



**Town of Amherst
Planning Advisory Committee Meeting**

Agenda

Date: **Monday, March 11, 2019**
Time: **4:30 pm**
Location: **Council Chambers, Town Hall**

	Pages
1. Call to Order	
1.1 Approval of Agenda	
1.2 Approval of Minutes - February 19, 2019	1 - 5
2. Motion - Recommendation for Demolition 1 Spring Street	
2.1 Staff Report	6 - 9
2.2 Committee Questions / Comments	
2.3 Recommendation	
3. Amherst Courthouse Accessibility Retrofit	
3.1 Staff Report	10 - 17
3.2 Committee Questions / Comments	
3.3 Recommendation	
4. Adjournment	

Town of Amherst Planning Advisory Committee Minutes

Date of Meeting: Monday, February 19, 2019
Location: Council Chambers, Town Hall

Members Present: Deputy Mayor Sheila Christie
Councillor Terry Rhindress (Vice Chair)
Councillor Jason Blanch
Citizen Appointee Gordon Goodwin
Citizen Appointee Ronald Wilson

Members Absent: Citizen Appointee Larry Pardy

Staff Present: Deputy CAO, Jason MacDonald
Unsightly Premises Administrator, Marc Buske
Manager of Planning and Strategic Initiatives, Andrew Fisher
Municipal Clerk Kimberlee Jones
Administrative Assistant Emily Wainwright

Others Present: Town Solicitor, Terry Farrell

1. Call to Order

Vice-Chair called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

1.1. Approval of Agenda

Moved By: Deputy Mayor Christie
Seconded By: Citizen Appointee Wilson
That the February 19, 2019 agenda be approved.

Motion Carried

1.2. Approval of Minutes

Moved By: Citizen Appointee Goodwin

Seconded By: Councillor Blanch

That the minutes of the February 4, 2019 PAC meeting be approved.

Motion Carried

2. Recommendation for Demolition – 1 Spring Street

2.1. Staff Report

Mr. MacDonald reviewed the staff report as included as part of the agenda package.

2.2 Owner Questions / Comments

The owner was not in attendance. Mr. Jim O'Neill, attorney representing the property owner, Walter Wells, spoke regarding the current situation with the property owner. "There is a problem as some of you may know. Mr. Wells was beaten badly, and the people have been charged with assault. He was in hospital for a while. I have had a hard time getting a hold of him. The last time I spoke with him he was still in the hospital and was in pretty bad shape. He was unable to come to the last meeting and I still cannot get him by phone, and I've tried three or four times today, and I have even checked the hospital with a follow up investigation trying to find out what is going on. So, I did note one thing, and correct me if I am wrong, I think the Town engineer indicated it's not in imminent danger now and therefore action could not be taken without the committee. Am I right about that?" Mr. MacDonald replied that he was correct. If it is in imminent danger to the public, the Town engineer could order to demolish with almost no notice. Mr. O'Neill stated "That is an important point in my presentation to you today. I am here without instructions so I will do the best I can under the circumstances. A good point, the building will eventually fall down anyways, as will all buildings, and this has been a slow-moving situation. In the circumstances, and I know it is inconvenient, but I am going to move for an adjournment. In this case where I cannot get a hold of the owner, and he has some serious problems, I would like to determine what is going on. Because I can't make a motion or to make a recommendation on whether it is even possible to repair it, so that is all I can really do. If you decline my request, I cannot really argue anything substantial without contacting Mr. Wells."

2.3 Committee Questions / Comments

Councillor Blanch stated that “we have adjourned once for the exact same reason, and I do not feel as though you are giving me confidence that any timeline or anything that we would not come here and sit again and hear the exact same request. It is a mirror of what we heard two weeks ago and I’m wondering if you have more to offer if we were to accept your recommendation, or your appeal. If you had more to offer that would offer some piece of mind that we would come and actually have a reason to be here. Mr. O’Neill replied that “I would say the same thing if I were in your position. What I would recommend is that it be put over to an indefinite date, I guess I call it sudden death, so at that point if I can find out what is going on and if we do not have a medical report or something, then at that point I think it would be fair game to go ahead. These kind of proceedings or adjournments are not unusual. I know in court, cases get adjourned all the time. There has to be some care to make sure that the owner, because what is recommended is equivalent to the death sentence, it is demolition, and those are very difficult orders to deal with and maybe that is appropriate, but I don’t know. Until I find out if my client has a view of repairs, given the drastic nature of the recommendation I think an adjournment would not be too much for the Town to bear in the circumstances given what you have been asked to decide.”

