



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

October 17, 2022, 6:45 p.m.  
W.C. O'Neill Arena

---

**A. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

*A Public Hearing of Objections for 256 and 260 Water Street of the Town of Saint Andrews Council was held on Monday, October 17, 2022, at 6:48 p.m. with the following members present:*

*Mayor Brad Henderson, Deputy Mayor Kate Akagi, Councillor Marc Blanchard, Kurt Gumushel, Lee Heenan, Steve Neil*

*Electronic Attendance - Councillor Jamie Hirte*

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

*Meeting Called to Order at 6:48 p.m.*

**B. LAND RECOGNITION OF THE PESKOTOMUHKATI NATION**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion: 395 - 10/22**

**Moved by** Councillor Heenan

**Seconded by** Councillor Blanchard

*That the Agenda be approved as presented.*

**6 – 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. for Second Reading, PED220710**

*Planner Gopen provided a presentation to the public and Council on Development Scheme By-Laws. The hierarchy of By-Laws is the Community Planning Act, Municipal Plans, Secondary Municipal Plans, Development Scheme By-Laws, and finally Zoning By-Laws. A Development Scheme By-Law would override a Zoning By-Law for an area. Development Schemes under the Community Planning Act Section 101 - 103 shall consist of written statements, maps, drawings, and other descriptive matters to illustrate the scheme, identify a specific geographical area, set out details of development or redevelopment, and descriptive manner of implementation (agreement elements). The By-Law may allocate areas of land for a particular use. The By-Law requires a public presentation, a public hearing of objections, views of the Planning Advisory Committee, and three readings of the Council. Exemptions and variances for a project, the developer would enter into an agreement with Council containing terms and conditions. Benefits to this By-Law include the allowance of the Council to set terms and conditions, extend the public*

consultation process, additional public presentations and public hearings, and can allow multiple main uses not allowed in the Central Commercial Zone, i.e. residential and commercial. An example of a Development Scheme By-Law was presented that has already taken place in town around Langmaid Park.

Douglas Greenaway, 62 Princess Royal Street. You will hear from several neighbours with grave concerns about the proposed project at 256 and 260 Water Street. The letter submitted is from the adjacent neighbours immediately and near to the proposed development. I speak on behalf of the neighbours and the calls for objections to the Secondary Municipal Plan. Of the 45 households that submitted a letter to Council on Friday, is committed to protecting and preserving the architecture, small-town flavour, and quality of life of our community of the Town Plat and Historic Business District as a recognized National Historic Site of Canada. We appreciate these characteristics are what attract visitors, tourists, and residents to Saint Andrews. After repeated efforts to focus the Council on the consequences of the proposal for the town and after further neighbourhood consultations we declare our full and complete opposition to the Bridle Path International Development as currently conceived and feel this is the wrong development for this site. It undermines the spirit and intent of the objectives and policies set out in the Town Plat and Historic Business District under the Secondary Municipal Plan. It violates the height, massing, scale, and footprint limitations of the Town Plat and Historic Business District. It undermines the Town's Zoning By-Laws in promoting zoning reclassifications that prioritize developers over residents, development over the quality of life, and chips away at the consensus of the Town's Secondary Municipal Plan. We are convinced the plan will contribute to significant and unreasonable light pollution from units and the garage, noise pollution levels, and add unacceptable freight and vehicular traffic for the neighbourhood, making it unsafe specifically for seniors and children. The arguments for the previous use generated high traffic and the proposal will have a positive effect on parking and traffic do not comport with the reality or the facts. The proposal will set unreasonable precedence for the massing, scale, footprint, and height of the Historic Business District and the Town Plat covered in the Secondary Municipal Plan. To be clear, we support reasonable, sensible, and thoughtful development of the site but this project, members of the Council, is in our estimation the wrong project for the site. It does not belong in the Historic Business District or Town Plat. Successful development required full process transparency, collaborative design and implementation partnership with impacted neighbours, and dynamic engagement with the community. It requires full vetting of the impact of a project on quality of life, quality of architecture, overall design, and its effects and consequences on pedestrians, traffic patterns, parking, environment concerns, and infrastructure services. Successful development is far more than building heights and aesthetics. It demands Town leadership refrain from fast-tracking the individual property owners and developers over the community. There is no enthusiasm for this project among the 45 households that have signed this letter. I repeat the Bridle Path proposal is the wrong project for this site. We do not believe the Council has adequately vetted the consequences of the impact of this development on the Town nor are we convinced that the Council has taken concerns seriously. The performative nature of the hearing and public declarations that side with developers, the apartment rush to act with developers coupled with the absence of written responses to community-posed questions suggest disregard for the consequences of this project on the community. Finally, the Council has offered and heard Mr. Gopen for the use of a Development Scheme By-Law as a tool to manage this and future development projects. This would be a convenient tool to avoid compliance with the Historic District and Town Plat Secondary Municipal Plan. This By-Law outside compliance will not benefit residents or the Town. It will be a ticket for development blight with devastating consequences. For all these reasons we are fully and completely opposed to the development as perceived. We urge Council to

