

COMMUNITY OF TIGNISH
OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW REPORT

Prepared for:
The Community of Tignish
By:
Lewis Consulting Services
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island

June 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	2
2.0 PLANNING IN TIGNISH	3
3.0 THE 2007 OFFICIAL PLAN AND BYLAW REVIEW PROCESS	4
4.0 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS OF THE 2000 OFFICIAL PLAN	4
5.0 DEMOGRAPHY	5
6.0 DEVELOPMENT LEVELS IN TIGNISH AND SURROUNDING AREA	6
7.0 SETTLEMENT PATTERN	8
8.0 WATERSHEDS AND TOPOGRAPHY	9
9.0 LAND USE, LAND USE CHANGES AND LAND USE CONFLICTS	9
10.0 BUILDING PERMITS AND SUBDIVISION APPROVALS	10
11.0 VACANT LOTS IN THE COMMUNITY	12
12.0 ASSESSMENT DATA	13
13.0 BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT	14
14.0 TRANSPORTATION, SEWERAGE AND WATER SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE	16

COMMUNITY OF TIGNISH

OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW DOCUMENT

2008

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Community of Tignish is located in the West Prince area of Prince Edward Island. As shown on Map 1, the Community is located 14 kilometers from North Cape, the western tip of the Province, 17 kilometers from Alberton and 34 kilometers from O'Leary, its closest municipal neighbours.
- 1.2 The Tignish area began its European based settlement in 1799 with the arrival of eight Acadian families. Over time more Acadians settled in the area along with English speaking settlers. What is now the Community of Tignish began its European based settlement with the establishment of the Church of St. Simon and St. Jude in 1859 and the completion of the western railway terminus in about 1875. The construction of the Church created, by extension, a service centre function and the railway created a rail service area. It seems clear from the 1880 map of the Village that the adjacent urban core area was a response to the rail service need. By the time of the publication of the J. H. Meacham & Co. Atlas in 1880 fishing and fish processing were established in the vicinity of Tignish Run. This led to the third function, that of a fishery service centre.
- 1.3 The community core is a grid street urban village core form established in response to the railway service function following the selection of Tignish as the Western branch line terminus in about 1873. Three main factors have altered this part of the Community. The first was fires, particularly the major fire of 1896 which resulted in the loss of 62 homes and businesses. Other smaller conflagrations over the years have resulted in the loss of a significant number of buildings. The second factor was the rise of the Cooperative movement in the area beginning in the 1930's, which culminated in the complex of buildings which comprise the Coop, as it now exists at the eastern end of the core. The third factor was the rise of the automobile and the improvements in the highway system which resulted in a change in the settlement pattern from the original urban grid street subdivision pattern to the linear form generally known as roadside or strip development which makes use of highways as if they were urban or suburban residential streets. This development form results from the stripping of the frontage of the rural land, often high quality farmland, abutting the highways. All of this is evident from an examination of the 1880 Village map in Meacham's Atlas and the air photos of the Community taken in 1935, 1958, 1974, 1990 and 2000.
- 1.4 In the years following World War II the Government of Prince Edward Island took two steps which led to an interest in planning in the urban areas of the Province. The first was a *Community Planning Act* established circa 1950 and the second was the creation of a municipal system of the government outside of the City of Charlottetown and Town of Summerside, which were municipalities established by the *City of Charlottetown Act* and the *Town of Summerside Act*. The Province enabled a two tier system of municipal government, namely, villages under the *Village Service Act* and towns under the *Town Act*.

- 1.5 In 1952 Tignish was incorporated as the Village of Tignish. As was common practice the Village boundaries were established to include the Village proper, as distinct from the surrounding rural lands which enabled both the farming and fishing industries. In addition the Village boundaries were extended to include a substantial portion of the surrounding rural lands, primarily at that time, farm land. With the exception of the southern boundary, which is the Tignish River, the Village boundaries were defined by roads rather than topographic considerations.
- 1.6 In 1983 the Province repealed the *Village Service Act* and the *Town Act* and replaced them with the *Municipalities Act*. Under the new legislation the Village of Tignish became the Community of Tignish as did all former Villages and Community Improvement Committees (CIC's). The CICs boundaries were nearly always the former rural school districts which were generally more rural than the Villages. The new designation of Communities de-emphasized the rural service function of the Village.

