

TOWN OF MAHONE BAY
Planning Advisory Committee
MINUTES
7 March 2005

The meeting of the Mahone Bay Planning Advisory Committee scheduled for 1 March was postponed to 7 March 2005 in the Town Council Chamber beginning at 5:30 p.m.

Attendance:

Chair Councillor Lila O'Connor

Members Deputy Mayor John Bain
 Councillor Cathie Slaughenwhite-Nowe
 Ms. Lynn Hennigar
 Mr. John Biebesheimer

Staff Geoff MacDonald, Planner
 Jim Wentzell, CAO

Regrets: Mr. Ed Kinsman
 Councillor Karl Nauss

Public gallery: Councillor Uhlman, Councillor Hennigar, Mayor Feeney, Mr. Saleh, Mr. Peters, Mr. Bardon, and Mr Latter (Chester Clipper)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting on 1 February 2005 were approved on a motion by Ms. Hennigar, seconded by Councillor Slaughenwhite-Nowe.

2. Referrals and Presentations

None

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

(a) Development Agreement 458 - 466 Main Street

Lila M: Shall we go through the report page by page or hear the developer's comments now?

The Committee agreed to hear Mr. Saleh.

Cesar S: Has reviewed the proposal with Mr. MacDonald, feels that the height, mass, bulk and scale of the project are the fundamental issues. Thought that the June 2004 MPS amendments allowed this kind of building. PAC made a motion in February to accept the building, and Council accepted that recommendation. The building does have regard for pre-1919 buildings. It is setback 165' from the street, the ground level is lower than the street, the trees are taller than the building, the roof line is broken into pitch roofs, the footprint is broken into three sections, and the siding and trim are based on the pre-1919 models. The building is now 200' by 70'.

Geoff M: Agrees that height, bulk, scale are the main issues, both with reference to pre-1919 buildings under policy 9.4 and with reference to adjacent buildings under policy 19.9. If PAC agrees with Mr. Saleh's interpretation of the MPS, than that must be articulated in contrast to the interpretation put forward in the report.

Gary B: Felt that the February motion covered these issues. Felt his January correspondence and proposed motion covered the issues. (He read the proposed motion). Felt that the MPS amendment in June of 2004 allowed Council to 'have regard' for the pre-1919 buildings and proceed with the proposal. Agrees with Mr. MacDonald that there may be a need to articulate this point of view for the record. Attended the 2004 meetings on planning for the Town, understands there is a need to grow the Town, to help keep the Town financially healthy. There are many flat roofs in Town. There is much variability in roof shapes and architecture. (He quoted a passage from 'Heritage Houses in Nova Scotia' on eclectic styles). He felt that the phrase 'pre-1919' had no clear meaning.

Lynn H: Thought that her February motion dealt with these matters.

Cathy S: Agrees. 'Have regard for' means 'think about it' and make a reasonable decision. Surrounding buildings like the Brookside Trading are not pre-1919.

John Bain: Agrees. This does not change the streetscape.

John Be: Agrees

During discussion, there was general agreement on not understanding that the specific wording of the motion in February was important.

Moved by Ms. Hennigar, seconded by Councillor Slaughenwhite-Nowe:

Having had regard for the architectural character of the proposed 34-unit building at 466 Main Street under Planning Strategy Policy 9.4 and having considered the primary architectural features of the proposal under policy 19.9(f), we are satisfied that the proposal as shown on the drawings dated 23 February 2005 is suitable in: height; bulk; scale; roof shape; building materials; exterior cladding; shape, size and relationship of doors and windows; and architectural details; and that the principle architectural features of the proposal are visually compatible with nearby buildings; and we recommend that Council enter into the proposed development agreement.

Motion Carried

Mr. Bardon asked if there were any other issues to discuss.

Cathy S: The domed canopy doesn't fit in

Cesar S: That will be changed

Lila O: What about the traffic report?

Cesar S: Doesn't feel a need for a study - the numbers show no effect on traffic volume.

Gary B: Further discussion of traffic and the lack of problem.

Geoff M: Please clarify. It looks like we are going to a public hearing based on the concept sketches, but the agreement text requires the detailed landscaping and other drawings to be attached to the text.

Cesar S: Prefers to have the concepts set out in the agreement, then to work out the details at the Building and Development Permit stage. Will work with Mr. MacDonald to have a revised text for the Public Hearing.

Lila O: What is the water situation?

Geoff M: We have comments from CBCL on Mr. Saleh's proposal, but are waiting for Mr. Morash's comments.

John Be: What about parking, it looks insufficient. Are there any rooftop mechanicals?

Cesar S: No rooftop mechanical such as air conditioning. Parking meets the Land Use By-law requirements. People often buy two units, which will reduce the parking requirement. It will be centrally located which also reduces the car traffic.

~~Joe F: Ted Gates (the building inspector) had a concern for fire truck turning radius in the parking area. The swale carries street storm water, it must not be blocked.~~

Cesar S: Point well taken. The development will also be using the swale for drainage, in addition to the combined sewer.

Geoff M: No storm water can be put into the sewer, we are trying to separate them, not make the treatment problem worse.

4. New Business

5. **Other**

None

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m. on a motion by Deputy Mayor Bain, seconded by Mr. Beibesheimer. The next meeting date was set for 5 April.

Chairman

Recording Secretary

7 March

P. A. C.

MOTIONS

Moved by Ms. Hennigar, seconded by Councillor Slaughenwhite-Nowe,

Having had regard for the architectural character of the proposed 34-unit building at 466 Main Street under Planning Strategy Policy 9.4 and having considered the primary architectural features of the proposal under policy 19.9(f), we are satisfied that the proposal as shown on the drawings dated 23 February 2005 is suitable in: height; bulk; scale; roof shape; building materials; exterior cladding; shape, size and relationship of doors and windows; and architectural details; and that the principle architectural features of the proposal are visually compatible with nearby buildings; and we recommend that Council enter into the proposed development agreement.

Motion Carried