

UEL – Draft Land Use and Development Bylaw, 2010

Themes Arising from Consultation with ADP

January 21, 2010

1. Scope
 - Suggestion that Area C be divided into 2 zones
 - Limited discussion on Area C as no reps present. Further discussion required.
 - Needs more focus on sustainability
 - Lingering concerns about constitution of ADP (e.g. are there too many engineers?)
2. Format Changes
 - No issues – appreciated new format
 - Clean up metric conversions by rounding up
3. Key policy questions
 - Should there be exceptions to the setbacks? One member thought that there should no exceptions as it would encourage better design. If someone wanted to build outside setbacks they should have to get a variance.
 - It was pointed out that this approach would lead to pressure to reduce setback requirements and could be counterproductive
 - Development permit guidelines were discussed; some found them valuable; some wanted changes (e.g. elimination of provision re materials in Area B and add in view protection guideline for Area B); agreed to have architects review to see whether they helped to clarify what designs would be deemed “suitable”
 - Did not appear to be a lot of support for eliminating development permits for houses
4. Specific suggestions for changes in bylaw
 - See notes from Rhodri and Randall
5. Development Permit Process comments
 - Does not appear to be support having a public meeting outside the ADP meeting, although it became clear at the end of the discussion that there were misconceptions re intention
 - Some concern that a neighbourhood meeting for every DP would be onerous; preferred amending existing process to ensure community views were fully expressed
 - Some members were concerned about the additional workload placed on them and time spent organizing the public meeting. It was suggested that if there were no objections during the 30 day neighbourhood review a public meeting would not be necessary.
 - Support for having all applications for DP’s to go to the ADP
 - Divided views on having public input at ADP meetings, although it was acknowledged by some that doing so has added an emotional component that did not necessarily result in effective advice on design
 - Stressed importance of continuing to have public input