2.0 PLANNING IN TIGNISH

- 2.1 In 1974 the Province adopted a new Planning Act. Among other objectives, this Act attempted to address the need for municipalities to undertake traditional planning as it was then practiced across the Country. The Act enabled, but did not require, municipalities to engage in planning as an alternative to having development approval, both for the subdivision of land and building approval, subject to the Provincial Planning Act Regulations. This "home rule" aspect of the Planning Act was a significant factor in making the decision to take on the responsibility of municipal planning.
- 2.2 In recognition of the fact that many municipalities had small populations and insufficient tax bases to permit the hiring of professional planners on staff or on a consulting basis, the Province established a Community Planning service in its new Land Use Service Centre. Under this program professional staff was made available to municipalities who wished to undertake Community Planning to enable them to prepare Official Plans and zoning and subdivision bylaws to implement the development control aspects of the Official Plans adopted. Over time this service was extended to include advisory services to municipalities as they carried out their development control functions.
- 2.3 Under the Planning Act, municipalities which wished to undertake planning did so by appointing a Planning Board which then oversaw the preparation of the Official Plan and zoning and subdivision bylaws. When it was satisfied and the public participation minimum requirements and other standards were met, the Planning Board recommended adoption of the Official Plan to the Council which, if it agreed, then adopted the plan as the Official Plan for the municipality. Preparation and adoption of the implementing bylaws followed. In most cases the official Development Officer for the municipality was the Chief Administrative Officer. Because the development levels were low in most municipalities, as long as the Province maintained its Community Planning service the system worked reasonably well.
- 2.4 In 1975 the Tignish Village Commissioners decided to undertake community planning. It appointed a Planning Board which, with professional assistance from the Community Planning Division, prepared and recommended an Official Plan to the Commissioners. The Plan was adopted in 1977 and subsequently approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The requisite bylaws followed. Subsequent Official Plans were approved in 1988, 1993 and 2000. All of these plans consist of the statements of objectives and policies required by the Planning Act and are primarily set up to permit the control of land use and development in the municipality. The Official Plans have also functioned as the springboard to propel the municipality towards dealing with issues which it considers to be important to the well being of the municipality.

- 2.5 In 1993 the Province withdrew its Community Planning Service as a cost saving measure. Two years later the Planning Act was amended to require that municipalities review their Official Plans and Bylaws within five years of their approval.

3.0 THE 2007 OFFICIAL PLAN AND BYLAW REVIEW PROCESS

- 3.1 In 2007 the Community Council decided to undertake a review of the Official Plan and bylaws. Following a review of proposals one was selected and the work commenced in mid October.

- 3.2 The process has involved meetings with the Community CAO, the Council, the Planning Board and the public. During the course of the review it was decided that it was in the Community's best interests to undertake the preparation of a new Official Plan.

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS OF THE 2000 OFFICIAL PLAN

- 4.1 The 2000 Official Plan contains a statement of goals and objectives which were, in effect, a list of projects or undertakings which responded to issues or needs identified by the Planning Board following discussion, analysis of a questionnaire distributed as well as comments made at an open house. The progress made in dealing with these issues was discussed by the Planning Board as part of the 2007 review process. The assessment of the Planning Board is as follows:

- a) *More support services for seniors are needed.*

Seniors coop housing has been developed.

- b) *Additional non-primary based industries, commercial and service development opportunities are needed within the Community.*

Although the Community continues to search for these opportunities, the loss of a call centre and the closure of the Holland College facilities have been setbacks.

- c) *There is land available within the Community which could be used for future development purposes.*

A study was undertaken to assess the feasibility of developing the existing undeveloped subdivisions. The conclusion was that the final lot costs were too high to compete with lot costs outside of the Community.

- d) *The Community should take the lead in new development opportunities by developing the Old Plough House property, perhaps as an apartment complex, a youth centre or as a mini-mall.*

The property has been developed.

- e) *Highway safety, particularly in the area of the Philip and Dalton Street intersection, is a major concern.*

As a Community under the Municipalities Act the Provincial Department of Transportation and Public Works is responsible for the maintenance and improvement of the streets. The land required to make this street improvement could not be acquired. Some improvement has been effected by the addition of a larger radius curve in the right turning lane from Church Street onto Dalton Road.

- f) *A means of encouraging residential development within the Community must be found in order to encourage people to build and live here.*

No progress has been made in dealing with this issue.

