

**Planning Board Meeting
30 January 2024, 6pm
Victoria Schoolhouse, 730 Victoria Rd**

MINUTES

In attendance:

Planning Board members (4): Chair Councillor Eric Gilbert, Susan Oxley, Janet Lauzon (by Zoom), Mayor Martin Ruben (by Zoom).

Regrets sent by Councillors Ben Smith and Shelley Trainor.

Staff: CAO Anna Keenan, FAA Marsha Empson

And 3 members of the public (in person or by Zoom)

1. Call to Order

Chair Eric Gilbert called the meeting to order at 6:04pm, with quorum achieved.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Janet Lauzon moved that the agenda as circulated be adopted. Seconded by Susan Oxley. Motion carried (3/0).

3. Approval of minutes

a. Minutes of Planning Board meeting of December 5, 2023

Janet Lauzon moved that the minutes of the December 5 planning board meeting be approved as circulated. Seconded by Susan Oxley. Motion carried (3/0).

b. Minutes of the Public Meeting on the Official Plan and Development Bylaw, January 23, 2024.

Susan Oxley moved that the minutes of the January 23 Public Meeting on the Official Plan and Development Bylaw be approved as circulated. Seconded by Janet Lauzon. Motion carried (3/0).

4. Reviewing correspondence received since the public meeting of January 23, 2024.

The correspondence included in the meeting package was noted, with all Planning Board members present acknowledging that they had reviewed the correspondence before the meeting.

5. Discussing amendments to the Official Plan and Development Bylaw, based on input received at the public meeting.

a. Minor edits for accuracy (general comments, lot sizes in the Commercial zone)

The CAO recommended that all of the 'general edits' noted in the minutes of the public meeting be made, with the exception being the subjective rephrasing of 'until recently' to instead be a more neutral 'a quiet seaside community'.

The planning board approved that the minor general edits recommended should be made, by general consensus of all voting members present. (3/0)

b. Agricultural Zone

The CAO summarized her reflections after hearing input from the Public Meeting of Jan 23. Based on that input, as well as advice received from our planning consultant Samantha Murphy during December, the CAO recommends:

- Introducing a minimum lot size of 2 acres in the agricultural zone
- A cap of 4 units of housing for multi-unit developments per lot, and
- that housing should be associated with/incidental to an agricultural use of the land.

Discussion included:

- The tension between the ideas of retaining and protecting agricultural land in the municipality itself, versus allowing higher-density housing development here which would protect agricultural land in the rest of the province.
- Examples from other municipalities (notably Ancaster in Ontario)
- The community's desire to protect farmland.
- The need to support affordability and availability of housing.
- That two separate issues are being discussed:
 - what is allowed to occur in any agricultural zone (which the CAO has given her recommendations for), and
 - Removing the future land-use designation of 'General Residential' from the currently-agricultural land to the east of Nelson St. (which is an issue that was not discussed in the last year of Planning Board discussions, only in the last week).

Susan Oxley moved that, in response to comments heard at the Public Meeting, the Official Plan and Development Bylaw be amended to specify that in the Agricultural Zone, the following requirements be added:

- *a minimum lot size of 2 acres*
- *multi-unit residential uses should only be allowed up to a maximum of 4 units,*
- *any residential uses should be associated with (incidental to, secondary to) an agricultural use.*

Seconded by Mayor Martin Ruben.

Discussion ensued on the degree to which this motion meets the intention of the Official Plan and bylaw, and the feasibility of implementation.

Motion carried (3/0).

Discussion continued on the possibility of removing the future land use designation of 'General Residential' from the land east of Nelson Street.

The CAO does not recommend removing this designation, for three reasons:

- It is a substantive change that would likely require another public meeting.
- It is reasonable that one of the 3 currently-agricultural areas be designated as General Residential, and of the three areas, this is the land that is most appropriate.
- The change to General Residential use is an future option only, not prescriptive: it's a future option that future Councils may choose whether or not they wish to exercise that option.

