



**TOWN OF SAINT ANDREWS  
SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
PUBLIC CONSULTATION SESSION  
MINUTES**

**February 8, 2021, 7:00 p.m.  
Electronic Meeting**

---

**A. RECORDING OF ATTENDANCE**

*A Public Consultation Meeting of the Town of Saint Andrews Council was held on Monday, February 8, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mayor Doug Naish, Councillor Kate Akagi, Edie Bishop, Kurt Gumushel, Andrew Harrison.*

*Staff: Chris Spear, CAO/Treasurer, Paul Nopper, Clerk - Senior Administrator, Alexander Gopen, Planner, Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission, Alex Henderson, Director of Planning, Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission.*

*Absent: Deputy Mayor Brad Henderson*

*Facebook – 76*

*Zoom - 20*

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion: Motion: 055 - 02/21**

**Moved by Councillor Bishop**

**Seconded by Councillor Groulx**

*That the Agenda be approved as presented.*

*5 - 0*

**Carried**

**C. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

**D. PRESENTATIONS**

**E. INTRODUCTION, CONSIDERATION AND PASSING OF BY-LAWS AND MOTIONS**

**1. PED200901b By-Law 21-01 A By-Law Respecting Short-Term Rental Residential Units in the Town of Saint Andrews Public Consultation Session**

*Marc Trudel and Helen Gurney Smith - Owners and operators of the Homestead Cottage. We submitted a letter. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and participate. We are not opposed to having regulations on safety to Short-Term Rentals. We recognize some of the regulations should be proposed for long-term rentals. The main issue with the By-Law is the assumption that short-term rentals are limiting long-term rentals. In the Municipal Plan, it highlights the Town would continue to monitor short-term rentals to assess the housing market and long-term rentals. To date, we are not aware of any study that the short-term rentals are negatively affecting long-term rentals. At this point, the number of rental units proposed, there is a statement that they have looked at the current market. There is no indication of the number presenting would have any effect on long-term rental supply. At the end of the day, why should it be the responsibility of homeowners to be responsible for the shortfall of long-term*

rentals? I think the Town needs to look at a strategy to increase long-term rentals such as increasing apartment buildings, the number of units for seniors, working with NBCC to develop student residents. There is plenty of vacant lands that could be used to build apartment buildings. The suitability of places for long-term rental in some of the properties with short-term rentals the costing in the winter is too big and some units are too small to have someone live there permanently. That summarizes our major concerns and please read the letter we sent. Thank you for your time.

Mary Craig - One biggest question, when are you hoping to implement this By-Law or hoping to? There are some struggles with COVID-19 and getting into the province, do inspections, etc. would be challenging? Have you thought about that?

Lindy Townsend - Thanks for the opportunity to speak on this. I did call Ms. Carney after the closed session and discussed a number of her 27 points. It appears that she sent these suggestions when the first notion of short-term rentals was discussed. I take the position that this should be entirely abolished. It starts from a draconian position and unfair to limit and have these huge fines. \$10,000 as a misdemeanor. That sounds like the USA. While sitting in Utah, I am Canadian and grew up in the town, my grandmother had borders for the community college, and one was Anne Murray. This needs to be rethought. People need to go back to the basics. I think the Town is biting off more than they can chew with this revamp of the By-Laws. I think far too many portions of the community are having to lawyer up because they spend hours combing through the documents, like Joanne Carney who has spent 40 hours doing so. Unless you hire a lawyer, it's as though your suggestions are not getting heard. Secondly, there is an invisible and visible economy. The invisible economies are cleaners, dry cleaners, house cleaners, and landscapers. The visible economy is whale watching and all the businesses like the Red Herring. What a great place to go. Kevin wants patrons, the hotel wants patrons. This decreases the inventory of accommodations. It relates not to long-term rentals because the summer rentals either get uses as long-term rentals when the season is over. This is ill-conceived from the beginning and I do not see a need for Council to ram this through. No offense, but COVID-19 has made you effectively Town Councillors. Unofficially, if COVID-19 did not happen, we would not have this Council. We have had a lot of trouble with this Council, me being one. 21 of us had to hire a lawyer to push our property rights. I do not think this is a Town we want to live in. That's all I have to say.