- g) *Police services within the Community need to be upgraded.*

There is now an RCMP office in the Community, but it is seldom staffed. The Community believes that this is a key issue to dealing with issues that hurt the image of the Community.

- h) *Efforts should be made to increase activities (e.g. outdoor summer concerts, flea markets, kitchen parties etc,) and development opportunities (e.g. parks, campgrounds, celebrity museum, etc.) which will draw more tourists to Tignish.*

Progress has been made in this area with the addition of a bluegrass festival, Irish moss festival and an Irish concert.

- 4.2 Progress has clearly been made in moving towards dealing with the issues and opportunities identified in the 2000 review. What has eluded the Community is the desire to have more persons building and living in the Community, increasing the level of residential building and diversifying the local business sector.

5.0 DEMOGRAPHY

- 5.1 Among the demographic factors which provide useful insights into a community are changes in the size of its population, household size and age structure.

- 5.2 Table 1 illustrates the population history of Tignish by Census year from 1976 to 2006. What emerges from an examination of the Table is a picture of steady but variable population decline over the 30 year period. During this time the Community has lost almost 25% of its population. This decline is attributable to two main factors. The first is changes in the family and household sizes. As shown by Table 2, between 1981 and 2006 the household size, as expressed as persons per occupied dwelling unit, declined from 4.5 to 2.3 persons. Put another way, if the average number of persons per dwelling unit had remained at the 1981 level of 4.5, the 2006 population of Tignish would have been 1485 persons.

Table 1
Community of Tignish
Population by Census Years
1976-2006

Year	Population	Numerical Change	% change	Number Change '76 to '06	% Change '76 to '06
1976	1007				
1981	982	- 25	- 2.5		
1986	957	- 25	- 2.5		
1991	893	- 64	- 6.7		
1996	839	- 54	- 6.0		
2001	831	- 8	- 1.0		
2006	758	- 73	- 8.8	- 249	- 24.7

Source: Statistics Canada (Numbers) and LCS (calculated data)

Table 2
Community of Tignish
Occupied Dwelling Units (DU's) and Household Size by Census Year
1981-2006

Year	No DU's	Population	Persons/DU (Hshld size)
1981	220	982	4.5
1986	300	957	3.2
1991	320	893	2.8
1996	335	839	2.5
2001	345	831	2.4
2006	330	758	2.3

Source: Statistics Canada and LCS (Calculated data)

- 5.3 Further examination of population statistics reveals that the population loss between 2001 and 2006 represents a stronger trend in Tignish at 8.8% than the Province (+0.4%), or its two closest municipal neighbours, O'Leary (+0.1%) and Alberton (-3.0%).
- 5.4 The median age of Tignish is 47.1 years as compared to the Province at 40.8 years. This is a significant difference but, at the same time is not inconsistent with O'Leary at 46.3 and Alberton at 44.8 years.
- 5.5 An approximation of the presence of young families is gained by looking at the population which is 15 years of age or less. In this case Tignish has 14.9% of its population in this group while the Province as a whole is 17.7%, O'Leary is 16.3% and Alberton 16.7%. These numbers are consistent with a low household size, such as that found in Tignish.
- 5.6 The final analysis undertaken related to the age structure of Tignish in comparison to that of the Province, O'Leary and Alberton. As shown in Charts 1 to 4, the pattern among the three municipalities is not strongly different. There is a greater difference when the comparison is made with the Province as a whole. Tignish has a relatively larger percentage of residents which are in the 65 years of age or older than the Province as a whole. When compared with O'Leary and Alberton the differences are smaller.
- 5.7 The second factor contributing to the population decline is the amount of building which has occurred just outside of the Community boundaries. To measure the differential in residential development rates within Tignish and its immediate surrounding area, the relevant development information was obtained from the Province. The area of interest is within 3 to 4 kilometers of the Community boundaries which approximates a 10 kilometer square from the center of the Community. Map 2 illustrates the area in which the residential building starts were measured and Table 3 shows the new residential construction in the Community compared to the area lying just outside of the Community.