Planning Board discussed the matter at hand, and the processes that would be required to re-zone this land in future, if the plan remains as is. No motion was brought forward to change the future General Residential designation.

c. Preservation of Heritage Character

The CAO recommended that, based on the comments received at the public meeting:

- The Objectives in the Central Core be changed to include preservation of heritage architectural compatibility, and
- That in the Development Bylaw, that compliance with the Design Guidelines (Appendix D) be a requirement for the Central Core, rather than simply optional and encouraged as it is for all other zones in the municipality.

Janet Lauzon moved that the architectural design guidelines be required for development in the Central Core zone, with changes to be made for consistency across both the Official Plan and Development Bylaw. Seconded by Susan Oxley. Motion carried (3/0).

Discussion included:

- how these guidelines can be enforced from an administrative perspective
- the level of detail included in the guidelines, and whether more should be added or removed.
- if these requirements also extend to commercial buildings built in core area?

Motion Carried (2/0 with 1 Susan Oxley abstaining)

d. Tourism (including Short-Term Rentals)

No specific amendments were recommended by the CAO following the Public Meeting. No motions were proposed by Planning Board members.

e. Traffic and Parking

No specific amendments were recommended by CAO following the comments received at the Public Meeting. The parking guidelines included are 'guidelines', and if they are not practical or possible on a certain site, there is the ability for them to be varied.

The CAO summarized the active debates about parking at the moment in many municipalities in PEI, Canada and around the world:

- The main argument in favour requiring parking is that people visiting a commercial business can park on that lot, at the commercial site, rather than on the street, which is unsightly.
- The main argument against parking minimum requirements is that it results in a lot of land on many properties occupied by parking lots, which are unsightly, contrary to heritage values, and contribute to a lack of density and lack of walkability in communities..
- The long term solutions for traffic and parking in Victoria (as in any municipality) are: integration into transit networks, establishing metered on-street parking, establishing a municipal parking lot (outside of the central core, for example by the Schoolhouse), pedestrianizing the core of the village, and more.

CAO recommends that PB continue to look at long-term solutions for parking and traffic in the future, but does not recommend changes to the draft Official Plan and Development Bylaw at this time.

Discussion from Planning Board members included:

- The validity of public concerns around parking.
- That the Development Bylaw has various provisions and criteria for traffic.
- The need to engage the province to conduct a traffic study and to look at options.

No motion was brought forward.

f. Section 7, Investing in the Future - Noise & Nuisance Bylaw

CAO agrees that the suggestion received at the Public Meeting to develop a Noise & Nuisance Bylaw in the future is a reasonable request. It does not pose a problem to include in the list, as the list is not prescriptive.

Susan Oxley moved that a Noise and Nuisance Bylaw, with appropriate description, be added to the list in Section 7 of the Official Plan. Seconded by Janet Lauzon. Motion carried (3/0).

Discussion included the development-related bylaws that the Council is currently considering.

Mayor Martin Ruben moved that a Dangerous, Hazardous and Unsightly Properties Bylaw, with appropriate description, be added to the list in Section 7 of the Official Plan. Seconded by Janet Lauzon.

Discussion included:

- That 'unsightly' is a subjective judgement that there may be disagreement around, but judgements of dangerous, hazardous and derelict are more objective to assess.

Motion carried (3/0).

6. Recommendation of the Official Plan and Development Bylaw to Council.

Susan Oxley moved:

- ***That the Planning Board recommends to Council the adoption of the draft Official Plan and Development Bylaw, after the amendments agreed upon at this meeting have been incorporated, and further,***
- ***that the CAO be authorised to craft the specific language of the changes agreed to this evening before presentation of the Plan and Bylaw to Council.***

Seconded by Janet Lauzon.

Discussion noted that while two members were absent for the final motion to move documents forward, both were involved with decision making processes.

Motion Carried. (3/0)

Staff and members of planning board expressed mutual appreciation and congratulations for reaching this milestone moment. It was noted that public input was carefully considered and that the group has done a lot of work to reach this alignment.

A standing ovation was given by the resident present in the public gallery.

7. Scheduling next Planning Board meeting dates

The Planning Board discussed and agreed to leave the next committee meeting for a date yet to be determined, as the process for approving the plan progresses.

8. Adjournment

With no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 7:52pm.