



**TOWN OF SAINT ANDREWS
PUBLIC HEARING OF OBJECTIONS MEETING
MINUTES**

**August 15, 2022, 6:30 p.m.
W. C. O'NEILL ARENA COMPLEX DINING ROOM**

A. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

At the Public Hearing of Objections to Amendment MP20-02-01 Secondary Municipal Plan of the Town of Saint Andrews Council was held on Monday, August 15, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present:

Mayor Brad Henderson, Deputy Mayor Kate Akagi, Councillor Marc Blanchard, Lee Heenan, Jamie Hirtle, Steve Neil.

Chris Spear, CAO/Treasurer, Paul Nopper, Clerk - Senior Administrator, Alexander Gopen, Senior Planner, Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission.

Absent: Councillor Kurt Gumushel

B. LAND RECOGNITION OF THE PESKOTOMUHKATI NATION

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: 336 - 08/22

Moved by Councillor Hirtle

Seconded by Councillor Heenan

That the Agenda be approved as presented.

5 – 0

Carried

D. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

E. PRESENTATION

F. HEARING OF OBJECTIONS

- 1. Amendment MP20-02-01 to the Town of Saint Andrews Secondary Municipal Plan MP20-02 for PIDs 01320035 and 15054893 256 and 260 Water Street for Bridle Path International Inc. First Reading, PED220710**

Mayor Henderson spoke to the 32 letters submitted to Council regarding the proposed development at 256 and 260 Water Street. Mayor Henderson noted the processes of the Public Hearing of Objections and asked the public to be precise in their discussions. It was noted that Council's job is to listen to the comments and will take them for review and discussion at another meeting of the Council.

Douglas Greenway - 62 Princess Royal Street

Speaking on behalf of 22 households as indicated in the letter submitted. We support reasonable, respectful, and sensitive development at 256 and 260 Water Street. No single property sits in isolation within the community and any new development should be fully integrated into the character of the Town. Consider the quality of life, architecture, and effect on all aspects of the community. Importantly we believe the responsibility rests with the developer and the Town for this development. With regards to the specifics of the amendment, we are pleased with the overall height of 12.2 metres and that it meets with the streetscape with less of an assault on adjacent

properties. For note, the two most cited elements in our letter pertain to the four-story development. Referencing the elevations of nearby properties suggest heights of buildings are consistent. Heights of chimney peaks, roof lines, etc. do not equate to the volume of this project. We would like an 11-foot setback on the side yard to disguise the fourth storey and would object to a height over 12.2 meters and no mechanical systems on the roof. The second is the underground parking garage. Before the start of this project, engineering reports and feasibility studies should be completed documenting the geology, how to excavate, if there need to be explosives used, and how it will affect adjacent properties. There is also concern about the liability and risk regarding flooding and the precautions to mitigate the concrete deterioration from flooding and the salt and sand from winter. Other concerns listed in our letter include demonstrating the economic viability and experience of the developer if performance bonds will be put in place, environmental testing, and remediation of the soil, comprehensive evaluation of the pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and a parking study. Children and seniors in this neighbourhood are experiencing increased traffic and this is incompatible with the street. The development will complicate additional volumes of traffic. This should be reviewed. Some additional items include construction impacts and how to protect neighbouring properties, contractor parking, and the repair process to adjacent properties if issues occur. Significant design improvements to the streetscape need to be reviewed as noted in the letter this looks like a motel from the side. Attention to stormwater management and wastewater management needs to be addressed. We want neighbours part of the discussion and input with the developer. Tourism and viability are also pieces that fit together for this project. In closing, we are all called to think about the environmental burden and consequences that we must address as we consider further development. We urge you to move forward carefully, thoughtfully, and transparently on this project. We remain in support of a successful project.