6.0 DEVELOPMENT LEVELS IN TIGNISH AND SURROUNDING AREA

- 6.1 In Prince Edward Island the Province manages development in unincorporated areas and in municipalities which do not have Official Plans and development control bylaws. The Province's primary regulatory instrument is the Planning Act Regulations. The Province does not have the equivalent of an Official Plan for the area in which it exercises development control and does not make use of traditional zoning to manage land use. While there is a distinction in some Special Planning Areas between urban and rural zones, these do not distinguish areas for differing land use areas within the zones created. With the exception of the Special Planning Areas which surround the amalgamated municipalities of Charlottetown, Stratford, Cornwall and Summerside, the

Province does not limit residential urban and suburban development in the areas in which it exercises development jurisdiction. Predictably and for a variety of reasons this has led to widespread roadside or strip development. This is most pronounced in the areas which are close to, but outside of, the Towns and those Communities which were formerly Villages, such as Tignish. In practical terms has resulted in much higher levels of urban and suburban development in the areas which surround these municipalities.

- 6.2 This settlement pattern is typical of what has been occurring for the past four decades across the Province. The suburban strip development pattern was established beginning in the relatively prosperous years which followed the initiation of the PEI Comprehensive Development Plan in 1969 and has carried on relatively unabated. Tignish is one municipality among many which have been adversely affected by the Province's land use and development policies which, except for two short periods, have been followed in practice for many years.
- 6.3 Tables 3 and 4 convey a clear picture of the development which occurred between 2003 and 2006. Table 3 shows that there were 4 single family dwelling building permits issued in Tignish and 38 in the surrounding area. In the non-commercial cottages category (many of which are occupied year round) there was 1 permit issued in Tignish and 13 in the surrounding area. In terms of subdivision the picture which emerges for the 2003 to 2006 period is much the same. Table 4 shows that, between 2003 and 2006 there were 4 single family residential lots subdivided in Tignish compared to 57 in the surrounding area within close proximity of the Community boundaries. In the non-commercial cottage category there were 16 lots approved by the Province in the surrounding area while none occurred in Tignish

Table 3
Number of Single Family Residential Building Permits
Tignish Area and Tignish
2003-2006

Dwelling Type	Tignish Area *	Tignish
Residential Single	38	4
Non Commercial Cottage	13	1
Total	51	5

* See Map 2 for area included
 Source: Tignish Area: DCCAL; Tignish: Community of Tignish records

Table 4
Number of Single Family Residential Building Lots Subdivided
Tignish Area and Tignish
2003-2006

Lot Type	Tignish Area *	Tignish
Residential Single	57	4
Non Commercial Cottage	16	0
Total	73	4

* See Map 2 for area included
 Source: Tignish Area: DCCAL; Tignish: Community of Tignish records

7.0 SETTLEMENT PATTERN

- 7.1 In the course of the review work an analysis was undertaken of the settlement pattern in the Community based on the physical structure shown in the 1880 J. H. Meacham and Co. atlas and air photography taken in 1935, 1958, 1974, 1990 and 2000.
- 7.2 In 1880, as Map 3 shows, the Tignish village settlement was dominated by three groups of land uses. First was the presence of the St. Simon and St. Jude Church on its present location on the west side of Chapel Road (now Church Street), together with the Notre Dame Convent and the Parish House. The cemetery was located, as now, on the east side of Chapel Road as was the grammar school. The second group was the railway terminus facilities, including the station, warehouse and freight facilities, the round house, coal and water storage and other maintenance and repair facilities to the north of the built up area. Third was a rural village grid based residential subdivision consisting of the streets and 60 lots which housed many of the people who were connected with the railway. Much of this subdivision remains today although fires, time and the location of the Coop at the eastern end of the area have radically changed the area from its 1880 to 1958 character. Several stores and a Post Office existed along Church Street which was clearly the main street of the village.
- 7.3 In 1880, as shown on Map 4 the balance of what is now the incorporated Community was a mixture of farms with parcels generally in the 40-60 acre range, which typically represented what a family could maintain sustainably with the technology, knowledge and farming practices of the time. Eventually these became the backbone of the family farm system which dominated rural Prince Edward Island until the 1960's.
- 7.4 The early 1930's brought the great depression to Prince Edward Island as they did across North America and Europe. However, it was also a time when the population of the Province increased, rather than continuing the decline which occurred between 1891 and 1929. The attraction to return or stay in the Province was based on the fact that at home there was food, if few jobs or little cash. As shown in Map 5, by 1935 the core area of the village had filled in. Residential development was proceeding strip fashion along Church Street south of Phillip Street. In addition, based on information from J. Henri Gaudet's *Photo Historica of Tignish from 1799 to 1999*, by 1940, Main Street had emerged as a commercial street. In 1969 these buildings were removed to make way for the new Coop enterprise. Outside of the village most of the land was in active agriculture.
- 7.5 By the time of the 1958 aerial photo (Map 6), development was continuing along Church Street, south of Phillip Street almost to Chaisson Road, with the stripping off of the road frontage for suburban residential use,. However, in the rural area within what was by now the incorporated Village of Tignish there is a noticeable decrease in the number fields in active farm production and a corresponding increase in the amount of land which was reverting to forest use.
- 7.6 Map 7 is the 1974 aerial photo of the area. The key trends here are the emergence of residential development along Phillip Street and the continuation of residential development along Church Street, north of Maple Street. The Coop complex has emerged as a major feature of the core area. Outside of the core area the rural area continued to move towards fewer fields in active production and more of these lands reverting to early growth forest land.
- 7.7 An examination of the 1990 aerial photo (Map 8) reveals a continuation of the previous trends. Suburban residential development has continued along Church Street beyond the limits of the Community of Tignish, suburban residential development has now begun to appear along Dalton Road and the trend towards fewer rural fields in active production continues.