Peter Breeze - 303 Joes Point Road otherwise known as Harding's Point. This property has been available for one to four weeks for summer rental for several years. I would like to continue to offer that property as I believe the people who would like to stay there cannot afford to stay at the Algonquin or one of the hotels up by the Algonquin, nor as families do they wish to stay at Bed and Breakfasts. With all due respect to the host and hostess, little children can be quite a pain in the neck. They want the freedom to run in open spaces. I was quite surprised to receive a communication from an Agent in Saint Andrews that this By-Law has been proposed. As I have seen nothing which suggested that 50 units of home rental for one to three-week rentals would anyway disrupt the availability of long-term rentals for those residents of Saint Andrews that are very very important to Saint Andrew's but need twelve, six, eight-month rental accommodations. Show me that information and I would be glad to discuss it with you. Second, the process in which these permits would be awarded is frankly flawed and potentially available for self-dealing. If the process is monitored and managed by the Council without complete transparency, without an assurance that one's application would be treated fairly, regardless from whence that application comes, one might have the feeling that one has lost the application to someone whose brother-in-law was a member of excuse me not the Council but a friend of a friend of a friend. There is no transparency here. This is an attempt, in my opinion, and my

considered opinion, a lock-in to the Algonquin Hotel, existing hotels, existing bedpan breakfasters, for reasons we the taxpayers and the offer lords are not privy. So in sum, if you want to do this and I think you should not, you need to prove to us the taxpayers and the property owners that fifty, not forty, not seventy-five, not one-hundred is a legitimate number. You must prove to us that no Council member or a member of the Council's family has the right to secure such a permit. Furthermore, said permits would not be capable to be withdrawn for any reason other than a violation of the established rules of safety coming from the federal government and provincial government. Not simply because a neighbour chooses to object to the sound of children enjoying themselves in their neighbours garden. Thank you for the time.

Jamie Steel - Owner and operator of Salty Towners. I am calling in regard to this. Salty Towns as you know has been in operation for 100 years. This is our 100th anniversary. It is an accommodation facility that has been known as a Tourist Home. One of the things I am concerned about is that we don't seem to fit anywhere in any definitions that Council has at present. It looks like you are removing the Tourist Home or not being friendly to that type of accommodation. I am a little bit worried about being lumped in with some of the things you are trying to control given that this short-term residential resident facility was built as such, a large home built as an accommodation facility. I live here while I am renting. I am an owner-operator, not an owner, not an operator with an intermediary. It is my job. It is what I do for a living and this present By-Law would limit my ability to do what I do because of the limitations on the number of rooms available to rent. I find it, for me, because of the situation I am in, the type of accommodation we are, the By-Law is working against what we are trying to do for the last 27 years and Margorie Clark's previous owners' 80 years. I appreciate the time, your time, and your ability to speak before Council. I have sent a letter addressing additional concerns. I did want to be here tonight to voice my concern and to any other long-term accommodation providers who are challenged or may be challenged with the prospects of this By-Law.

Bill Teed - I am here with Pam Vincent who submitted a letter to Council concerning the matter, the By-Law before you. I will let you speak to the matter she would like to raise. My question to either Mr. Nopper, your worship, or Council, what has changed that's made Council think this By-Law is a possible necessity. That is the puzzle that I am trying to unravel. Why is this being presented? What has happened to cause some concern enough to create a By-Law to restrict an important part of the tourism business.

Mayor Naish - This is a valid question and will take under advisement. I do not have an immediate response to this.

Bill Teed - If this By-Law in some form or another becomes a By-Law for the Town, when would you be thinking of an implementation time? I would encourage Council to consider at the earliest implementation of 2022. As you know the planning for the tourist season does not start in 2021. It starts in 2020 or earlier. People have planned events, visitors, reservations made in 2021. To change the rules mid-stream would be grossly unfair to those operating short-term rentals and those that would like to start doing that. The second is the number, with respect, the intrusion into the free market by limiting the number of people who can offer this service is unnecessary. Let the market determine what is needed and not needed, not regulatory intervention by the government.

Councillor Groulx - I just want to add something that will answer one of the questions. One of the driving forces behind this is the current Zoning By-Law restricts short-term accommodations to hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, and tourist homes only. There is no provision for vacation homes, Airbnb's, short-term rentals, whatever you want to call it. The

Council is in the process of revising the Zoning By-Law and the Council is looking at expanding the opportunity for short-term rentals and not curtailing them.

