



**CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF CLARENCE-ROCKLAND
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

January 29, 2025
Teleconference

PRESENT: Carl Grimard, President
André J. Lalonde, Councillor Ward 5
Diane Choinière, Councillor Ward 8
Michel Bourdon, Member
Mathieu Couture, Member
Karine McCulloch, Deputy Clerk

1. Opening of the meeting

The President opens the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Chair informs the Committee that the applicant for item 5.4, zoning by-law amendment for 586 de la Baie, has chosen to withdraw his application at this time.

Moved by Mathieu Couture
Seconded by Michel Bourdon

THAT the agenda be adopted, with the removal of item 5.4, Zoning By-law amendment for 586 de la Baie.

CARRIED, as modified

3. Declaration of pecuniary interests

None

4. Adoption of the minutes

Moved by Michel Bourdon
Seconded by Diane Choinière

THAT the minutes of the Planning Committee of October 30, 2024, meeting be adopted.

CARRIED

5. Presentations / Reports

5.1 Zoning By-law amendment for 1220 Landry

a. Presentation

Presentation by Marc Daigneault.

b. Questions / Comments

None

c. Recommendation

Moved by Diane Choinière

Seconded by André J. Lalonde

Whereas the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-law for the property described as a Part of Lot 2, Concession 6, is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, and conforms to the Official Plan of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell; and

Whereas a zoning amendment was required as a condition of consent application B-052-2024 which received conditional approval from the Approval authority on November 8, 2024.

That the Planning Committee recommends to Council the approval of a by-law to change the zoning category of the property to be severed of file B-052-2024, from “General Agricultural (AG) Zone” to “General Agricultural – Exception 32 (AG-32) Zone”.

CARRIED

5.2 Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment for 1191 St-Jean

a. Presentation

Presentation by Marc Daigneault.

b. Questions and Comments

Councillor Choinière and Councillor Lalonde agree with the zoning change, which will allow the construction of various housing units.

c. Recommendation

Moved by Mathieu Couture

Seconded by Michel Bourdon

WHEREAS the proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Urban Area of the City of Clarence-Rockland is in conformity with the Official Plan of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell and is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement; and

WHEREAS the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-law will be in conformity with the Official Plan for the Urban Area of the City of Clarence-Rockland once the concurrent amendment to the local Official Plan is adopted;

THAT Planning Committee recommends to Municipal Council the adoption of a by-law amending the Official Plan of the Urban Area of the City of Clarence-Rockland in order to designate certain lands from “Service Commercial Area” to “High Density Residential Area”; and

THAT Planning Committee recommends to Council the adoption of a by-law amending the Zoning By-law 2016-10 in order to change the zoning category of the subject lands from “General Commercial – Exception (CG-8) Zone” to “Urban Residential Third Density Zone 3 – Exception 68 (R3-68)”.

CARRIED

5.3 Zoning By-law amendment for 1067-1079-1087-1091 Laurier

a. Presentaiton

Presentation by Marc Daigneault.

Marc Daigneault draws a parallel with the definition of a semi-detached dwelling and a linked dwelling, which are different, despite the similarities between the two types of building.

Marc Daigneault mentions that he and the developer are not trying to hide additional units, as mentioned in the report. Rather, he is trying to create an innovative project and propose alternatives to the problems that arise with this type of zoning change, such as parking. Marc Daigneault also specifies that he uses the term additional dwelling unit in the same way as supplementary dwelling

unit or accessory dwelling unit or second unit, since the term has changed several times in recent years.

Marc Daigneault mentions having informed the city's administration that the definition of a semi-detached dwelling does not mention that the party wall must be lateral or rear. The city's official plan would therefore not need to be modified, as the land in question is already zoned residential, which allows semi-detached housing. He mentions that the developer would comply with current standards for additional units. He explains his proposed definition of back-to-back semi-detached units and the difference with the units seen in Ottawa, which have different lot sizes.

Marc Daigneault discusses the city's easement on the property, for an underground pipe, and suggests that the city change the easement so that it is not in the parking lot.

The Chair, Carl Grimard, asks the administration to share their comments regarding the zoning change.

Marie-Eve Belanger summarizes the comments in the report.