- 7.8 The final aerial photo was taken in 2000 and appears as Map 9. This shows a continuation of development along the main roads. Church Street has been developed well beyond the Community boundary. In addition the trend towards less farmland in active production and more in forest use has continued.

8.0 WATERSHEDS AND TOPOGRAPHY

- 8.1 As shown in Map 10, the Community of Tignish falls within a single watershed containing in the range of 40 sq. km of land. The Community lies in the northeastern quadrant of the watershed whose boundaries lie about 1 km to the south, 1.5 km to the east, 0.7 km to the north and 7.5 km to the west of the Community boundaries.
- 8.2 Topographically, as shown in Map 11, the Community rises from sea level at the Tignish River in the south, to a high point of 22 meters in the northwest corner of the municipality. The built-up portion of the Community ranges from approximately 8 meters in the southeast to about 20 meters in the vicinity of the Church of St. Simon and St. Jude.

9.0 LAND USE, LAND USE CHANGES AND LAND USE CONFLICTS

- 9.1 Land use distribution in Tignish was studied for the 1988, 1993, and 2007 Official Plans. Perhaps because of changes in definitions or originating data from one period to the next, there are differences in the resulting land use information presented which cannot be traced to development or other physical changes within the Community.
- 9.2 Map 12 shows the 2007 generalized land use in the Community.
- 9.3 Table 4 presents an amalgamation of the land use distribution for 1986 (used for preparation of the 1988 Official Plan), 1993 (used for preparation of the 1993 Official Plan), 1999 (used for preparation of the 2000 Official Plan) and for 2007. The 2007 estimates are based on the information used previously as well as information obtained from building permit and subdivision records in the Community and information developed for the 2000 land use mapping carried out by the Provincial Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry.
- 9.4 Overall, the land use distribution in the Community has not changed appreciable since 1986. The 1986 split between rural land use and urban or suburban was 85% and 15% respectively. In 2007 the split is 83% rural and 17% urban or suburban. This difference is within an acceptable error range for the two years. Probably the most significant change in land use has been the change in land use category for the former rail lands from Industrial to Recreation and Open Space.
- 9.5 One of the major purposes of municipal planning is to recognize that some land use mixes will produce land use conflicts. In the built-up parts of a community space may be at a premium and land use intensity tends to be somewhat higher. In the rural parts of communities which have an urban, suburban and rural land use mix, as is the case in Tignish, the rural land use conflicts come largely from the land use activities which flow beyond the boundaries of the land holdings, despite their fairly large size. In the review of the Tignish Official Plan, there was discussion of two types of land use conflicts. The first was the odour produced by the spreading of manure on farm properties. This was not considered a key issue because of its short duration. The second is the spraying of agricultural crops to control disease or insect damage. This is an issue which needs to be dealt with at the Provincial level.

