



---

**Minutes of the Town Planning Advisory Committee meeting held at Halcro Cottage, on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014 at 7 P.M., at which are present:**

Present: Deborah Woodhead, Councillor and Chairwoman  
Diane Piacente  
Joyce Galliker  
Marcus Owen  
Phillip Avis

Invited and present: Nathalie Lavoie, Director of Urban Planning, Nicole Durand, Councillor  
Convened and absent: Miriam Katz Tabori  
Invited and absent: Mayor Ed Prevost

**1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:**

The minutes of the regular Town Planning Advisory Committee meeting held on April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 were submitted to all members. It is **moved** and unanimously resolved that the minutes were **not approved** as submitted. TPAC voiced its concern on the following points:

- 1- The delay in which the minutes were circulated for revision;
- 2- The final version of the minutes were not circulated prior to the Council meeting;
- 3- The minutes were presented as adopted to the last Council meeting when in fact they had not been approved by TPAC;
- 4- **193 Main Road - New Proposal for a Residential Development:** TPAC was asked merely to 'listen to what Mr Ellerbeck has to say'. There was no indication that TPAC was expected to vote on the new plan submitted as what TPAC refers to Rev 1-2014, although that was subsequently implied to the Committee. It would be absolutely impossible to do so without serious and detailed study as this is a totally new plan of much higher density. TPAC has been in support of the concept but not the plan.

This on-going debate has taken nearly 9 years, 20 TPAC members, 3 Councils and 3 Mayors and we still have nothing. In every instance where TPAC have asked for revisions to the plan, Mr Ellerbeck would make other changes TPAC did not ask for. When pushed to finalise any presented plan, Mr Ellerbeck always walked away. The current plan is a massive increase in density and a totally new plan design which bears little or no resemblance to past submissions.

Statements were made by attending Councillors that they 'had a lot to deal with' and did the best job they could, given the time constraints and the intention to help move important projects along. It is important that Council should review and research the background information and make well informed decisions.

Lastly, clarification as to what exactly TPAC is supposed to review when Mr Ellerbeck presents: A request for a zoning change or a vote on a subdivision plan? This has been asked a number of times and TPAC would expect that the process be the request, acceptance and public consultation on the zoning change after which TPAC would consider presentations of subdivision plans. The former has not yet taken place. Why is time being wasted on the latter?

- 5- **35 Quarry Point - Proposed New Residential Construction:** Council went against TPAC's recommendation concerning the proposed architectural design of the house that does not fit within the context of the existing built environment which, in TPAC's opinion, would create important



prejudice to the immediate neighbourhood. It was misunderstood by Council members that the Town does not have any say when it comes to architectural taste and preference to which it was replied that the Town does indeed have architectural control over the type of house that can be built within its territory so as to safeguard the architectural integrity of a neighbourhood, thereby preventing prejudice to the existing properties;

- 6- **Whitlock:** The paper trail was included in the package detailing the chronology of events leading to TPAC's recommendations which were overruled by Council. TPAC members would appreciate knowing the reason for this decision especially since documents show what Whitlock is allowed to do and what Council granted them the right to do is something they had agreed not to do, especially since Whitlock have not met their requirements, for example they have not connected their parking lots to the trail head;
- 7- **Proposed Subdivision on Côte St-Charles: Whitlock Golf and Country Club Master Plan Change and Zoning Change:** It is the Committee's opinion that TPAC should be made aware of Whitlock's long term plans to assure that elements work within Hudson's Master Plan for the Town's development.

**Adopted unanimously**

2. **Como Gardens Project – Zoning Change for lot 4 658 147 :**

WHEREAS an application has been received for a zoning change from residential single family dwellings to 2 and 3 units townhouses for lot 4 658 147 on Como Gardens;

WHEREAS a preliminary residential project was presented by Mr Peter Galland, Contractor Developer, Mr. Patrick Magee, Architect and Mr. Yves Perron, Urban Planner. The 2 other parties involved in this project, Mr. Sébastien Weiner and Mr. Gerald Eisenman were absent;

WHEREAS the proposed residential project has proposed density of 11 units per hectare which does not meet density criteria of the Master Plan of 5-10 units per hectare. Therefore TPAC recommends the Town's Master Plan be modified to accommodate the project as the density proposed is only a slight increase over the existing density requirement;

WHEREAS there are 3 proposed phases for this project: Phases 1A and 1B on Como Gardens and Phase 2 on Hodgson Road, for a total of 27 to 34 units. It is understood that this meeting will only involve Phase 1A of the development project;

WHEREAS all environmental concerns regarding lot 4 658 147, whereupon Phase 1A is proposed to be built, have been addressed to the complete satisfaction of the Ministère du Développement Durable, de l'Environnement, de la Faune et des Parcs (MDDEFP) who issued its Certificate of Authorization;

WHEREAS the back part of lot 4 658 147, which represents approximately 80% of what is referred to as the Peat Bog, has been purchased by the Ministry of Transport who in turn will eventually cede it to the Town;