In the R2 zone, which allows semi-detached units, the minimum requirements are that each unit must have frontage on a public road, and the minimum lot measurement requirements apply to each unit. In the case of the proposed project, only the front unit would have frontage on a public road. The project therefore does not meet the requirements of the R2 zone. The project could possibly meet the requirements of an R3 zone, and the administration proposes that the developer apply for this type of zoning.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger clarifies that the number of additional units permitted is per lot and not per main unit.

b. Questions / Comments

Councillor Choinière mentions her concerns about the parking lot, which doesn't seem safe for people who have to walk to get there.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger mentions that the type of unit meets the criteria of a low-rise apartment block under an R3. However, the administration has not assessed the zoning for an R3, as this was not the request. If the request is made for an R3, it

would be necessary to look at setbacks and other margins for this type of unit.

Marc Daigneault mentions that the additional units are not required to be included in the calculation for the project, so without them the proposed project is low density. If the project is presented as an apartment building, then it will be considered high density. In both cases, these are buildings with 6 units, but depending on whether it's considered low or high density, the requirements are different. The purpose of the request is to create an exception zone.

Councillor Choinière shares her opinion that, given that in both cases there would be 6 units, it would be a high-density project and therefore must meet the criteria.

Following questions, Marc Daigneault explains that the request was not made for an R3, as this would imply an amendment to the Official Plan, additional costs and delays. However, this could be an option.

Councillor Lalonde suggests that the application be made for an R3, as this would be more representative. The criteria still need to be evaluated by the administration to see if the project would qualify. He also points out that he has difficulty with the number of units and the fact that the building would be so close to the Laurier Street.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger confirmed that the applicant had been informed that, according to the definition of proposed building, it would be considered an apartment block.

Marie-Eve Belanger also mentions that should Council approve a zoning change for R2, the administration would not be able to allow two additional units on the rear main unit, which limits the number of units to 4 per building. The two additional units are permitted per lot, not per main unit. In addition, the extra units would generate more bags of garbage than anticipated per lot, which would mean that the city would no longer be able to collect garbage, and a bin would be required. There could also be problems with other departments.

Marc Daigneault informs the committee that the developer has mentioned the possibility of making an R3 application rather than an R2.

Geoffroy Lafleche, owner of the lots, joined the meeting. He responds to some of the points raised in the previous conversation. He understands that the project can only be 4 units and not 6, as originally planned. As for the garbage, the option of putting in bins needs to be verified. The project is not a way of saving on development charges, as the city can charge these costs on the additional units. He mentions that, in his opinion, an R3 application requires him to obtain more exceptions than an R2.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger mentioned that if Council recognized this new use in the R2 zone, two additional units per lot would be recognized. So a semi-detached, as proposed, could be approved and would be entitled to a maximum of two additional units to remain in an R2. If the developer wanted a 6-unit, then it would be an apartment building and an R3 would be required.

Councillor Lalonde and Councillor Choinière are concerned about the consequences of adopting this new definition, as it could set a precedent.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger mentioned that an R3 application requires an Official Plan amendment, new notices must be sent out and comments must be received. It would be a new application and a new process.

Following questions, Marie-Eve Belanger mentions that if the developer chooses to downsize to 4 units, the recommendations will have to be re-evaluated, as the application was assessed for a 6-unit. The fact remains, however, that one of the main units has no frontage on a main road and therefore does not meet the definition for an R2.

Following questions on the possibility of deferring, Julian Lenhart mentions that it would be more advantageous for the applicant to have a decision so that he can start an appeal process, if he so wishes.

Marc Daigneault mentions that the building footprint won't change whether it's an R2 or R3. What will change is the number of parking spaces required and other criteria.

c. Recommendation

Moved by Mathieu Couture

Seconded by Michel Bourdon

That the Planning Committee recommends to Council the refusal of an amendment to zoning by-law 2016-10 concerning the 1067, 1079, 1087-1091 Laurier Street to change the zoning category from “Urban Residential First Density Zone (R1)” to “Urban Residential Second Density Zone - Exception (R2-X)”.

CARRIED

6. Other Items

None

7. Adjournment

The meeting is adjourned at 8:34.

Carl Grimard, President

Karine McCulloch, Deputy Clerk