*Bill Teed - I thought there was a provision in some Zones within the Zoning By-Law that does allow for this type of rental. I do not have the By-Law in front of me, but I thought I read some provisions in some zones that do allow for what this By-Law is trying to cover. I will forward that on if I find it.*

*Pam Vincent - I would like to know how this change or the proposed By-Law came into effect? Why all of a sudden are you doing this? How do you believe this will help long-term rentals? I think you are taking away a very significant part of the tourist charm of Saint Andrews. I believe if there is a long-term problem, it revolves around the students at the college and staff at the hotel. I do not see how penalizing the short-term rentals helps the long-term. If there need to be more long-term accommodations in town, then that should be addressed as something and should not penalize short-term rentals. Out of town people who have properties here, are under double taxation, so to be able to do a short-term rental helps them with the cost of the property. You have severely hampered other people who potentially would want to buy a property in Saint Andrews if they wanted to do a short-term rental. Also, your rules and regulations are extremely heavy-handed. When you get into details of the 17-page document, you are asking that these rooms, houses, be governed under the same regulations under the Algonquin. You want \$2,000,000 insurance, you want egress windows, you want carbon monoxide things, it is very heavy-handed and in extreme objection to the introduction of this By-Law.*

*Joanne Carney - Thank you. Rob Carney would like his time after me. I have gone over this document extensively 5 minutes is not enough if you can circle back to me at the end if there is time. There is a Facebook group page Saint Andrews Vacation Rental Owners if anyone would like to join that. So, I still think that this timeframe is inappropriate. If it does go through, it should not go through until January 2022, as some other people have said. I have been following every single Council meeting for a year and a half. I have been waiting for this document since last August and it has been pushed and pushed and pushed. I congratulate the Council forgetting to have a lot on their plate, the Municipal Plan, Secondary Plan, Transportation, and now this By-Law and Short-Term Rental. This is a long-complicated document. It is not an easy document to get through. There is a lot of loopholes. There is a lot the Council does not understand fully. These different loopholes and the complications of this document. To push it through now is not appropriate especially with COVID and people have expressed their concerns with that. The tourist season is already planned, many things are booked, it's inappropriate to push it through. So, there is a real shift in the rental dynamics. I think we have to consider Saint Andrews as unique. We are not like other places. No other times quadruple their population in the summer. We need to have space for these people. We have advertised as a tourist town. We are proud of ourselves for increasing our tourism to support businesses and we need places for people to stay. As a Whale Watching operator, I often have people call and cancel, they will make a booking and then find no place to stay. I don't think there are many places in Canada, in general, that have a college with no dormitory. I am not sure how that got through that the college was allowed with no dormitory built. Saint Andrews has a population of 1700 people. There are 250 students who come into this town for three seasons of the year. That means 1 out of every 2 or 3 houses must have a student and accommodate them because there are no dormitories. This is unacceptable pressure on the town and or us to put through a whole short-term rental document just because there are no dormitories, which may be inappropriate. There may be a way to develop dormitories with students in the winter and Algonquin employees in the summer. You could even shift the school year to allow for that. I sent in 27 comments and corrections to the document. There is no way I would*

have time to go through these tonight. I can pass it along to anyone interested. There are many problems with the definitions as I have already described. Basically, motels, hotels, B&B's, and short-term rentals are all mushed together. There is very little clarity between the three. There is a huge misconception that the province regulates hotels, motels, and B&B's. They do not. There is something called Experience Select New Brunswick, and this is a completely voluntary program. There are no regulations at all for fire, insurance, room size, anything. The Town has a few bits of regulations for parking in these areas and a Bed and Breakfast has to serve a muffin and that is about it. I have asked how many numbers principal residence and how many numbers are secondary residence. I have yet to receive that data. I have asked the Town to do some data collection and that has not been forthcoming. There are big problems with Tourist Homes and the definition if they will be grandfathered in forever. There are problems with the amount of insurance required, for asking for guest addresses, the problem with estate residential zone, on and on at least 27 different problems plus more.