Deputy Mayor Christie stated “the letter had gone out on November the 28th giving notice of this hearing. We are now in February the 19th. As well as, the first complaint on the property was in 2015, so there has been ample time to have this addressed, and like my fellow Councillor, I do express the same concern that we will be in the exact same situation. If this committee decides to proceed and go ahead, there are other avenues of appeal that are open, so there really isn’t an issue for us to postpone it because those avenues are there. So, I would be inclined to say we need to move forward based on the history of the dates and the letter that was sent from this office on the 28th of November.”

Citizen Appointee Wilson stated “I concur with the opinions expressed by the other committee members. I think what we should also recognize is certainly the rights of your client in respect to the matter before us, but we also have an obligation to the community, to the citizens of Amherst, in that it has been identified that there are inherent safety issues related to the condition of the building. At a previous meeting we saw photographs, not only of condition of the exterior of the building as Mr. MacDonald alluded to in his report, but there appears to be, based on the report given by the building inspector, what appears to be considerable issues structurally on the interior of the building. Given the weather conditions that we have, and the fact there are opportunities for people within the community to access that building I think that it has come upon this group to address the issues, and then the property owner has opportunities to take recourse.” Mr. O’Neill replied “I am not sure if that is a question or if I should comment, but I can’t disagree with anything that you are saying. I am not an engineer, or even a carpenter, but I am relying completely on the Town engineer who said it was not in imminent danger when I made the request for adjournment. I just wanted to clarify.” Mr. Wilson stated that “your point about the recommendation of the engineer with respect to imminent danger of collapse, the

fact that it has been brought to the attention of this committee by the building inspector who has a fairly significant degree of expertise in the matter at hand. He has made the recommendation that identified issues of safety that would be concerning to us and I think that as a result of that, we have an obligation to move forward and let the process take its course.”

Citizen Appointee Goodwin address Mr. O'Neill and asked, “is there any feedback to you from the medical people as to when Mr. Wells would be well enough to give proper instruction so that you can go forward?” Mr. O'Neill replied “no, I don't. In fact, the last time I spoke to anyone was when he was in the hospital, so he has not provided me with anything.” Mr. Goodwin asked, “is he still in the hospital now?” Mr. O'Neill replied “no, he is not. I am not even sure who his personal doctor is, I do not have that kind of rapport with Mr. Wells. I can only provide you with what I have, which is not very much.”

Councillor Blanch stated that “we have two reports, one from the building inspector and one from the Town engineer. It seemed as if the Town engineers report showed less concern than the building inspector. That is in my reading, and I only have the skills I come with. I guess I really want to echo what you're saying in that not having great expertise and having one report that says it is in imminent danger of collapse and having one say that it's not quite so bad, but definitely in a bad way, makes me feel, based on a precautionary principle I would go with the assessment that says it is in the worst condition. I was young, and I would not have thought twice about climbing into an old building to look around and I can just imagine if we postpone and something terrible were to happen, then we would have some responsibility in those events for postponement.”

Citizen Appointee Goodwin stated “I understand that the building is fenced now to prevent pedestrians and traffic from getting too close. If the front wall collapsed, depending on which way it goes, it will be on the street. The other thing is that Ben has already said that maybe it will not collapse all that quickly. As from my experience around buildings, if the roof is overloaded then the collapse is always inward. If it is subject to a collapse by wind forces, then it is probably going to be outward. The big danger really is the house immediately adjacent on the South Albion Street side. If that building is going down, it will impact the house.”

Deputy Mayor Christie added that “when we all see the pictures, it is definitely collapsing inside. There has been some collapse happened already and this has been ongoing since 2015. There has just been delay after delay with some of these things, and it is time we take safety ahead of other things and with the house being so close and the street being so close, I think that it is due diligence on our part to make sure it is no longer a safety hazard, because it is going to come down, and it has already proven that. It is just a matter of when and how fast and what damages is it going to cause.”

Vice-Chair Rhindress added that he is very worried about the house next door and asked if the Town would be liable if something happened. Mr. MacDonald replied "I do not have a comment on whether we are liable. We've received a complaint, done our investigation, the Town engineer said it is not in imminent danger to the street, we have fenced off the property to make sure that people can't get at the property. So we believe we have taken all the steps that we should have in order to ensure public safety and that the Town is following the rules set out in the Municipal Government Act."

3. Adjournment

Citizen Appointee Goodwin motioned to adjourn the meeting at 12:37p.m.

Motion Carried

Kimberlee Jones, Municipal Clerk

Vice Chairman Terry Rhindress



TO: Mayor Kogon and Members of Amherst Town Council

FROM: Jason MacDonald, LPP, MCIP, Deputy CAO

DATE: March 4, 2019

RE: 1 Spring Street – Recommendation to Demolish

Issue

A recommendation from the Dangerous and Unsightly Premises Administrator to order the building located at 1 Spring Street to be demolished:

Process

The meeting of March 4, 2019 is an opportunity for the Committee to make a decision on the recommendation of the Administrator to demolish the building located at 1 Spring Street. The process for this agenda item is as follows:

- a) The report of the Administrator will be summarized;
- b) PAC members may ask questions of staff;
- c) Upon motion, PAC will make a decision on the matter.