Guy Groulx - 50 Ernest Street

Have submitted my comments in writing but want to address three points. 1. The Municipal Plan and Secondary Municipal Plan are the preeminent documents for growth. They are of a strategic nature and reviewed every 10 years and applied equally across the Town. To exempt the development from this By-Law is wrong. This opens the door to all forms of requests and exemptions to the By-Laws. If the developers are not expected to follow the permitted permission, why should residents of Siant Andrews follow the By-Laws? 2. Honesty and transparency. The property in question is zoned Commercial with a secondary use as residential. When looking at the property, the Zoning By-Law defines the main use. Is there anyone here who thinks that the primary use of this building is commercial? Two small storefront shops with a lot more residential. This building is more to the Multiple Residential 2 Zone guidelines. This is an MR building and should be zoned accordingly. If variances and accommodations are made, should be done on this basis. 3. This is not the end of the journey and amending the plan on this. Council and the Planners need to come clean on this. This amendment is only part of the way and multiple variances need to come forward. The dilemma, if Council changes the Secondary Municipal Plan, how can you evaluate the Zoning By-Law variances in an impartial way? As an example of this, the Zoning By-Law requires a rear yard setback of significance. This would need a significant variance for this to occur. The public deserves to know the full scope of the project and the Council should do their homework and research the changes and variances needed to all By-Laws and come back to the public with the entire package. Thank you for your time.

Carla Linton - 61 Princess Royal Street

My property is in a state of renovations, and I plan to live there. My name is not on the letter submitted by Mr. Greenway but would like it added.

Jeff Holmes - 235 Queen Street

People should remember when this was the HMS property and was a busy transportation organization. The building had 9 apartments, multiple vehicles, and fleets with over 30 vehicles in operation at any time. Operations ran from 7:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m. 7 days a week. I do not think a residential complex would generate as much traffic as we did.

Stephanie Ruckstuhl - 267 Montague Street

I signed the letter submitted by Mr. Greenway and if you look at it, we are not addressing the social equity levels in our Town. We need this housing but are more desperate for affordable housing and maybe some lower-income housing. The Town is struggling to have workers and to bring these people into our community to support our community. I do not understand how this property is only affordable to those that can afford to live there. We are not meeting the support of workers, and this bothers me and our ability to be open to the public. The Town supporting this project financially, I shake my head for supporting higher rent buildings. I do not think funding should be used for this.

Mayor Henderson provided clarification that the Town is supporting another affordable housing development and that there is no funding invested by the Town in this project.

Stephanie Ruckstuhl - 267 Montague Street

Reiterate that 30 potential cars with houses on Princess Royal Street. I see the disadvantage of cars parking along our house and do not understand it.

Ken Beaubien - 56 Princess Royal Steet

I will reiterate the key points; we need a traffic study that identifies implications to the vehicle and pedestrian traffic including the rerouting of traffic down Princess Royal Street, and must do due diligence on the underground parking garage.

Barry Murray - 363 Water Street

That Civic Trust has submitted commentary and I would like to highlight a couple of topics. One is the Secondary Municipal Plan. The Civic Trust was part of the strategic planning process on this. It was developed to help retain our heritage and community for the future community. The Secondary Municipal Plan speaks to what shall do not should do. The developer is seeking a total exemption to this. By exempting from this, they are permitting the developer to ignore this document and this block. It is inferred in the Secondary Municipal Plan that similarities of the massing of buildings and in light of the proposal, they are arguing to abandon the Secondary Municipal Plan approved in 2020. This is the first real test of this and would establish a baseline for the next 10 years. You can nullify the plan and ignore the massing and scale. This could lead to a loss of our National Heritage Designation on massing and streetscape area. We support Mr. Greenway on the discussion and have submitted a fair number of questions. Do we want to throw out the plan? We hear that there will be more opportunities for the public to participate in the process in the future and we look forward to it.

G. QUESTION PERIOD

H. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: 337 - 08/22

Moved by Deputy Mayor Akagi

Seconded by Councillor Heenan

At 7:00 p.m. that the meeting be adjourned.

5 - 0

Carried



Brad Henderson, Mayor

Paul Nopper, Clerk - Senior
Administrator