Rob Carney - I sent a letter in months and months ago and you probably have a copy of that with my suggestions. You do not have time to tackle this right now. I have been on these Council meetings for quite a bit in the past year with Joanne. I have yet to hear anyone call in that is happy about this or positive about it. It is all pretty much questions; lot of people are not really interested in this and want to be left alone. Maybe we should be dealing with fire and safety. That is the low hanging fruit hard to argue with that. That would be a good place to start. It is hard to know how many homes you are going to have in town with the COVID. All of this is in flux, which makes this a really bad time. I just do not feel that the Council, no disrespect, but I do not think the Council has time. I am hearing this in every different way. The Public is just starting to get up to speed. If you give these guys a little bit longer and you will be inundated with more people as they hear about this. Just to close, what I said before, there is no way you will solve the rental problem in town with the short-term rental. Those are the days of the \$90,000 homes that the couple buys the extra house and puts students in there or long-term rental. Prices are going up and it just does not exist. You should be going with the energy here. Taking some money from those of us with a short-term rental, taking a piece of the pie, pool that money together, and create a scenario where you can, I would not call it subsidized rent, but where the town can pitch in with the land and maybe some services to try to get some long-term rental units built in the town with a developer. Try to solve the problem with the school. I think by again what Joanne said earlier, change the school year a little bit and see if you can get a dormitory that is full year-round with summer staff, Algonquin summer staff, and then the students at the school. Maybe the first two weeks of school could be at home on the computer because there is an overlap there while those people move out from the summer whale watching season then the students come in. Try to solve those problems first and comes back to we do not have time. These are big overarching questions about the future of the Town. I guess I just leave it there. I think you need to give this a year. You need to make sure everyone knows about this and get the best comments that you can. You cannot do anything about this year, it is too late. Try to do something next year. I think you could do the fire this year I am all for it. Soon as you can get people out to make sure the houses are safe, smoke detectors, things like that go nuts. I do not think anyone is going to argue about smoke detectors, a place to park, window to get out of if there is a fire. No one wants that. The big overarching philosophy here and need to take a bit more time. I would like to hear of a committee to address the long-term rental idea. Is there any federal or provincial money available for 18-unit thing, affordable housing, could you try to get a dormitory in there? I heard there is some money, there was some money in December from the Federal government. Maybe we could have applied for it and maybe it will come up again. Get a dormitory and see how we can get it full all year, part with students and part with summer staff. That would go a long way to solving

the problem. Take a bit of money from the short-term rentals and put it towards that.

Dayle Chambers - Thank you Mr. Nopper, Mr. Spear, and your Worship and Councillors. It is hard to follow that act. I will just follow up on what Joanne and Rob said. I am opposed to the By-Law as it stands. I have been in the business for over 20 years and have a lot of experience. I feel that some of the recommendations are ill-advised, for the real world. I guess the main question is, can this be tabled for a later date when there is more discussion from the major stakeholders. Can we put this off until the next season instead, I do not know when you plan to implement it but is obviously before the next election in May? So, that would be my recommendation as Rob Carney has previously said to me. Thank you for your hard work.

Christina Hill - I do want to thank you to the public that has called in and those who have spoken to the situation. I do want to thank the Council and I know it is a lot of work to put this forward. I do have some questions and when will there be a forum to have these questions answered that the public has brought forward? We have bought a home here in Saint Andrews, we are not terribly wealthy people and we bought the Mallory home because it was a dream of my husband and mine. His family is from Saint Andrews, the Gillman's, and they grew up here. We wanted to make this an opportunity to raise our family here at a certain point. His aunt does live on-site, and my parents have now retired here. The short-term rental that we have is only available in the summer. The stipulations being put in place are quite extensive and my biggest question is the timeframe. I do not have a huge issue with the By-Law except I do not understand the limit of 50 and how many signed up for the TAL. For the actual stipulations of the By-Law, the timeframe is problematic for many of us. The question is, knowing that, the tourist season is already underway, and it is important to know we have bookings taken care of for the summer. To not be able to adhere to those and promises that we have made to people who want to come and enjoy the town are very important and it is incredibly important to adhere and also honour our commitments to the public. So, the timeframe I am very curious about moving forward and if there is an opportunity to have a discussion. I know we are posing questions and I have not heard any answers to the questions brought forward. I have lived in the city of Toronto for most of the time of the year, except during COVID. Often, we would have town Council and city Councillors discussions. Will we have an opportunity to discuss this with those affected.

Mayor Naish - Thank you very much. I can answer that. A couple of comments tonight, we take under advisement. We are not trying to ram this through. We have heard many people speak to the timing of this and we will take it back into considerations. There will have to be more discussion on this down the road. It is not tonight, tomorrow night, it will be at some point in the future.

Tom O'Connor - I have no real questions and I think most of the points were made by other people were done more eloquently than I could. I also feel like they are on other ground in Saint Andrews. I have some definite concerns with the timing as we cannot cross the border. If there was something to happen in 2021 seems unlikely, that would be a real problem. 2022 feels challenging as well as we may not be able to get up there until the fall at this point. So, lining up contractors, there are a lot of issues with that. I would advise a much slower pace. In general, I do object to it. I think there are other solutions for the long-term rental market. I think you are utilizing the wrong tool to solve the long-term rental market. That is an issue from my perspective, and I guess that covers it. In general, I just do not think this is the right solution. I do feel like there is a problem and can appreciate what you are trying to accomplish, I just wish you were doing it in a different way other than this. Thanks.