Table 4
Community of Tignish
Estimated Land Use Distribution (Acres)
1986, 1993, 1999, 2007

Land Use Type	1986	1993	1999	2007(est)	2007 %
Agricultural (Cleared)	N/Av	N/Av	263	260	18.3
Residential	118	109	398	120	8.5
Commercial	4	12		15	1.1
Comm'l/Retail			38		
Comm'l /Residential			2		
Public Service/ Instit.		50	70	70	4.9
Recr/Institutional	62				
Recr/Open Space		12*	4	20	1.4
Industrial	19*	21*	24**	10	0.7
Roadways	13	13	77	13	0.9
Undeveloped***	1226****	1201	541	910	64.2
Totals	1442	1418	1418	1418	100.0

Sources: Official Plans for 1988, 1993, 2000 ; LCS for 2007

* Includes rail lands

** includes former rail lands

*** includes wetlands and forested lands except for 1986

**** Includes wetlands, forested land and agricultural lands

10.0 BUILDING PERMITS AND SUBDIVISION APPROVALS

- 10.1 Table 5 shows the data with respect to residential building permits in Tignish from 1979 to 2006, with the exception of the years 1992 and 1993. This Table indicates that, for the 26 years which are reported, there were 91 residential units approved for construction in the Community. It is not felt that there were many, if any, permits not acted on and this represents an accurate summary of the new units added. Given as well that Statistics Canada reports a rounded increase in occupied dwelling units of 110 between 1981 and 2006 the numbers obtained from the Community records are probably representative of the numbers of residential units constructed.
- 10.2 Over the time period reported there were, on average, 3.5 new residential dwelling units added to the housing stock per year. The largest share of the new units were single family detached units (49.5%) with apartments accounting for 36.3%, semi-detached/duplex at 8.8% and mobile homes/mini homes accounting for 5.5% of the total.
- 10.3 Table 6 shows the residential building lots approved between 1994 and 2006. The total number of new lots for the period was 23. For comparison, during the same time period, Table 5 indicates that the Community issued residential building permits for 29 units. This amounts to an average of 1.8 new lots per year.
- 10.4 There are three reasonably large incomplete subdivisions in the Community containing about 50 vacant lots. Road construction and servicing would be required to bring these lots into the market place for sale for the two largest. The MacLeod Lane subdivision has the road constructed and is serviced by the central sewer and water systems.

Table 5
Community of Tignish
New Residential Development (units)
1979-2006

Year	Single unit	Semi detached/ Duplex	Apartment	Mobile/Mini Homes	Total
1979	1			1	2
1980	2			2	4
1981	1				1
1982	2				2
1983		4			4
1984	6		6		12
1985	3				3
1986	2				2
1987	5		7		12
1988	4				4
1989	2				2
1990	2	4	6		12
1991	2				2
1992	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av
1993	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av
1994					
1995				1	1
1996	1		14		15
1997	1				1
1998	2				2
1999	1				1
2000	1				1
2001	1				1
2002	2				2
2003					
2004	2			1	3
2005	1				1
2006	1				1
Totals	45	8	33	5	91
Average/yr	1.7	0.3	1.2	0.2	3.5

Source: Community records

**Table 6
Community of Tignish
Residential Subdivision Lots Approved
1994-2006**

Year	Number
1994	0
1995	1
1996	2
1997	5
1998	0
1999	0
2000	N/Av
2001	N/Av
2002	11
2003	1
2004	2
2005	1
2006	0
Total	23
Average/year	1.8

Source: Community records

11.0 VACANT LOTS IN THE COMMUNITY.

11.1 In 1995 a Vacant Lot Survey was carried out through Holland College by planning technology students as part of their practical application of learned skills. The survey included the collection of the following data for each property:

- a) Property Number (PID)
- b) Owners name
- c) Property address
- d) Lot size (area)
- e) Zoning
- f) Service hook-up (sewer, water or both)
- g) Assessment

11.2 The survey identified 32 vacant lots zoned for residential use and 4 for commercial use. It was of interest to review this same set of lots to determine what changes had occurred during the 12 years between 1995 and 2007. The use of the property in 2007, as interpreted from the assessment data, was added to the list of factors examined.

11.3 The results of the survey update, shown on Map 13, may be summarized as follows:

- a) Of the 32 residential lots reviewed, 18 had changed ownership. 10 of these were to include a spouse or sibling. Eight of the lots had been apparently sold.
- b) Of the 32 residential lots, only 1 has been developed.

