access to PIN 0289 will also be provided. The Agent noted that the neighbour submitted a letter of support.

The Planner thanked the Agent for the presentation and noted that if approved, the identified for easement would be surveyed and registered on title. Initially, the application had not considered providing access to the second PIN (0289).

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application. There were none.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions.

Robert Kitowski referenced the comments made by Kenora Fire and asked what the standard is for the driveway to be built that supports the weight of a large truck. He asked whether the applicant will be given a sketch or weight to work off of. The Planner explained that it is a comment that the Committee should consider and that it will be evaluated at the time of a building permit. At this time, there is an existing cabin and the property is a lot of record; however, it could be added as a condition.

The Agent explained that at this time there is no plan to construct the road but that they want it there solely for future planning purposes. The Planner added on by saying that if there was a full time residential use proposed, this would come up. Fire access will want to be there.

Bev Richards asked that if an easement is creating access for PIN 0288 and that there is an existing one on PIN 0289, if the Committee should include it within a condition of approval.

The Agent clarified that it had been included within the MTO's conditions.

The Committee agreed to include it as a condition of approval. Bev Richards also noted that there was a newer reference plan on record.

Bev Richards asked why the City wouldn't take over the existing driveway/road, if it's been used for so long. She asked if it would be because of the standard. The Planner explained that the City isn't looking to increase the number of roads to maintain and that this road would need to be upgraded substantially. If it was a brand new road for lot creation, the City would be looking at a private road agreement; however, that would be a different circumstance.

Robert Kitowski asked if the conditions are met under the MTO requirements. The Planner confirmed that there nothing else to address.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion. There was none.

Moved by: Bev Richards

Seconded by: Robert Kitowski

That property located at 978-B Redditt Road, Kenora ON; described as Parts 1, 2 and 4 of Plan 23R-4831; being PIN 42136-0287; being application for consent to grant a new easement, approximately 6m wide and 75m in length, over Part of PIN 42136-0287; and over Part 2 of 23R-4831, in favour of PIN 42136-0288 for access be approved; and that registration for access over an existing easement on PIN 42136-0289 also be granted. That this approval will allow for legal road access from Redditt Road (Hwy 658) to PIN 42136-0288, and that provisional consent be granted, subject to conditions outlined within the planning report, as amended.

Carried.

(viii) Consideration of Applications for Draft Plan of Standard Condominium
• D07-19-02, River Ridge

Randy Seller, Agent
HSL

Randy Seller introduced himself as the acting Agent for the file, explaining that they are revisiting an approval from 2018 that had been for a four unit condo. Based on logistics and affordability, the application has been fundamentally revised to eight units. The building size will remain the same but with the increased units. He noted that he has read the planning report and can confirm that there are no issues. He deferred to the Planner.

The Planner explained that the Applicants have come forward to cancel their draft approval and apply for a new one in order to accommodate eight units. The City has given consideration for applications to acquire City lands and Council has given the approval for the sale. However, that is was decided to hold off until the condo application was reconsidered and for the permits to be issued. She noted that because it is for a standard condominium, no public consultation was required. When she had taken a site visit, residents in the area did come out to ask questions. There was a lot of support and curiosity. The condo has also been listed on ReMax with a lot of interest.

The Planner further explained that the increase in units will provide additional supply to the City's housing market. There may be concern over doubling the number and the access, and it was suggested to have something in the site plan agreement with the option of dictating the upper units to have access off of Veterans Drive within a period of time. The Building Department had several comments and some have been alleviated. A hydrant is proposed to be installed, which would put one within 90m of the development. As far as the Planner was concerned, all concerns can be dealt with through site plan. The developer is aware of all of the comments made so far with no concerns that they won't be able to be addressed.

She noted that although doubling the previous approval, the criteria for development is still met. It was the Planner's professional opinion that it be approved; draft approval is valid for three years.

The Agent stated that there are no issues with the concerns regarding infrastructure and will deal with those related to water and fire. He explained that the City has agreed to make the purchase of the surplus lands in order to make the project viable and that the creation of eight units compared to four will make them more affordable, and thereby consistent with the Official Plan. The comments regarding access will be dealt with through site plan agreement; however, he was unsure if the solution would be to have half the units access differently. It is a matter of wait and see. He referenced similar concerns had resulted with the Tall Pines development, however, there were no real problems. He noted that if there is further development in the area, there may be the requirement for other planned access arrangements.