*Nicole Gowan - I don't have any questions and my two properties are in Bayside and incredibly grateful for after I read through the By-Law. I am someone who interprets government policy for a living and can appreciate the time that went into this. I am also someone who has been a landlord and had short-term rentals on and off for 20 years and it's pretty comprehensive. It's going to be difficult for people to adhere to what you have put in here and making it harder on ordinary people. I was hoping to sort of move some of my business dealings in town and this would deter me from doing so. I just wanted to put that out there. I know you probably will not roll this out right away, but to give you some context, if I was in town and what I have on the books in 2021 is over \$30,000 in short-term rentals and that was taken away from me that would be very devastating. From an economic standpoint, I would think that is a huge consideration for your townfolks and stuff. That is, it for me, thanks.*

*Stephen Crabbe - I am just listening to the meeting and a couple of comments. Taking away such a thing as short-term rentals, especially currently is very drastic. Taking an opportunity that people don't have everywhere and Nicole Gowan expressed it very clearly. Thank you very much.*

*Joanne Carney - So I was talking with Paul Nopper, and he was mentioning there would be another draft after this meeting and that there would be another meeting like tonight to comment on the new draft as it is likely to have a lot of changes to it. I wanted to make sure that happens that there is another public meeting before the second reading without seeing the new draft. The one thing that has not come up is the cap. I am not sure many people understanding what is going on with this document and the cap of 50 rentals. Several people noted as it was arbitrary and lacking data and a yearly assessment on that to decide if that number can be increased if dormitories are built. There should not be a cap on short-term rentals in primary residences. Right now, it has a cap on all sorts of residences including tourist homes. I think we need to consider finances are not what they used to be, and the cost of living has gone up not in proportion to wages. Only 37% of people in Canada have pensions and that is dropping, and it is low in Saint Andrews to have a job with a pension. People need to be creative with their finances. We should not be capping primary residence short-term rentals. People need to be able to pay for their mortgages. The cost of housing has gone up dramatically and to be able to have a granny suite or a duplex that allows people to get into homes and not always be renting. That cap should be removed for a primary residence. There may be a case that we don't want someone from Quebec City or Toronto coming in and buying up 5 houses and putting them into the short-term rental market. I do not see that being a problem. I have not heard that has been happening. They may be coming into Moncton and buying up 5 buildings, but I do not see them going into the short-term rental small business market. I am not sure if that justifies this document. Tourist Commercial Zone is an issue. Short-term rental is a primary use in the Tourist Commercial Zone, and it has not been exempted the Tourist Commercial Zone from the Short-Term Rental By-Law. It is the only zone in the whole town of Saint Andrews as this is listed as primary use and needs to be exempted from any By-Law if it does go through. I think this is difficult to enforce and not sure if you have come up with any data of how you are going to enforce this. I do not even think it was that successful in the enforcement of the levy and there needs to be more discussion on this. If there are any kind of fees, I do not see anything in there to put towards long-term rentals. At least 50% of anything collected should go towards long-term rentals as that is your goal. The Tourist Home definition should be added back into the By-Law and the Zoning By-Law. The Tourist Home's basic definition is a single-family home providing sleeping accommodation to the public. If Tourist Homes are allowed in the current Zoning By-Law in almost every zoning area in Saint Andrews, I can't remember but maybe the Mixed Zone or Multi-Residential one where it is not allowed, but Tourist Homes are allowed. If we are going*

to delay the Short-Term Rental By-Law or scrap it altogether, then the Tourist Home definitions need to be added back to the Zoning By-Law. Again, I mentioned that a lot of definitions need to be updated for hotels and motels. The campgrounds are not listed. People can rent an RV for the summer, for example at the Kiwanis Campground, and then re-rent it out as a short-term rental. This has not been considered in the By-Law.