- c) None of the 4 commercial lots has been developed.
 - d) Of the 31 residential lots which remain vacant, 17(55%) are owned by Tignish residents and 14 (45%) are owned by persons whose address is outside the Community.
 - e) Of the 14 residential lots which remain vacant and are owned by persons residing outside the community, 3 (10%) are residents of Prince Edward Island and 11 (35%) reside outside of the Province.
 - f) The total assessed value of the residential lots in 1995 was \$192,200; in 2007 the assessed value had risen to \$297,900. The net increase in tax revenue in 2007 over 1995 was \$708, up from \$1288 in 1995 (at the 2007 residential tax rate) to \$1990 in 2007.
 - g) The average assessed value of the residential lots in 1995 was \$6006 and by 2007 this had risen to \$9509. This represents an increase of about 55% over the 12 year time period.
 - h) The total acreage of the 31 vacant residential lots in 1995 was 31 acres. In 2007 this had been reduced by the lot area of the one lot developed to 29.8 acres.
 - i) 29 of the 31 vacant residential lots have sewer service and 2 have both sewer and water service.
 - j) Of the 4 vacant commercially zoned lots, 1 has been developed since 1995.
 - k) Of the 3 remaining commercial lots 2 are owned by persons outside the Community.
 - l) Of the 3 remaining commercial lots, 2 have sewer service and 1 has both sewer and water service.
- 11.4 It may be that this situation carries with it an opportunity for development, primarily, residential, to undertake infilling in most cases with strong benefits for the Community as a whole.

12.0 ASSESSMENT DATA

- 12.1 A municipality's assessment base is critically important to its financial well being. Municipalities are heavily dependent on property taxes to raise funds to provide services to the residents and these are generated directly by the property located within the Community. Table 7 shows the assessment data from 1994 to 2007. The property tax payable is a combination of the assessment divided by 100 and the tax rate applied to this number. The tax rates in Tignish are currently \$0.67 per hundred dollars of assessment for non commercial (taxable) residential and farm property and \$1.00 for commercial property. These rates have not changed over the past ten years and, for this reason, the analysis focussed on this period.
- 12.2 During this period the residential tax base increased by 20.4% or just over 2% per year. The commercial tax base increased by 48.4% or about 4.8% annually. The non commercial tax base increased by 67% or about 6.7% annually and the farm assessment tax base increased by 30.8% or 3.1% per year.

12.3 On average this means that about two thirds of the Community income from property taxes comes from residential property, one third from commercial property and about 1% from farm property.

**Table 7
Community of Tignish
Assessment Data (\$M)
1994-2007**

Year	Resid.	Comm'l	Non Comm'l	Farm	Non Comm'l Tax Rate	Comm'l Tax Rate
1994	12.9	3.4	15.4	0.3		
1995	13.5	3.4	15.8	0.3		
1996	13.6	3.5	15.8	0.3		
1997	13.6	3.7	16.1	0.3		
1998	14.5	3.8	17.2	0.2	0.67	1.00
1999	15.1	4.4	21.6	0.2	0.67	1.00
2000	15.4*	4.3	18.2	N/Av	0.67	1.00
2001	15.7	4.9	22.6	0.2	0.67	1.00
2002	16.7	4.7	20.0	N/AV	0.67	1.00
2003	17.8	5.0	25.2	0.2	0.67	1.00
2004	19.0	5.0	26.6	0.4	0.67	1.00
2005	16.9	5.1	27.1	0.4	0.67	1.00
2006	17.3	5.0	27.6	0.4	0.67	1.00
2007	17.5	5.6	28.7	0.4	0.67	1.00
% increase 1998-2007	20.4	48.4	67.0	30.8		
07 Prop Tax	0.12 (57%)	0.06 (28%)	0.03*(14%)	0.002 (1%)		

Source: Provincial Treasury; and LCS (calculated data)

Note: The property tax generated by Non-commercial is calculated excluding the residential component.

13.0 BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT

13.1 During the review process it was noted that:

- a) there are serviced lots in the Community and the development of these lots between 1995 and 2007 has not been significant.
- b) there are several residential subdivisions which have not developed.
- c) the ratio of residential development in Tignish versus the area which lies within 2 to 4 kilometers of the Community is about 10 to 1 in favour of the periphery.