Additionally, with the eight units, there would be a maximum of 16 vehicles and most residents won't have two cars each. In the previous application, two parking spaces were allocated for visitors and now there is three with the new plan. He concluded by saying that the project would provide necessary infrastructure in the area and would benefit the neighbourhood.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application. There were none.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions.

John McDougall asked whether the upgrades for storm sewer and the hydrant would be at the cost of the developer. The Agent confirmed that they would be.

Wayne Gauld referenced the conversation over the Veterans Drive and Dowsett Street access, and noted that the situation would be there anyways. The Agent confirmed.

Ray Pearson also wished to verify that there are currently two access points, one off of Veterans Drive and the other off of Dowsett St. The Agent also confirmed, explaining that they are noted as the rear and the main entrance on the site plan.

Bev Richards referenced page 2 of the planning report, where it discussed vacant land and a possible encroachment agreement on the east side. The Planner explained that as far as she was aware, there is nothing required so an encroachment agreement would not be necessary. If the setbacks are unable to be met, then a minor variance application would be required. The Agent also confirmed that they will be consolidating the PINs as a condition of the City land sale.

John Barr asked the Planner to confirm whether properties to the north don't have municipal servicing. The Planner explained that properties fronting Dowsett Street have holding tanks and that it would be the Northwestern Health Unit that enforces them.

John Barr asked if the developer puts in servicing, whether the City would extend services. The Planner explained that it would be unlikely, because they would be getting services from Veterans Drive. The properties to the north should obtain services from Regina Avenue but this would require a lot of blasting.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion.

Ray Pearson stated that he feels as though it is a good plan and can't wait to see the development happen.

Moved by: Robert Kitowski

Seconded by: John Barr

That the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee gives draft approval to application file D07-19-02, property described as PIN 42179-0434; Part of Block B M28, being Lots 1,2,3,4 of Plan M106, together with property to be obtained from the City of Kenora;

described as PIN 42179-0431, 42179-0432, 42179-0433, and Part of PIN 42179-0439, subject to conditions as outlined in the planning report.

Carried.

Andrew Koch left the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

(ix) New Business

- Recommendation(s), Application for an Amendment to the Zoning By-law:
 - i. D14-19-05, Kendall House

Tara Rickaby, Agent
TMER Consulting Kenora

Tara Rickaby presented herself as the Agent for the file, indicating that the application is to re-zone the property back to R3-Residential Third Density. It was originally zoned as such up until 2015, when there was a sale that was imminent and one of the conditions was to have it zoned to LC-Local Commercial with the permitted use of Bed and Breakfast. The Agent explained that the sale did not go through and now the property is still zoned accordingly. The property itself has been for sale for the last 3 years with no interest in the LC zone and associated uses. However, there has been interest and an offer to purchase the property for use as single family residential. The Applicants are therefore looking to re-zone back to R3 in order for future development purposes. At this point, the use will be a single family dwelling and it has been listed as a heritage property; it is not formally designated. It was identified as having heritage significant through public consultation and permission by the owner at the time.

The Agent presented her planning rationale, explaining that the existing structure has been on the property since 1895. Onsite parking is accessed off the laneway, although there is an old curb cut in front of the existing garage, of which there is the opportunity to put in a driveway if the garage ever failed. The Agent also explained that the front yard is technically on Second Street, which make the setback dimensions legally non-complying to the Zoning By-law for the front yard, side yard, and accessory structure setbacks.

The Planner thanked the Agent for their thorough presentation. She noted that there are lots of opportunities for parking in the R3 zone, but that would be evaluated at the time of a building permit. There were no concerns by departments apart from the parking provisions if the property was developed for higher density residential use.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application.

Craig Bryant
127 Fifth Avenue South

Craig Bryant introduced himself as one of the current owners for the property. He explained that they are very pleased with the potential buyer. They love the property and will take care of it. As current owners, they want the property to be respected and maintained, and they believe that the potential new owners will do just that.

Phil Hanstead
Cambrian Drive

Phil Hanstead also raised his hand in favour of the application.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions.