*cease the development process and reject the developer's proposal. To quote a local resident, this development is suited for a city and not Saint Andrews. It is too commercial, too large for the lot, and resembles an institution. In other words, the proposal is the wrong project for this site. We remain available and interested to support a project that fully conforms with the Secondary Municipal Plan and urge you to stand with the neighbours of this letter and to stand with us. Thank you for the presentation.*

*Barry Murray, Civic Trust. We have written and represented the views of the Civic Trust. We submitted an objection at the second reading and now at the third reading. I will be speaking on the exclusion of the Secondary Municipal Plan. As the Trust, we remain without prejudice to reserve our observations to this development should it proceed after this meeting. We support Mr. Greenaway and the group for taking the time to understand the application of the Secondary Municipal Plan. To remind us all of the primary objectives of this plan are to retain and enhance the architectural and cultural heritage of Saint Andrews, the Historic Business District, and Town Plat, and to maintain the built character of the town for present and future generations. The plan is barely a year old and intended to be a directional document for the next ten years. In our letter, we suggested it would act as a north star for current and future council decisions. We ask the question if this development respects the stated intent. Mr. Greenaway and others have reminded us that we enjoy a wonderful definition in this country and town as a National Historic District. To remind you what was said in the awarding of this, since the founding of the town the commercial section for Saint Andrews has been located on water street and located in close proximity. Design continuity is the repeated use of a simple single rectangular form in classical detail. 19th Century buildings are often three full storeys in weight but continue to respect the proportions established and the relationship of surroundings on volume, mass, materials, and embellishments. New buildings shall respect the general pattern of massing and scale of the general vicinity and adjacent properties. Sections 2.1.6 a, b, and c state how a building shall meet the requirements. This proposal requests to be exempt from all three requirements. To a finer point. 3.1.4 of the Plan states that residential and commercial buildings conform to 2.5 and 3-storey buildings. To the request on the table this evening, that the approval of the fourth storey abandons the intent of the Secondary Municipal Plan. Approval of exclusion to major sections of the Plan nullifies respect to the plan through precedence. This invites all future developers to expect similar treatment. As mentioned earlier the Civic Trust reserves without prejudice to reference this development if it moves forward.*

*Guy Groulx, 50 Earnest Street. Former Councillor and thank you for allowing me to present to Council. I would like to start first by thanking the developers for coming to the Town and for looking to invest. My comments are directed to Council. I would like to speak about the Municipal Plan and Secondary Municipal Plan. These Plans were developed during my time on Council and were prepared after extensive consultation with the community, civic groups, and outside agencies. These Plans are to guide the Town, Council, advisory committees, developers, and residents in decisions affecting environmental and planning issues. It took a year of consultation and there was consensus from the community on how we wanted to develop. The Plans were finalized along with a Zoning By-Law. The key principle behind the Plans is to guide Town, Council, developers and residents on the growth and development of Saint Andrews for the long term with plans and policies to guide. The idea is that residents and developers would have to formulate their proposals to conform to the Plans so the Town can develop based on the wishes of the community. The underlying rationale of the Plans and short-term decisions of the Council that might seem right for the Town might not be right for the long term. The Plans are universal documents meant to be applied equally to the properties of Saint Andrews. The Secondary Municipal Plan was developed to give direction on future land use and development to protect the heritage value of the*

