

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
AUGUST 7, 2017 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Councillor Heather Kelly, Chair  
Councillor Susan MacLeod  
Councillor Raymond Fiske  
Don Kimball  
Julie Petrella  
Mary White  
Paul Connolly  
Robert Ross  
Mike MacLeod, Planner

**1. CALL TO ORDER -**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA –**

It was **MOVED** by **Raymond Fiske** and **SECONDED** by **Susan MacLeod** that the Agenda be approved as circulated.

**Motion Carried Unanimously.**

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 5, 2017**

It was **MOVED** by **Julie Petrella** and **SECONDED** by **Mary White** that the Minutes of June 5, 2017 be approved as circulated.

**Motion Carried Unanimously.**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM LAST MINUTES**

/

**5. DOG KENNEL IN GENERAL RESIDENTIAL (R2) ZONE BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

Mike MacLeod noted that the applicant was requested to have additional information, including a site plan, ready for tonight's meeting; however, this information was not provided. Committee could discuss the proposal, but Mike did not feel that a decision could be made at this meeting. Susan MacLeod concurred.

Raymond Fiske noted that the applicants did mention that they could have the site plan in by tomorrow, but that would not assist the Committee tonight.

Robert Ross advised that not having all the information does not assist in the evaluation of an application. As such, he did not feel that the Committee should be even looking at the application. That being said, he did have some concerns. Robert felt that the size of the property may be of some concern. The area was primarily residential. This type of use may create issues with the neighbours. He noted that there are no real parameters around this type of use and felt that there ought to be a special policy developed to adequately regulate kennels. He noted that the lack of clear regulations around this and other uses, such as household livestock operations, have potential to create problems. Robert also had concern that approving applications such as this is setting a precedent for other requests.

Julie Petrella wondered about the access to the property and whether the existing driveway and parking area was sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic the use would create. Susan MacLeod enquired if we could consider only the doggy daycare (day kennel) as opposed to a full kennel operation.

Paul Connolly noted that the applicant was also looking at some overnight boarding as part of the operation and we have to evaluate based on what was applied for. Paul concurred that there was need to have all the information prior to making a decision, but felt that the noise potential was his biggest concern.

Raymond Fiske felt that a defined list of criteria for such uses would be beneficial in dealing with these applications.

Don Kimball felt that the potential noise from a kennel was an issue, but also noted that Hygiene of the operation could also be an issue. Robert Ross concurred.

Paul Connolly commented on the environmental aspect of the operation and wondered if the applicants had thought about suitability of the septic to accommodate additional water / waste water. Paul wondered if there were examples of guidelines or best practices for such operations that we could review. Mike MacLeod advised that the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association does have guidelines for kennel operations and in fact, a portion of these guidelines were incorporated as part of a previous kennel development agreement. Mike noted that he would provide copies for the next meeting.

Robert Ross noted that PAC dealt with a similar request several years ago. At that time, there was discussion around the preparation of criteria or a separate policy to deal with kennels. However, nothing was ever done in this regard. He felt that we need to have consistency and we need regulations to do this.

Julie Petrella enquired as to how stringent a development agreement could be. Mike MacLeod advised that provisions could be incorporated in development agreement to address a multitude of issues / concerns.

Robert Ross felt that a potential use of land needs to be looked at from a community liveability aspect and accessory / secondary uses such as this have the potential to erode the quality of life in an area. He felt that we need to protect what we hold dear and not water down.

Heather Kelly noted that the allowance of commercial operations in a predominantly residential area has the potential to erode the quality of life for those living in the area.

Robert Ross felt strongly that the planning reports prepared by staff need to be more detailed, providing a fuller evaluation of a proposal and including a recommendation in order for the Committee to be able to evaluate a proposal.

Heather Kelley noted that she thought that was the Committees job.

Robert Ross noted that the reports needed to contain a better evaluation and look at proposals from a sustainability perspective.

Paul Connolly felt that the applicants did not appear to have truly considered all the details of the operation prior to submitting the application. Mary White concurred.

Robert Ross felt that there ought to be a checklist of deliverables for planning amendment and development agreement applications. Mike MacLeod agreed and would look into this.

## **6. MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY AND LAND USE BYLAW REVIEW**

Robert Ross enquired as to why the Committee was spending the time to review the sections of the current MPS and LUB, as he did not feel that the documents were a true reflection of today and should not be used as the basis for a plan review. He felt that there were too many changes / improvements that needed to be made.

Heather Kelly felt that the current documents did not reflect where we need to be and that much work needs to be done to meet today's realities.

Paul Connolly somewhat disagreed, in that the state of the Municipality has changed since the adoption of the MPS and LUB in 2009, but the framework is there and is still good and is a base to build upon.

Robert Ross felt that there has been a whole lot of discussion over the last several years, but has seen little action coming out of these discussions.

Mike MacLeod advised that Staff are in the process of trying to scope out the framework for the MPS and LUB review and hoped to have something ready for Council to review shortly.

Robert felt that the amount of work required to prepare a comprehensive plan was beyond the resources of existing staff and we should be looking at preparing a request for proposals to hire the services of an external consulting firm to assist in this project.

Julie Petrella enquired as to what the Committee should be doing now to prepare for the review.

Robert Ross suggested that everyone start a list of things that they feel need to be looked at as part of the review and bring back for discussion.

## **7. OTHER**

N / A

## **8. NEXT MEETING -**

The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2017.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

---

Date