Tanis McIntosh asked about the process on public notification and claimed that there was no notice on the property. She wondered how members of the public outside of the 120 m radius would have been aware of the application. Craig Bryant (part owner), in the audience, clarified that the yellow notice sign was posted in the window on the property. It was also confirmed that the notice was posted in the newspaper.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion. There was none.

Moved by: Ray Pearson

Seconded by: John McDougall

Resolved that the Planning Advisory Committee recommends that the Council of the Corporation of the City of Kenora approve application D14-19-05, subject property located at 127 Fifth Avenue South, generally known as "The Kendall House", described as Plan 3, Lot 158 and Pt 157 Block 2, being a legal non-complying building, to change the zoning from Site Specific Local Commercial (LC) [34] with Bed and Breakfast to Residential Third Density (R3) to allow for those uses in accordance with Section 4.3 of the Zoning By-law.

That the Committee has made an evaluation of the applications upon their merits against the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and the Provincial Policy, and provides a recommendation to Council purely passed on these matters; whereas the Committee may not have had the opportunity to hear public comments in full.

Carried.

The Committee took a break at 7:20 p.m. Andrew Koch returned to the meeting and it commenced again at 7:23 p.m.

ii. D14-19-06, Small Home Zone

Adam Smith, Development Services Strategist
The City of Kenora

The Planner introduced the file, as it was brought forward as a result from Council support. She explained that the City is working with a developer looking to bring some smaller homes to Kenora. They are aware that they would have to re-zone,

acquire property, and potentially subdivide. She noted that other developers and property owners already in town have inquired about smaller homes. There hasn't been substantial interest in "tiny homes" but there have been discussions about going even smaller. This proposed Small Home zone would strike a balance and would allow for servicing and basic needs that single detached dwellings have today, yet with smaller gross floor areas and lot areas.

The Planner referenced the supplementary documents that had been attached to the application information. In the County of Prince Edward, they noted differences between the types of smaller homes and some of the challenges that arise. The article noted that the Ontario Building Code has minimum size requirements and aside from that, cities are going above and beyond what the building code does. Most of the time, it is for financial reasons and that this point, the discussion for smaller homes has not taken into account all the financial reasons for property evaluation purposes. As noted in the report, if there are too many reductions in provisions, an Official Plan Amendment would be warranted.

The Planner explained that there are a few opportunities to reduce yard requirements but that for now, those should be looked at on a site specific basis. In situations where a condominium application is applied for, it would be site specific and houses could be fronting on internal streets that are smaller than municipal standards. In that case, reducing the front yard setbacks would make sense.

Adam Smith, Development Services Strategist, didn't have anything to add. He stated that this application is a good reflection of the City seeking more innovative planning tools for changing demographics and the demand for smaller units and lone person households. He stated that this new zone would be a good tool to streamline some aspects of development.

There was no one in the audience to speak in favour of or against the application.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions.

Ray Pearson noted that it was mentioned that a developer has shown interest in Kenora. He asked if the intent is to build numerous small houses in a block or if development will be infill. The Planner explained that she anticipates development as being both. A developer could do a ten house development, or a fifty; it depends on the market and the property they are acquiring. There is the potential for a larger subdivision.

Ray Pearson explained that there is concern with prior development and row housing units where there is a lot of smaller units in a confined area. He expressed concern if there is a huge development that's considered "lower-end". He asked if infill development would be better.

The Planner explained that the developer that is interested in Kenora are looking at building market homes, as far as the City is aware. The estimate that we've heard for a sale price is approximately \$270,000.

Bev Richards asked what the size of the lots will be. The Planner explained that if they use the proposed criteria, they could have 15m frontage with a minimum of 275 m² area. Currently, the minimum lot area for single detached dwellings is 450 m². What is proposed is almost half that size, and so would not be considered standard lots.

Bev Richards asked that small lots like this can be found in the Lakeside area. She asked if they could increase the size of the house. The Planner explained that at the time of a subdivision, the developer would have to rezone to the Small Home zone concurrently with the application for subdivision. Someone could also look at re-zoning to this and have a smaller lot. Someone could also have a mixture of R1 and SH zone provisions in a zoning approval that is site specific if someone wanted a larger house on smaller lot.