Peter Breeze - I would like to comment on Mr. O'Connor who says this is the wrong tool at the wrong time. I completely agree with him. If the town has a serious problem with accommodation, we must deal with it in a longer-term fashion and not restricting the number of summertime rentals. I and several members of my family which have homes that are unoccupied in the winter would not make them available for summer rental if this regulation came into being. That would be several beds that would be taken off the market for otherwise high spending tourists. The other point I would make, Mrs. Carney and others have said this is an administrative nightmare. I have calculated over a course of two months assuming a family of 4 in a rental accommodation would generate 89,600 pieces of data which your Council would have to process. 89,600 to comply with your regulations, which gentleman, with all due respect is an excess of control over what should be an encouraging and inviting invitation to enjoy Saint Andrews in the summer. Thank you.

Lindy Townsend - I am going to make comments for my daughter. She is echoing the logical arguments that have been raised and she wants to add that why are not the people who really know the By-Laws well, it does not seem, it seems like there are lots of us that are property owners who understand the By-Laws, and understand that they are not quite merging and holding hands between the documents. The spirit of this could be absolutely a community effort. I apologize if I seem like I am angry, it is just my tone, and everyone says so. My daughter said Mom, just tell them that maybe hand this over to community members. Rob is very nice, and he is laid back and cool. You do not get cooler than Jamie Steel. Dayle and Mark have rented our property and what I wanted to say about that, when it goes through a real estate agent Dayle and Mark already have it all figured out. All the other real estate agents have it figured out before the guests even arrive. They have their name and damage deposit. The visitors and the owners trust each other as they are using a trusted facility to go through like a real estate agent. I do think that Mr. Groulx, although you did add to the argument, starting out at 50 units, doesn't start a sort of community conversation. What I am hearing and what my daughter is hearing, why do you not hand it over to us? We will come up with a really great collaborative agreement. Council I understand you are tired. We are battle weary as citizens as we feel it is so hard to have a discussion, while these little community efforts of public meetings are helpful, they are one-sided. You cannot take it on advisement. When you do that is when we become irate and hire lawyers to voice our opinions. There has to be a better way here. I am just saying I don't like to be cut off, but with all due respect, we do not get any feedback. Look at the time that Joanne and Rob Carney have poured into the document. They know more about this than you do. I happen to know more about these By-Laws than you do. Give us some respect and add us in as stakeholders. If you would have added some property owners into those committees in those four documents, you are revising. You could have done it with an abridged amount of time and with more area people involved. This not an offense or a dig, it is just when we must review these documents, we are not doing it to entertain ourselves, we are doing it to protect ourselves. I think you should really, really think about a committee that involves the stakeholders that spoke tonight. We elected you not the other way around.

Mayor Naish - Thank you for your input we will take that under advisement.

Michelle Greenland - I have lived here for 13 years as a manager at the biological station. We lose out on candidates because of limitations to long



term rental. Please find a balance between rentals and economic development. I appreciate the town and the process you are taking. I think a little regulation in place is good, requirements for fire extinguishers and safety of guests is appreciated. I appreciate the difficulty of the lack of long-term rental. I do not feel this is the right mechanism for this. I suggest Council has a working group for short-term rentals, I rent for only 5 weeks, others have businesses. It would be nice to have a working discussion and holistic discussion based on short-term rentals. Access to financial statements, invasion of privacy, random checks, privacy is paramount. The floorplans would take me longer to put together. Liability, quotas, etc.

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

**G. QUESTION PERIOD**

**H. COUNCILLORS' AND DEPUTY MAYOR'S COMMENTS**

*Councillor Harrison - This is the way to get it to the public. It is a happy thing when people provide feedback. We have been going back and forth on this for over a year including the municipal plan. We have not come up with all the answers and this gave us a starting point. I tend to fall into the camp to throw our two cents in. It might be overly regulated but we still need to get long-term rentals in town. If you know anyone at NBCC, have them develop their property. They could fix this problem through a partnership with apartments.*

*Councillor Groulx - I think one thing universally accepted, the status quo is just not an option. We are in the process of amending our Zoning By-Law and is restrictive to short-term rental. The input we received tonight is excellent and will be taking into consideration moving forward.*

**I. MAYOR'S COMMENTS**

*Mayor Naish - We have gotten a lot of feedback and more consultation on the process. We will regroup as Council and have a working session to deliberate and go back for more consultation. I want to assure everything has been given to Council and will be considered by Council. We are not rushing this through and may take longer than we think.*

**J. CLOSED SESSION**

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion: Motion: 056- 02/21**  
**Moved by Councillor Bishop**  
**Seconded by Councillor Akagi**

At 8:16 p.m. that the meeting be adjourned.

5 - 0

**Carried**



Doug Naish, Mayor



Paul Nopper, Clerk

