



ATTENDING

- Mayor Jodi MacKay
- Deputy Mayor Jennifer Ingham
- Councillor Mike Butler
- Councillor Wendy Elliott
- Councillor Ian Palmeter
- Councillor Kelly van Niekerk
- Councillor Howard Williams
- Chief Administrative Officer, Glenn Horne
- Recording Secretary, Laura Morrison

ALSO ATTENDING

- Director of Planning & Public Works, Devin Lake
- Manager of Communications & Strategic Initiatives, Barb Shaw
- Manager of IT, David Hopkins
- Senior Planner, Mark Fredericks
- Community Planner, Lindsay Slade
- Administrative Assistant, Laura Yaroshevskaya
- Interested members of the public

CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Deputy Mayor Ingham, called the meeting to order at 4:30pm.

Mayor MacKay read the Land Acknowledgement

Deputy Mayor passed the Chair to the Mayor

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED AS CIRCULATED.
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No conflicts of interest declared
3. Public Input	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No public input.
4. Staff Reports for Discussion	
a. RFD 053-2025: Housing Accelerator Fund Plan Review Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Director Lake presented on the Housing Accelerator Fund the first half of this presentation took place at the Special COW meeting on December 3, 2025.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jacob Ritchie from Fathom was also present as well as staff members Lindsay Slade, Community Planner and Mark Fredericks, Senior Planner who have been working on this file. <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p><i>Building Height in Downtown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the purposes of this decision, the Downtown area would include the proposed C1 expansion. No majority support for 5 or 6 storey buildings in Downtown area from council members, even if significant public investment from developers were offered. Support for 4 storeys with caveat that the Design Review Guideline Working Group look at everything within tight design guidelines such as setbacks of mechanical items like elevator shafts, so they are not seen from the street. Further parameters can be added. Architecture and design criteria could be implemented into new buildings to respect the look of the Town. In response to a question, Presidents Field is zoned Institution as part of Acadia Campus. Further discussion on that section but not as part of Downtown. Concern that when Micro Boutique was built a number of things were promised by the developer, such as a green roof, which did not come to fruition. Contributions could be written into Development Applications beyond the current owner. For small lots, if the building fills the whole lot design guidelines would be reviewed by the Design Guideline Review Working Group and would have stipulated requirements. Any challenging proposals that the site plan requirements could not clearly be applied, would fall under unique and site-specific applications and would come to council. <p><i>Parking Requirements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking minimums will be kept in the residential streets where there are ADU's. Downtown parking requirements will be removed but accessible parking requirements must be included. Zones R1 to R3 – parking requirements remain and would depend on the lot coverage.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zones R4 and R5, are largest properties in town, there is a significant set back in those zones - least area of concern. No parking requirements. Private developers will decide whether they need parking. • If someone wants a conversion they would be required to have a parking stall on site, which is not in the front yard. Only a portion of front yard can be used for parking and if that can't be done, it can't be built. • There is no demand for units that don't have a parking stall attached to them. Developers have the option to build underground parking. • Loading and garbage collection, would be looked at through site plan approval. • The Town's Minimum Property Standards cover nuisance parking and enforcement. • As part of Operational and Budget plan review, parking compliance will be looked at. • Current parking requirements are 1.5 per unit. Downtown is 1.25 per unit. Electrical vehicles, autonomous vehicles and car sharing adds another layer that the current Land Use Bylaw doesn't consider. • Single room occupancies – parking requirement exists now and would continue to be addressed. <p><i>Zoning Transition Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require buffering between high contrasting zones. • Tools such as setback requirement, solid wood fence of a certain height with cedar plantings. On some sites natural buffering exists. • Staff will bring back to council detailed buffering and setbacks. <p><i>Design Guidelines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain types of buildings are reviewed by Design Review Guideline Working Group which is made up of two architects, a history buff and staff. • There is a desire to apply the design guidelines to buildings in other areas in Town not just Main Street, to consider the size and scale throughout town and through a social impact lens. • Design Review Guideline Working Group follow a term of reference. • PAC and Council will be oriented to the process the Design Review Guideline Working Group go through for better understanding.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<p><i>Heritage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of operations and budget deliberations staff will look at a heritage study to bring someone in to advise council. • Pleased with new fence at burial ground. • Design Review Guideline Working Group must have a heritage person onboard in line with their Terms of Reference. <p><i>Site Plan Approval</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's acknowledged that for those not involved in it, the site plan approval can be quite confusing with the level of detail involved. • Approvals required to be met are contained within the Land Use Bylaw. • Development Agreement is a useful tool for site specific and unique applications and negotiations with council. It doesn't preclude rezoning applications that come to council. • Staff are working to improve communications around the site plan approval process, moving different using into this category and buffering with Design Review Guideline Working Group. • In the Site Plan appeal process, council are semi-judicial, the appeal is a test of the Town's Land use Bylaw to ensure it functions as it should and that staff have done their job. Council have no more authority than the Development Officer. • New apartment building on Pleasant was done by Site Plan approval. Concerns raised around the lack of setback. • If setbacks and buffering are required, these would be added to the Land Use Bylaw which in turn will be part of the Site Plan Approval process. • Staff will resume the monthly reports which in the past were shared with PAC and Council around the applications that come in. • Council would like to see what the checklist is that staff use in the Site Plan Approval process. • Development Applications give a sense of comfort that council can see the parameters and do the negotiation. • Improved level of communication to council so they know what is happening and can answer questions from community members. • Staff will develop a tool to show how to use the site plan that everyone can see and use. <p><i>Lighting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real change is recommended other than updating the wording.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chimney swifts discussion – unsure if lights at Robie Tufts affected their decision to leave. • A lot of requirements for light come from a public safety perspective. • Other municipalities have worked with residents to use hooding or shielding options etc. <p>View Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still looking at further enhancing views through park investment. <p>Non-Market Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Accelerator fund requirement which we feel we have completed. • Non-market housing aspirations into MPS. • Developed land bank. • Plan review component and Town Grant program to bring back to council once plan review complete. • We have a couple of years to look at what Town’s role is. This will come back with recommendations as part of the Ops Plan and in 2026 discussions with bringing process for council and reconciling the remainder of the funds. <p>Municipal Planning Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely complete, mobility and Active Transportation being reviewed and updates to mapping. • Town is in good shape with Housing Accelerator Fund Action Plan. On track to meet our requirements. There will be another round of review for council. <p>10-12-2025 IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FORWARD THE FOLLOWING MOTION TO COUNCIL FOR DECISION:</p> <p>THAT COUNCIL DIRECT STAFF TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PLANNING DOCUMENTS AND HAVE THE UPDATED DOCUMENTS BROUGHT TO A WORKSHOP IN EARLY 2026 BEFORE BEING CONSIDERED FOR FIRST READING, PUBLIC ADVERTISING AND SCHEDULING OF A PUBLIC HEARING.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p>



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
5. Regular Meeting Adjourned	REGULAR MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:13pm.

Approved by Committee of the Whole meeting of January 13, 2026
As recorded by Laura Morrison, Town Clerk & Manager of Administration