WHEREAS this lot is considered a sensitive area, thereby the Committee would need further input as to the soil bearing capacity and the water table level especially since there is evidence of a spring on one of the proposed building sites;

WHEREAS the Project Developers suggest including a buffer zone of 10 meters between the buildable lots and the Peat Bog, said buffer zone to be ceded to the town as part of the 10% requirements for the land transfer for Parks or Playgrounds. The balance of the 10% value will be of a monetary nature;



WHEREAS this lot is currently serviced by both municipal services, i.e. water and sewers. According to a study conducted by Stéphane Raymond and Catherine Haulard, the sewer treatment plant has, at present, the overall capacity to process the additional load engendered by this project, and the Town's water network, at present, should be able to supply the water needs for this project, although solutions will have to be found for future water needs;

THEREFORE it is **moved** and resolved (3 for, 1 against) that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends** the approval of the proposed zoning change with the following remarks:

- 2.1 The vote against is based on the fact that there is not enough information at this moment about PMAD and the MRC Master Plan to be able to give a recommendation;
- 2.2 The concept, as presented, is the type of project Hudson would appreciate seeing more often which is sensitive to the style of Hudson, yet meets the present and future needs and requirements of the Town;
- 2.3 The citizens should not be cut-off the decision process involved in the approval or rejection of this project, thereby TPAC recommends that collectively with the Town Administration the project be presented to the residents affected within the zone;
- 2.4 The Committee recommends there be only semi-detached dwellings in Phase 1A;
- 2.5 What will be the time framing for Phase 1B, once accepted by the Ministère du Développement Durable, de l'Environnement, de la Faune et des Parcs (MDDEFP), as well as for Phase 2;
- 2.6 What will the environmental impact be on the bog as well as the whole area once this sensitive area has been disturbed?

**Adopted**

3. **49 Lower Maple – Demolition and New Construction Project** :

WHEREAS a demolition request and preliminary proposal for a new 6 unit/5 garage townhouse construction project has been received for 49 Lower Maple;

WHEREAS the present building does not meet any of the guidelines enumerated in By-Law N° 355, Section 5.A;

WHEREAS Zone R-59 permits multi-family dwellings;

WHEREAS the new construction project, in essence, meets with the densification needs of the Town's Master Plan for more multi-family dwellings in the downtown core;

WHEREAS it is suggested that this application for demolition be broken into 3 parts namely: demolition, reutilisation concept and 10% monetary or land transfer for parks or playgrounds;

THEREFORE it is **moved** and resolved (3 for, 1 abstain) that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends** the approval of the new construction project with the following remarks:

- 3.1 One member abstained from voting on this demolition and new construction project with the following remark: There is a sudden influx of large development projects without considering the overall impact on the Master Plan and the Vision of the Town, which is critical path;



3.2 Demolition recommendations:

3.2.1 The demolition permit will only be presented to the demolition committee once all the criteria of the new building have been met by the Planning Department.

3.2.2 Demolition will be conditional on the approval of the replacement project and the issuance of the building permit.

3.2.3 The actual demolition of the building will only be done once the replacement project is ready to start.

3.3 TPAC acknowledges the fact there cannot be a 10% land transfer therefore recommends the 10% monetary option.

**Adopted**

4. **71 Maple – Demolition and New Construction Project :**

WHEREAS a demolition request and preliminary proposal for a new construction project has been received for 71 Maple;

Therefore it is **moved** and unanimously resolved that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends the approval** of the plans as submitted.

**Adopted unanimously**

5. **397 Main – Major Commercial Renovation :**

WHEREAS a request was received for a major commercial renovation project at 397 Main;

WHEREAS the new elevation will have minimum impact on Main Road;

Therefore it is **moved** and unanimously resolved that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends the approval** of the plans as submitted.

**Adopted unanimously**

6. **96 Elm - Proposed Extension to the House :**

WHEREAS a request for a proposed residential addition has been received for 96 Elm;

Therefore it is **moved** and unanimously resolved that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends the approval** of the plans as submitted with the following suggestions:

6.1 Shingles on the upper floor could be in a darker tone to break-up the height of the house.

**Adopted unanimously**

7. **688 Main - Proposed Addition to the House :**

WHEREAS a request for a proposed residential addition has been received for 688 Main;



---

THEREFORE it is **moved** and resolved (3 for, 1 against) that the Town Planning Advisory Committee **recommends** the approval of the proposed addition to the existing building with the following conditions:

- 7.1 Any joint between existing exterior materials and new addition to seamlessly integrate so as to create a uniform transition.
- 7.2 The detached garage exterior could also be addressed.

**Adopted**

8. **Discussion on Documents Required for New Development Projects**

Draft guidelines will be presented at the next caucus meeting to Council for revision, after which they will be given to the Town Planning Advisory Committee members as guidelines for new projects.

9. **193 Main – Discussion on the proposed Residential Development: Ellerbeck Property**

The Committee members exchanged views and information on this and other upcoming projects.

10. **Termination of Meeting:**

Having no other subjects to discuss, the meeting ends at 11:15 p.m.

Next meeting: June 12<sup>th</sup> 2014, 7 P.M.