

# PRINCES INLET AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mahone Bay Centre

May 19th 2015, 7:00 pm

## AAC Members Present.

Jim Betts  
Bob Weld  
Royal Stevens  
Councillor Errol Knickle

Anne Cosgrove  
Kelly Nelson, Chair  
Richard Wentzell

## Regrets

James Mosher

## Municipal Staff.

Douglas Reid  
Norma Schiefer

Meeting called to order at 7.01PM. No changes made to Agenda.

## Approval of Minutes.

Moved by B Weld, seconded by E Knickle that the April 13 meeting minutes be approved.

***Motion carried.***

## Business Arising

Staff reported that the matter of the proposed development at the corner of Sunnybrook and Hermans Island Rd (re: uses exempted from watercourse setback) was currently impacted by the location of the development being proximate/potentially across property lines with the provincial road. Staff was working with the land owner to determine if any structure could actually proceed on the property as proposed.

## New Business

### 3a. Plan Review (draft LUB - sections 1-5).

Staff highlighted proposed changes to existing regulations, found in Part 1 to Part 5 of the re-drafted Land Use By-law.

One deletion noted in Part 2 (regarding municipal correspondence to the Province on any permitting process in the former Environmentally Sensitive Zone), which was no longer valid, given the change in the proposed policy approach towards identified wetlands - Parts 1-3 being generally the same as found in the previous LUB document.

Changes made in draft Part 4 (General provisions) included:

- s.4.6 - clarity on the allowance of multiple land uses on a single lot;
- s.4.13 - one dwelling per minimum sized lot (for lots that may have more than one dwelling unit);
- s.4.16 - introduction of a coastal (horizontal) setback regulation, to mitigate potential flood/surge risks
- s.4.17 - MAJOR REVISION - wetland protection regulations, rather than use a distinct zone application.

Staff's presentation largely focused on the proposed requirements found in draft Part 5, regarding the application of two Rural Zones (rather than previous LUB's use of one).

### Review of the General Zone Requirements noted:

- introduction of Prohibited Uses;
- regulations regarding accessory structures and exemptions from watercourse setback,
- restrictions on fixed roof accommodation (*number of units, not the size of use*);
- introduction of generation capacity threshold for proposed wind turbine uses.

### Staff highlighted regulations affecting the Rural Highway Corridor Zone:

- increase of permitted residential uses from 4 dwelling units per lot to 12 dwelling units;
- removal of lot frontage requirement in the LUB, application of lot area requirement (30,000 sq ft);
- increase in size threshold for permitted commercial and industrial uses (6,996 sq ft);
- Restricted Developments to be permitted by Development Agreement only (*removal of power generating plants from existing list*).

Staff then highlighted the variation for regulations affecting the Rural Coastal Zone:

- Permitted residential use limited to 4 dwelling units per lot;
- Any permitted commercial or industrial use is to be explicitly listed in the By-law (under s.5.4.3);
- Size threshold for permitted commercial and industrial uses remains at 4,037 sq ft;
- again, removal of lot frontage requirement in LUB, application of lot area requirement (30,000 sq ft);
- Uses permitted by way of Development Agreement would include those uses above size threshold levels, but does not include the list of Restricted Developments found in the By-law.

Committee discussion focused on:

- The specific location of the two identified Zones. It was noted that the current 'draft' zoning map documented that part of Maders Cove nearest to the boundary with the Town of Mahone Bay was identified with the Rural-Coastal designation, and not Rural-Highway Corridor. This particular area held elements of both zones - being on the Highway 3 corridor, but also adjacent to the coastline.
- Where the proposed variations in the draft LUB were either more restrictive than what was existing in the current 2005 LUB, or were more 'relaxed' than what is being found.
- Highlight that requirements in the subdivision by-law would (potentially) impact on lot frontage, in the development of new lots.

Staff also made note of the number of properties that would potentially be affected by the application of the two Zones framework, as opposed to the continued use of a single Rural Zone. It was noted that approx. 170 properties were located in the Highway Corridor Zone area, with another (approximate) 35 properties being "double-zoned". The rest of the identified plan area was within either the Rural Coastal Zone entirely, or within the Two-unit Residential Zone.

Staff also made note - as had been discussed in past AAC meetings - of further information regarding the initial formation of zoning regulations for the communities in the Plan Area.

A review of a 1990s Ratepayers Association newsletter highlighted that the initial community Survey, which led to the establishment of a land use by-law, was undertaken in summer 1991, with a second process / vote taken specifically in Second Peninsula in 1992. The second voting process saw that community opt out of further involvement in the proposed regulations. Approx. 87-89% of respondents had voted Yes to the introduction of land use controls in the initial 1991 survey.

**Next meeting date.**

Monday June 15th.

\*\*Staff also made note that a Public Information meeting was likely to take place, which would look to involve the members of the Area Advisory Committee, sometime in early July. The (proposed) date of Monday July 6th was identified as a possible date - staff would be undertaking a mail out to all property owners, following a review of the final sections of the draft LUB, which was proposed to take place at the next (June) PIAAC meeting.

A Cosgrove moved to adjourn at 8.30PM.

**Meeting adjourned.**