Bev Richards then asked if they could have a "house-plex" and apply for that in a subdivision. The Planner explained that if they were to tie in multiple units of small homes together and call it a house-plex, it would require condominium approval or a re-zone to R3-Residential Third Density zoning. Bev asked that in these instances, whether the KDSB gets 10% of a home in a subdivision. The Planner explained that they are looking at the capital facilities by-law to support the developer to a maximum if they are providing an amount of affordable housing. There are some opportunities down the road.

Adam Smith, Development Services Strategist, clarified that this proposed zone is not initiated by the KDSB. They are focused more on apartment based units, which wouldn't be encompassed within the SH zone.

Andrew Koch asked to confirm that a property had to be serviced by municipal sewer and water. The Planner confirmed, that yes, otherwise they would need larger lots to accommodate private services. She explained that the City does not approve lot creations anymore on the basis of holding tanks. If there was vacant property, although it would be an existing lot of record, there would need to be criteria for how it is serviced. Properties not on services would need to have a strong rationale and comments by the NWHU to propose a re-zone to the SH zone without municipal servicing.

John Barr noted that the provisions under the proposed Small Home zone are almost the same as in the R1-Residential First Density zone. He indicated that when doing initial calculations based on property width and the required setbacks, a 65 m² dwelling wouldn't be able to fit on the lot. The yard depths would need to be extended.

The Planner stated that the provision for rear yard and/or lot area can be changed. She explained that she did reduce the minimum lot area even more to be within the density requirement of the Official Plan, last minute, but didn't double-check the numbers.

John Barr described how approximately a month ago, the Committee recommended a proposal to add a public use in several zones. He explained that the minimum gross floor area in the R1 zone could be reduced. That way, a property owner could build a smaller home and avoid the re-zoning process altogether.

The Planner stated that she missed talking about this approach, as she had looked into it but the implications can be pretty broad. There would be the potential to significantly change neighbourhoods and what is currently developed. She explained that the other point that should be considered is that the new zone would be reducing the lot size for what certain neighbourhoods already do have, like in Lakeside. There would be the opportunity to sever areas that are already very dense.

The Planner further explained that there is a fairly drastic difference with minimum lot areas between the R1 and proposed SH zone for infill development. She stated that it is a matter of matching smaller homes with smaller properties so that you don't end up with small homes on large properties.

John Barr asked the Planner if this type of development is clustered, based on what she found in her review. The Planner indicated that it varies across the board. Part of the reason why developers would want to is because they can build quickly and efficiently; they want to do subdivisions. From what she saw in Selkirk, small homes were lined up on a street and fit well together.

Tanis McIntosh asked if there are rules in place in the process for subdivision to have a combination of housing types (i.e. single detached dwellings, apartments, etc.). The Planner clarified that the City would be working with a developer on what they want to do. If the City wanted to make a deal for cost sharing then perhaps the City could insert their own interest in the application.

The Planner further explained that the Committee would have the opportunity to review proposed subdivisions. At that time, they would know the proposed use and opportunities based on zoning. If it is zoned for single detached dwellings, then the subdivision would be developed with single detached dwellings. If there is a mix of zones, a mixture of housing types could be expected.

It was also explained that because the City does not have any areas currently zoned "SH", the Committee would be evaluating it on a site specific basis and it could potentially be applied concurrently with a severance application. If the R1 zone provisions were reduced, it would be an overall reduction and therefore there wouldn't be control over new lot creation.

John McDougall noted that it sounded as though there were various moving parts to the proposal. He expressed concern about protecting residents that live in areas with the potential to re-zone to the new zone, and whereby two smaller homes are built side by side.

The Planner clarified that the situation could happen essentially right now, especially with the permitted use of secondary dwellings on a lot. For lot creation, two

developments with small homes would only happen if the Committee considered concurrent applications for a re-zone and a severance. There would be public consultation for part of that.

John McDougall asked what would happen if the neighbourhood wasn't favourable to it. The Planner stated that could happen and perhaps there are road frontage and density issues. Those would be factors that are evaluated at the time of the lot creation application.

John McDougall also noted that based on the proposed provisions for the zone, a dwelling could not be built under the proposed minimum setbacks.

Robert Kitowski explained that either the minimum lot area would need to be increased or that the front or rear yard would have to be reduced.

The Planner stated that they could look at reducing the rear yard, but that she is hesitant to reduce the front yard since that is where servicing concerns are addressed.