*Historic Business District and Town Plat. The Municipal Plan and Secondary Municipal Plan are not property specific like the Zoning By-Law, rather providing planning direction on a town-wide basis. There is no variance process for these plans as they must adhere to their provisions. Council can amend the Municipal Plan and Secondary Municipal Plan at their leisure, but these amendments must apply equally to all properties. Section 24 of the Community Planning Act states these Plans apply to the community as a whole. The request for 256 and 260 Water Street is not simple. It requires an amendment to the Secondary Municipal Plan, Zoning By-Law, and significant variances under the Zoning By-Law. It has been proposed to grant an exemption unique to this property from several clauses in the Secondary Municipal Plan and a Development Scheme which effectively does an end run around the Zoning By-Law. To grant a specific property exemption from the Plans, may not be legal and amounts to preferential treatment for a select few. To set aside the Zoning By-Law and do a Development Scheme, would do an end run of the Zoning By-Law and undermines this, with re-enforcement to the developer being given special consideration that is not afforded to the residents of Saint Andrews. Clearly, this is a case of development that does not conform to the Plans of the Town and as said before this development does not fit. This leads to the question of why residents should respect the Plans if the Council does not. If Council wants to move ahead, they need to be ready to amend section 2.1.2 and change the height restrictions for all properties in the Historic Business District. What implication will this have on heritage considerations? Instead of setting aside the Zoning By-Law, Council should work within the By-Law and work on any variances or amendments for the project to move ahead. This will help restore confidence in the Town By-Laws. The last thing I would like to speak to is meaningful consultation. Much of the consultation done is to meet the Community Planning Act rather than to solicit meaningful consultation with the public. There is a perception that is Council has already made up their minds. Council has already started to draft a Development Scheme and will circumvent the Zoning By-Law and has not completed the Secondary Municipal Plan amendment without further consultation. How can Council come to the public today and say with any honesty they are open to objections on these projects when they are doing things behind the scenes?*

*Mayor Henderson provided clarification to Mr. Groulx and the public that the Council has not started a process on the Development Scheme By-Law, nor has it even come to the table for discussion. Mr. Gopen provided a presentation at the beginning of this meeting to outline what a Development Scheme By-Law is and that it is an option for Council to use under the Community Planning Act. It is a legal process available to the Council and the Town if they wish to use it. Providing speculation to Council on a Development Scheme By-Law, this Council has not looked at it. Do not speculate that anything is happening behind closed doors as this has been an open process and not one member of the Council has participated in a Development Scheme By-Law. Do not use this as an opportunity for implications that Council is disloyal or dishonest. I will not have it.*

*Mr. Groulx Cont. What I am saying is that Council is not totally open to the public.*

*Mayor Henderson noted that is your opinion of the subject, but you can continue.*

*Mr. Groulx Cont. As an example, Council has approved \$900,000 in development grants in the budget. You have approved \$500,000 to Compass Housing, the largest grant in history. This is \$500.00 per household and was approved by Council, no competitive process was used, and no public consultation.*

*Mayor Henderson noted to Mr. Groulx to keep his comments specific to the agenda topic at hand. You are using this as an opportunity to attack Council*

and that funding is pending approval. There is a process to follow. Again, stick to the By-Law and wrap this up.

Mr. Groulx Cont. The fall newsletter indicated the need for a Heritage By-Law can we get a commitment from Council that they will be subject to this By-Law, or will they be exempt from this By-Law as well?

CAO Spear to clarify Mr. Groulx's comments on the Development Scheme By-Law being potentially illegal, it is not. It is a tool that Councils can use that is in the Community Planning Act. Whether appropriate or not, it is up to Council and the community to debate.