As the hearing on this matter has already taken place, there will not be an opportunity for the owner or the public to address the Committee at this meeting.

History

A complaint was received in 2015 regarding the condition of the property. At that time the Town cleaned up the property and the costs were added to the property owners tax account. In November of 2018 a second complaint was received regarding the structural integrity of the building. Due to the advanced state of disrepair and partial collapse of the roof the Town has fenced the property to restrict access to the building.



A November 27, 2018 inspection by a Building Official with the Municipality of the County of Cumberland identified the following issues:

- 1- The brick face is showing signs of mortar failure and cracking
- 2- The top plate at the junction between roof and wall is open in sections and rotted
- 3- The top wall on the backside of the exterior is collapsed inward
- 4- Front wall and side show signs of structural failure
- 5- Side wall on top portion of building side shows cracking and disconnect from roof structure
- 6- Interior of building shows near complete structural failure
- 7- Collapsed floor open to below
- 8- Roof support beam failed and is broken and roof rafter system is failing
- 9- Roof is collapsed and open to the elements

Due to the advanced state of deterioration of the building and close proximity of the building to the street, the Town Engineer has been periodically monitoring the property for signs of imminent collapse. While the Engineer is not yet of the opinion that there is an immediate danger to the street, it is not prudent to wait until such a condition exists to take steps to remedy the known hazard.

Municipal Government Act

Section 346 (1) of the Municipal Government Act states:

Where a property is dangerous or unsightly, the council may order the owner to remedy the condition by removal, demolition or repair, specifying in the order what is required to be done.

Municipal Government Act Definition of Dangerous or Unsightly

“dangerous or unsightly” means partly demolished, decayed, deteriorated or in a state of disrepair so as to be dangerous, unsightly or unhealthy, and includes property containing

- (i) ashes, junk, cleanings of yards or other rubbish or refuse or a derelict vehicle, vessel, item of equipment or machinery, or bodies of these or parts thereof,
- (ii) an accumulation of wood shavings, paper, sawdust, dry and inflammable grass or weeds or other combustible material, is stockpiled, hidden or stored away and is dangerous, unsightly, unhealthy or offensive to a person, or
- (iii) any other thing that is dangerous, unsightly, unhealthy or offensive to a person, and includes property or a building or structure with or without structural deficiencies**
- (iv) that is in a ruinous or dilapidated condition,**
- (v) the condition of which seriously depreciates the value of land or buildings in the vicinity,**
- (vi) that is in such a state of non-repair as to be no longer suitable for human habitation or business purposes,**
- (vii) that is an allurements to children who may play there to their danger,**
- (viii) constituting a hazard to the health or safety of the public,**
- (ix) that is unsightly in relation to neighboring properties because the exterior finish of the building or structure or the landscaping is not maintained,**
- (x) that is a fire hazard to itself or to surrounding lands or buildings,**
- (xi) that has been excavated or had fill placed on it in a manner that results in a hazard, or**
- (xii) that is in a poor state of hygiene or cleanliness;**



Recommendation

The Planning Advisory Committee has the following options:

1. Accept the recommendation of the Administrator and order the building on the property be demolished.
2. Order the property owner to:
 - a. Immediately hire an engineer to evaluate the building and make immediate repairs necessary to mitigate any hazard the building may cause.
 - b. Immediately hire an engineer to submit stamped drawings for the design of the complete repair of the building in order to bring it into compliance with all relevant provisions of the Nation Building Code along with a timeframe and budget for such repairs.

Given the advanced state of deterioration of the building evident and the deficiencies listed above, including the fact that the roof has already partially collapsed, combined with the likely cost of remedying those deficiencies the Administrator has recommended demolition as the remedy to address the dangerous and unsightly condition of the property.

Motion

That the Planning Advisory Committee order that all contents be removed from the building at 1 Spring Street and the building be demolished, and back fill the hole within 21 days from the date of this Committee meeting, with all work to be done by the property owner. Failure by the property owner to do the work will result in the Town completing the work and send all contents of the building to an appropriate solid waste facility with all costs charged to the property owner's tax account.



SYNOPSIS

1 Spring Street

This property received its first complaint in May of 2015. The lack of maintenance over the years has left the building in a state of serious disrepair. As articulated in the reports filed by the Building Official, there are various locations of structural failure, and one rear wall has already collapsed.

Given the advanced state of deterioration of the building evident and the deficiencies listed above, including the fact that the roof has already partially collapsed, combined with the likely cost of remedying those deficiencies the Administrator has recommended demolition as the remedy to address the dangerous and unsightly condition of the property.