The Committee discussed the options of reducing the proposed provisions. It was noted that the frontage would not be able to be reduced as it would restrict parking and access to the rear yard. The minimum 15m for frontage is already quite small.

It was clarified that no property would be zoned SH-Small Home without an application coming forward to the Committee.

Ray Pearson referenced the maximum height of 7 m, which is different than the other residential zones. He asked if that was to make the dwelling smaller all around. The Planner confirmed so.

Ray Pearson also noted that the supplemental articles in the application describe how some buildings are on a foundation. He asked whether restrictions need to be imposed to ensure there is a foundation for a permanent home. The Planner explained that a definition for small home wasn't created because it could be a single detached dwelling or a modular home. It is also already known that it would be permanent and that the height could be something that may need relief for, which would result in a minor variance application. However, the house could also be modular.

The Planner highlighted that the issue of making sure that a house could be built under the setback requirements could be resolved by increasing the minimum lot size. Realistically, they only need to consider it to be a one-storey because if they wanted to do a two-storey, they wouldn't need to rezone to this; they could keep an R1 zone.

The Committee calculated what the minimum lot size would need to be to accommodate a dwelling with the proposed setbacks. This area was determined to be 375 m². The Planner noted that if someone needed more reductions, a minor variance could be applied for.

Ray Pearson asked if that would change the lot coverage maximum. Robert Kitowski explained that the 40% maximum could never be reached under the proposed zone.

Kylie Hissa clarified that the 40% maximum lot coverage encompasses accessory buildings and structures as well as the coverage of the dwelling. So perhaps the 40% coverage could be reached if there were several other structures on the lot.

Tanis McIntosh also explained that it should not be assumed that this type of development would be considered low income. Once the land is purchased, the house is brought in, with the contractor costs, someone would still be looking at \$250,000 to \$300,000.

Tanis McIntosh wished to note in the minutes that this recommendation is the first draft of the proposed zone in order to open the doors and enable more discussion and development around smaller homes.

Moved by: John Barr

Seconded by: Andrew Koch

Resolved that the Planning Advisory Committee recommends that the Council of the Corporation of the City of Kenora approve city-wide application D14-19-06, to establish a new Residential – Small Home Zone (SH) in the Zoning By-law No. 101-2015; being Section 4.20 – Small Home Zone (SH), as amended. Please see the attached document.

That the Committee has made an evaluation of the applications upon their merits against the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and the Provincial Policy, and provides a recommendation to Council purely passed on these matters; whereas the Committee may not have had the opportunity to hear public comments in full.

Carried.

- (x)** Old Business
 - OACA Conference 2019

Devon McCloskey let the Committee know that flights have been booked for everyone that is attending the conference, which is held in Toronto. She informed those attending to keep receipts for everything. The Planning Department will be confirming what can be reimbursed and what won't be. She noted that if you are on their own during the conference, so will the costs. An update will be provided to the Committee when everyone returns with binders with presentations from the workshops to share.

- Sharepoint for Committee members

Devon also provided an update to the Committee for the potential of having members access the Sharepoint drive for meeting documents. IT said that this can happen and access will be given shortly. Instructions will be sent out once available.

- Second Meeting Date in June – Request for Availability

Given the volume of applications coming in for June, the Planning Department is requesting availability for a second meeting in June. Typically, the department aims to determine which applications will be more contentious than others and the amount of time an application will take at the meeting. Typically, six applications per meeting is a good limit. The regular meeting is scheduled on June 18th, 2019 and the department is proposing to have a second on June 25th, 2019.

The Chair clarified that even if one or two people can't make it that is okay for quorum purposes.

The Committee confirmed that a second meeting on June 25th, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. works for them.

The Chair also requested that if there are proposed amendments relating to the applications, including the minutes, to please cc him in an email.

(xi) Adjourn

Moved by: Robert Kitowski


That the May 21st, 2019 Planning Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Minutes of the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee meeting, Tuesday May 21st, 2019, are approved this 18th day of June, 2019.

Wayne Gauld, Chair

Kylie Hissa, Secretary-Treasurer

Minutes of the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee meeting, Tuesday May 21st, 2019, are approved this 18th day of June, 2019.


Wayne Gauld, Chair


Kylie Hissa, Secretary-Treasurer