

A meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) was held in person on Monday, April 13, 2026, starting at 4:00pm.

PRESENT

Chairing the meeting: Hilary Campbell; Councillors Dan Smith and Jonathan Archibald; Citizens-at-large, Howard Selig, Dianne McDonald, and Margaret Jerke, Senior Project Manager Jennifer Nicholls, Development Officer, Ethan Oderkirk, Chief Administrative Officer, Ashley Crocker and Director of Public Works, Adam Verran.

Regrets: Councillor John Bartlett, Recording Secretary/Planning Services Coordinator, Sara Marceau

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 4:00pm.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

260413.01 It was moved and seconded to approve the agenda as circulated. **Motion carried.**

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.1 Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2026 Committee Meeting Minutes
February 19, 2026 Public Information Meeting Minutes

An omission was noted by Dianne McDonald, and the minutes were considered approved as corrected.

4. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 18 King Street, Planning Report

Councillor Archibald declared a conflict of interest and left the discussion table.

Development Officer Ethan Oderkirk gave a presentation on the 18 King Street Planning Report.

Development Officer Oderkirk outlined concerns that were raised at the Public Information Meeting, including stormwater management (pooling and flooding neighboring yards), increased traffic on King Street, nuisance impacts (bright lighting), and the impact on the Town's tax base if the zoning change were to take place.

Oderkirk described the process moving forward, recommending that the request proceed by development agreement. He also outlined key aspects proposed for inclusion in a development agreement, to help address some of the public's concerns:

- Requirement of a stormwater management plan
- Outlines the intended use of Subject Property
- Driveway access requirements
- Landscaped buffering requirements along King Street and south adjacent residential property – including retaining mature trees in buffer
- Lighting controls requirements
- Parking requirements
- Maintenance of property and landscaped buffer
- Permitted hours of operation control and winter maintenance

Oderkirk then described the approval process, after which Committee members asked questions:

Margaret Jerke asked whether the public would still have an opportunity to voice concerns if the motion were recommended.

- Staff responded that yes, Council is required to hold a public hearing in conjunction with Second Reading

Dianne McDonald and Howard Selig expressed concern about bright lighting overnight and asked whether motion sensors or dimming could be used.

- Staff responded that motion detector lighting could be explored, and that there may be liability reasons that require lights to be on overnight.

Margaret Jerke asked for clarification on the timeline for installing fencing and buffers, and responsibility of maintaining the fence.

- Staff responded that the mature trees would be maintained, and the fencing would go in between the trees. Staff confirmed that the development agreement states that the applicant is responsible for maintaining the fence.

Councillor Smith asked about recourse if the applicant does not follow the development agreement.

- Staff responded that the development agreement will state that all actions required in the agreement must be completed before permits are awarded.

Councillor Smith also noted that it will only be evident if the stormwater management plan works if it rains. He said that there are public comments and complaints around flooding in that area since the previous parking lot was put in. He asked for clarification on how a stormwater management plan can be accepted if it's not certain it will work, and whether there are options if it doesn't work.

Chair Hilary Campbell asked if it was possible to write a one-year review clause into the development agreement to require the applicant to take additional steps to mitigate any problems that may arise if the stormwater management plan proves to be ineffective.

- Staff responded that they would need to investigate this.

Margaret Jerke noted that there were concerns from residents about the potential effect this project may have on property values in the area. She asked if a review has been completed on this.

- Staff explained that the potential impact on neighbouring property values is not a consideration in the application process.

Dianne MacDonald expressed concern for the environment, ensuring trees are protected and that the Town is a welcoming community.

Chair Hilary Campbell noted that, based on a review of the zoning map, this would be the first commercial/residential mixed zone without frontage on Main Street. While she acknowledged that mitigation measures could be implemented, she questioned whether permitting this property to expand further into residential areas could set a precedent and asked where such expansion would be limited. She emphasized that Council must carefully consider the potential negative impacts of commercial encroachment into residential neighborhoods.

CAO Crocker asked if there is a plan to consolidate the lot, so it is not separated and the only lot that is left without road frontage.

- Staff confirmed that the development agreement requires the lot to be consolidated with the one right above it, which would give the newly consolidated lot road frontage on Main Street.

Margaret Jerke asked for clarification on whether the applicant can put a separate entrance into the new parking lot from King Street.

- Staff responded that the current development agreement states that the new parking lot must be accessed through Main Street.

Committee members discussed amendments but chose to proceed while ensuring concerns were reflected in the minutes:

The PAC recommends that Council consider putting additional mitigation measures in the development agreement or ask staff and the applicant to further explore:

- 1) Planting of mature trees instead of saplings
- 2) A clause that the stormwater management plan be revisited after one year to see if the plan is working and if not, that the applicant be required to put additional measures in place to rectify any problems, particularly with flooding
- 3) Motion censored lights or lights that will dim overnight
- 4) The negative impacts of encroachment of commercial businesses into residential areas

260413.02 It was moved and seconded that the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Council give First Reading to the proposed amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law to redesignate and rezone 18 King Street (PIDS 05079264 and 05180641) from Residential to Residential Mixed Use (RMU); and that Council give initial consideration to the attached draft development agreement; and that Council schedule a Public Hearing. **Motion carried.** Councillor Smith voted against the motion.

Councillor Archibald returned to the discussion table.

4.2 Magee Drive Amendments

Development Officer Ethan Oderkirk gave a presentation on the Magee Drive Amendments.

Development Officer Ethan Oderkirk clarified that only the amendments are coming forward at this time, and not the development agreement. This will give Council the discretion to allow grouped dwellings in its Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw. Any development over six (6) units must be approved by way of Development Agreement. Without having these amendments in place, a Development Agreement for Magee Drive cannot come forward.

Members of the Planning Advisory Committee asked a variety of questions:

Councillor Archibald asked how this development relates to trailer park situations, and if it would enable trailer parks in Town.

- Staff replied that trailer parks are a land-leased community, not a grouped dwelling. A trailer could be brought in, but only by Development Agreement.

Howard Selig asked if the grouped dwellings will all be one owner.

- Staff replied that yes, it is one owner for all the buildings.

260413.03 It was moved and seconded that the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Council give First Reading to the proposed amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law to enable Council to consider grouped dwellings within the Residential Designation by Development Agreement, and direct staff to proceed with the required Public Hearing process. **Motion carried.**

5. ANYTHING BY MEMBERS

Howard Selig expressed concern regarding increased lighting levels in the Industrial Park on the west side of Town. He noted that the intensity of lighting has grown and is impacting his property on Victoria Street, making it difficult to enjoy the area after dark. Mr. Selig indicated he is not aware of any existing Town bylaw or policy governing lighting and suggested that guidelines related to light pollution be explored.

Margaret Jerke expressed concern about the importance of maintaining clear boundaries between commercial and residential areas, noting that the Town should remain mindful of preventing the encroachment of commercial uses into residential neighborhoods.

6. NEXT MEETING DATE

Tuesday May 12th at 4:00pm. One agenda item Magee Drive Development Agreement.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Campbell declared the meeting adjourned at 5:16pm.



CHAIR



RECORDING SECRETARY