A hearing was held on February 19, 2019 to allow the property owner and the complainants an opportunity to provide input on this issue. The property owner's representative requested an adjournment of this issue, however did not provide any information regarding the owners plans, if any, to remedy the deficiencies within the building.

MOTION:

That the Planning Advisory Committee order that all contents be removed from the building at 1 Spring Street and the building be demolished, and back fill the hole within 21 days from the date of this Committee meeting, with all work to be done by the property owner. Failure by the property owner to do the work will result in the Town completing the work and send all contents of the building to an appropriate solid waste facility with all costs charged to the property owner's tax account.

To: Heritage Advisory Committee
From: Andrew Fisher, Manager of Planning & Strategic Initiatives
Date: March 4, 2019
Subject: **134 East Victoria – Provincial Courthouse substantial alteration - accessibility ramp**

PROPOSAL:

The Province of Nova Scotia intends to alter the Provincial Courthouse building to make it barrier-free. This will include the installation of an elevator within the existing building footprint, and an exterior accessibility ramp on the north side entrance facing Victoria Square. As a designated heritage property, the exterior ramp constitutes a substantial alteration, which under the NS Heritage Act requires review by the Heritage Advisory Committee.

BACKGROUND:

The Provincial Courthouse building is a Municipally Registered Heritage property. Given the heritage value of the building and its prominence in the downtown adjacent to Victoria Square, any alterations to the building exterior could be considered substantial. The NS Department of Justice hired an architectural firm to develop ramp construction options that maximizes its functionality while minimizes the visual impact on the building and Victoria Square. A review team that included representatives from the design team, Department of Justice, Cumberland County (the property owners), and Town Staff considered various ramp options, and the attached design was determined to be the best option.

The preferred option includes construction of the ramp off the side of the existing north entrance. The stone materials used will be chosen to match, as closely as possible, the existing building. The ramp is cantilevered out from the building main wall so as to not create a void space between the ramp and the building. While not within the mandate of the Heritage Advisory Committee, landscaping, lighting, and other features within the Square will be reinstated as part of the project.

RELEVANT POLICY AND DISCUSSION:

As noted above, the courthouse is a very prominent public building of significant heritage value that is worthy of protection. As such, any alteration to the exterior of the building warrants careful consideration that the heritage value is not diminished. The proposed accessibility ramp design will perform a critical function (ie. Barrier-free access) while respecting the heritage character, and will support the long-term use of the building for a public purpose.

It should be noted that the Province is not legally bound by municipal regulation, but has sought input on the design from stakeholders, and is looking for concurrence from the Town.

CONCLUSIONS:

The Provincial Courthouse building currently does not offer barrier-free access to the ground floor occupied by Restorative Justice, or the actual courtroom on the second floor. In order to ensure continued use of the building within the justice system and other public purposes, it must be made accessible to members of the public of all abilities. This proposal provides barrier-free access while respecting the heritage character of the building. Staff feel that this matter is an opportunity to herald the commitment being made to preserve this building.

OPTIONS:

- Option One: Recommend that Council approve the addition of an accessibility ramp as proposed.
- Option Two: Recommend to Council not approve the addition of an accessibility ramp as proposed.
- Option Three: Defer the application and instruct Staff to provide more information or negotiate changes to the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Option One.

Amherst Justice Centre
New Barrier-Free Ramp - Option 1 - Updated
Jan. 29, 2019 Scale 1:100

Existing vertical
lights.

Low planting to
compliment
other planting in
park.

Perhaps granite
cubes could be
relocated to this
area to create
feature.

New concrete stairs and handrails opening
onto park and to access back parking.
Coordination of handrails with ramp required.

Stairs

Light



Amherst Justice Centre - Supreme Court
New Barrier-Free Ramp - Option 1 - Revised
Jan. 31, 2019



Amherst Justice Centre - Supreme Court
New Barrier-Free Ramp - Option 1 - Revised
Jan. 31, 2019

Materials and Colours

Match existing exterior stairs in form and material.



SYNOPSIS

134 East Victoria - Provincial Courthouse Substantial Alteration - Accessibility Ramp

The Province of Nova Scotia intends to renovate the Provincial Courthouse building to make it barrier-free. This will include the installation of an elevator within the existing building footprint, and an exterior accessibility ramp on the north side entrance facing Victoria Square. As a designated heritage property, the exterior ramp constitutes a substantial alteration, which under the NS Heritage Act requires review by the Heritage Advisory Committee.

The courthouse is a very prominent public building of significant heritage value that is worthy of protection. As such, any alteration to the exterior of the building warrants consideration that the heritage value is not diminished. The proposed accessibility ramp design and use of materials complimentary to main building, will perform a critical function (ie. Barrier-free access). These renovations will support the long-term use of the building for a public purpose.

MOTION:

That the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the addition of an accessibility ramp as proposed.