13.2 Quite obviously the issue is why this is the case. Often there are four factors cited as barriers to development in municipalities. The factors are:

- a) municipal property taxes and utility rates which are not applicable to properties located outside the municipality;
- b) municipal regulation, which is felt to be more stringent or intrusive than what applies outside of the municipality;

- c) relatively small lot sizes in municipalities in comparison with those subdivided outside of the municipality;
- d) lot costs in municipalities compared to those located outside the municipality.

13.3 With respect to the differential in property taxes and utility rates, the facts are that a residential property located outside of the Community pays Provincial property tax at the rate of \$1.00 per hundred dollars of assessment. On a property assessed at \$120,000 the Provincial property tax bill is \$1200. The same property located inside the Community pays Provincial property tax at the rate of \$0.90 per hundred dollars of assessment (\$1080, in this case) plus the Municipal property tax at the rate of \$0.67 per hundred (\$804). In addition if the property is served by the municipal sewer system, the rate is \$148 per unit and, if the property is served by the municipal water system, this rate is \$160 per unit annually. The total differential for a property with sewer and water located in the Community pays an additional \$992 in taxes and rates. This differential is as much perceived as real because the capital cost of the well and on-site sewage disposal system is generally included in the capital cost of the house and is reflected in the mortgage payment and the cost of operating the on-site systems is hidden in the electrical bill. Finally, the on-site well and sewage disposal system maintenance if carried out is expensive, Unfortunately the maintenance is not mandatory and often ignored until a problem emerges.

13.4 With respect to municipal regulation:

- a) the Community permits residential development using on-site servicing and the standards and approval process are those mandated by the Province.
- b) both the Province and the Community require building permits and subdivision approval and the approval processes are similar. The Community does, however, apply the building permit requirement to a wider range of activities. This can be addressed by revising the Community bylaws to focus on the principal matters which must be regulated.
- c) the Community has zoning within its boundaries and the Province does not consider that land use is a significant factor when assessing applications for residential development. What happens in practice is that there are very few applications for development in the Community which are refused for zoning reasons.

13.5 Lot size has been cited as a factor when a decision to purchase a residential lot is being considered. Most of the suburban lots are larger than those which are available in the Community. The larger size is required to permit the use of on-site services but, at the same time this permits things like fishing boat storage during the off season and construction of out buildings for various purposes. There is little which the Community can do to deal with this other than to promote the development of a specific subdivision to cater to this need if there is felt to be a market and the Community wishes to compete for it.

13.6 Lot cost has also been cited as a barrier to the development of the existing vacant lots in the Community. There is little data which is available to analyze this factor, but the lot costs in existing subdivisions already served by road are not excessive. However, because the Province and the Community both require that subdivision roads be paid for by the developer, it is more attractive to the buyer to seek a location which has existing road access and is of sufficient size to accommodate on-site services which are capitalized into the mortgage. Often the seller is inclined by custom to provide additional land to permit the other activities envisioned for the lot following development. The result

has been that, outside of the Charlottetown and Summerside areas, most of the year round residential development has been achieved by subdividing road frontage.

14.0 TRANSPORTATION, SEWERAGE AND WATER SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE

- 14.1 Map 14 shows the highway transportation system in Tignish. Historic traffic counts are not available for most of the roads in the Community. In most case the volumes are not an issue.
- 14.2 Map 15 shows the municipal water and sewerage systems. The water system consists of a piped system primarily serving the core area and stretching north on Church Street to Centennial Drive and east on Dalton Avenue about half way to the Community boundary. The system is served by three wells located on the north side of Maple Street behind the Church of St. Simon and St. Jude. The wells are well protected by the presence of a large wooded area of the watershed to the north of the supply. Provided there is no significant development in this area, much of which lies outside of the Community, there is no a substantive threat to the water supply. At the same time there is no legislated protection for the water supply in the area outside of the Community boundary. There are some underground tanks in the general area but none is thought to be a hazard at this time. Although there have been some discussions between the Province and the Community regarding new wells, the current supply is adequate and would support modest expansion.
- 14.3 Map 16 shows the municipal sewerage system. The system is considerably more extensive than the water system because the main consideration has been to control sewage effluent. The system discharges into a single cell primary treatment facultative lagoon which discharges through an outfall into the Tignish River on the southern side of the Community. The system is one of the older ones in the Province and, because of changing standards for treatment will require consideration of upgrades such as disinfection, fencing and the like. There are no major issues at the moment, but the system can only handle minor increases in flow at this time.