

Début: 19 h 05 Fin: 19 h 28

<b>1</b>	<b>Q</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Est-ce que la ville est au courant de ces consultations et les prend en considération pour établir le développement de la zone CA-216?</li> <li>2. Pourquoi le règlement 1148-20 est nécessaire et que cherchons-nous à accomplir?</li> <li>3. Est-ce que le promoteur a déjà soumis un projet à la municipalité pour la zone CA-216 et de quoi s'agit-il au juste?</li> </ol>
<b>1</b>	<b>R</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nous sommes au courant des consultations qui ont été tenues par le promoteur du Quartier Meredith, mais il revient au promoteur le choix de partager ou non les résultats de ses consultations avec la Municipalité. Le promoteur a soumis récemment à la Municipalité des recommandations en vue de la révision du plan d'urbanisme. Certains des constats notés durant ses consultations ont été inscrits dans ce document soumis à la Municipalité.</li> <li>2. Quant à la raison du règlement 1148-20, il y a un projet intégré de prévu près du chemin Old Chelsea formé de trois bâtiments. Deux des bâtiments formeront une résidence pour personnes âgées, tandis que le troisième sera occupé par un centre de la petite enfance (CPE).</li> <li>3. Le promoteur des résidences souhaite relier les deux premiers bâtiments à l'aide d'une passerelle pour s'assurer que les personnes âgées soient à l'abri des intempéries alors qu'elles traversent d'un bâtiment à l'autre. Le règlement 1148-20 fait en sorte que cette passerelle ne soit pas comptabilisée dans la superficie totale du bâtiment et que chaque bâtiment de part et d'autre soit considéré distinct l'un de l'autre. Ce projet est en développement depuis quelques années.</li> </ol>
<b>2</b>	<b>Q</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. La municipalité peut-elle clarifier la notion de propriété contigüe de type 3A, 3B, et l'ajout du type 3C, qui seraient assujettis aux mêmes conditions que les propriétaires de type 3A ou 3B ?</li> </ol>
<b>2</b>	<b>R</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Le règlement sur les quais n'est pas à l'ordre du jour du conseil de ce soir. La consultation sur l'accès à la rivière est en cours et le sondage se poursuit en ligne jusqu'au 19 février.  Le Service de l'urbanisme et du développement durable prend note des commentaires dans le dossier des quais et ils seront pris en considération lorsqu'ils travailleront à nouveau sur ce règlement. Le conseil a décidé de prioriser la question des accès à la rivière Gatineau avant de finaliser le règlement sur les quais.  La Municipalité n'exclut pas la possibilité de conclure des ententes/baux comme il a été fait auparavant par Hydro-Québec. Il n'y a aucune décision prise à ce jour.</li> </ol>
<b>3</b>	<b>Q</b>	<p><u>On trail safety:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When will the Velo QC report/ recommendations be tabled at Council?</li> </ol> <p><u>On the river access survey:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. What were the specific criteria used for the selection of the 5 potential sites for public access docks to the river that were included in the survey?</li> </ol>
<b>3</b>	<b>R</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vélo Québec report is advice used by staff and the Community Trail Committee to make a recommendation to Council. There is no intention to table it because it is a working document for the Community Trail Committee.</li> <li>2. The sites for public access were selected by staff and based on comments from the community. The main criteria used was the distance from residents (not in front of residential land) and accessibility by the community trail (not from a parking area). The survey is a consultation to obtain the input of residents; this is not a vote. After the result of the consultation, the Council will have to deliberate. We are going to identify possible sites and there will be feasibility studies to consider the environmental aspect, to assess if we can put a structure or if it would be simply a place with a picnic table as stopping point.</li> </ol>



**Session ordinaire du 2 février 2021  
PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS /  
Ordinary sitting of February 2, 2021  
QUESTION PERIOD**

<b>4</b>	<b>Q</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why is it that the 1st dock permit proposal would have allowed property owners with both the road and the trail between them and the water to apply for a dock permit, but the most recent draft has excluded them?</li> <li>2. Mayor Green and our Councillor, Mr. Leduc, assured us at the first Farm Point consultation that our existing private and road docks would not be affected by their purchase of Hydro land. They said the intent was to stop non-residents from putting in illegal docks. Why are the docks that we have had for 25, 40 and even 60 years now being coined 'illegal'?</li> </ol>
	<b>R</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your property is separated from the river by River Road and the community trail: In the current draft dock by-law, your property corresponds to scenario 3B, which means you would have the right (according to this draft) to ask for a private dock to be installed.</li> <li>2. From a legal standpoint, private property in the form of a dock that is on public land for decades does not have any ownership rights. Furthermore, the criteria for acquisitive prescription in this case are not met. Hydro-Québec tolerated private docks on their land for the people who did not seek to have a lease agreement, but that does not constitute grandfathering rights. This will be the subject of future deliberation and decision by the Council regarding docks that have been there for decades.</li> </ol>
<b>5</b>	<b>Q</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As council knows, Ward 5 residents have had private property in the form of docks on the river for decades. In Quebec, an acquired right is established on immovable property after 10 years. In the case of our Winnisic community dock, it has been on the river since the early nineties. How will Council protect the ability of people who had private docks for decade, to continue to enjoy their docks and tranquility in light of the many access points proposed in Ward 5?</li> </ol>
	<b>R</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A dock that is on a public land which was owned by Hydro-Québec and is now owned by the Municipality does not have acquired rights. The Municipality is looking to build community access so that residents of Chelsea who do not have waterfront properties, such as residents of Winnisic Road and elsewhere, have a fair and equal opportunity to access and enjoy the river.  The Municipality does not exclude the possibility of having leases as previously done by Hydro-Quebec, but this is another question, and the Council will have to deliberate on that and come to a decision. First, we want to have a list of places that are public access to the river from the community trail. Then secondly, we will be looking at the question of the draft dock by-law.</li> </ol>