Ken Beaubean, 56 Princess Royal Street. I feel we are at a critical juncture of one of the most significant proposals in the modern history of Saint Andrews. Because Saint Andrews is a small town, it makes decisions more important. Preserved Historic Districts are rare in North America and any changes to the characters and function must be carefully assessed. One development does not make a Historic District, but one can degrade its character. The proposed development is one such project and, in my opinion, should not move forward. Simply put it is the wrong project for the site. My family is new to the community but the impact on the neighbours and the broader community is immediate and profound. Three key points I would like to address. The development plan, Secondary Municipal Plan, is an important preservation tool for Saint Andrews. It represents a plan forward and is longer than any Council cycle and bigger than any one development. The proposed development contradicts the development plan mainly in mass and scale. We talk about building height, but mass and scale cannot be let lost in the conversation. There is a hierarchy with plans and with the decision comes a cycle of decisions. In my opinion, the building is too big on the site and no facade change will fix this reality. It is the wrong building for the site. Precedence heard from others, Municipal Planning is of critical importance for developers to understand stability and what is needed, and what residents expect. An earlier speaker talked about criteria and a checklist to understand how Council can assess it, the community knows how it will be assessed, and have a predictable framework. We have this framework for the architecture and the community and at times feel we are not using it. We need to apply it for a development of this size and impact. I am one of the first houses considered residential on the street. It does say what is the precedence on this street. Is there an incentive to restore the buildings or a disincentive to tear them down and build bigger ones? My final point is about people and community. Architecture is about building heights and design, and have a background in urban planning, it is about the buildings and architecture but also the built form area and how they are being used. I have two young kids who walk to school and are aware of how to move through spaces. The traffic on Princess Royal Street is absurd for a residential street. You have large trucks backing up in the morning delivering to the Dollar Store not using a road but a private laneway, traffic diverted from the one-way Water Street during the summer, and the campers and trailers all come down Princess Royal Street. We have had to walk with our kids to school due to the heavy traffic. I urge Council to consider the impact of movement through the community and how to get to school. This is not considering construction traffic and will be a prolonged development and multi-year build. The other piece to consider is that there are other options for development on this site. A vacant lot is not optional for this site, and I do not think we need to develop it but needs to be consistent with the Town and architecture. The development now can be dropped into any Town and does not represent what the Town is. It makes it ill-suited to be in the envelope of the Town. I would urge members of the Council to reject the project and start again.

Mike Anstey, 41 Princess Royal Street. I am probably the one most affected by this project in Town. As mentioned in Mr. Greenaway's letter, I have taken a map of the properties that have signed the letter of opposition of the development in its current form. You can see we have it surrounded and did

not include the Kingsbrae development. There are not many homes in the area that are not in favour of this, except for Jeff Holmes's property and friends of Jeff Holmes's who will not sign the letter. I asked Mr. Nopper for the breakdown of signatories for those for, those against, and those against with concerns. If we add them up, 11 for and 175 against or against with concerns. That is 94% of the people who are against the project as currently conceived. I would like to address Mr. Gopen's characterization of the Development Scheme By-Law. He brought forward the 1988 Langmaid Park Development Scheme as the way to do that.

Mr. Gopen noted that the example was of a process Council can use and not the exact Development Scheme By-Law potentially for this project.

Mr. Anstey. Cont. Acknowledged Mr. Gopen on the comments that this is a process example. One glaring difference from 1988 to today. In 1988 Council developed the Development Scheme By-Law and then went for proposals, in this project's case, it is a Development Scheme to fit the developer's needs. The height of the project, I find interesting. On September 6th there was a lot of talk of height and Mr. Spear noted Mr. Gopen's report on the height and the exemption from Municipal Plan 2.6. The report of June 20th, 2022, and during the September 6th meeting, Councillor Heenan asked the question about Mr. Holmes's previous development. It was stated a 14.4 m variance. The actual variance was 13.25 m. This is the first error in the report, the second error is 30 units versus 36 units, the third error was the lots converted back to Central Commercial, and the fourth error that does not work is so long as residential uses do not front onto Water Street are allowed as a secondary use to main commercial use to the main commercial zone. There is only one way into the building beside the garage and that is the front door to the residence on Water Street. The final is the height map that was presented, with buildings that are 120 years old around the block, and had different Zoning By-Laws, somewhere close to the heights of the proposed developments. I walked them and checked them all. First off, the definition of height means in relation to a building or structure, the vertical distance is measured from the grade level to the highest point of the structure and does not include towers, chimneys, ornamental roof constructions, or mechanical things. Every item on that height map is either a chimney or a cupola.

Mr. Gopen noted that this was not an accurate representation provided by Mr. Anstey. They all have chimneys and cupolas but not the highest point. The arrows on the map are pointing to the properties. I am sorry, but if you are going to attack me, please be correct. The height was taken to ensure the chimney is not taken. We take the roofline.

Mr. Anstey apologized for the misconstrued. When looking at the Butterfields place, where are we taking the measurement from? We are taking it from the back of the lot because on Water Street to the back of the lot the property drops 24 inches. So that makes it 24 inches taller. Like the other side of the street, this building is longer and drops 30 inches. The height of the building from the back of Princess Royal Street is 15 m and would be in violation of paragraph 6d where it cannot be more than 14.4 m or 41 feet.

Mr. Gopen stated the height is from the natural grade. Grade means in the Zoning By-Law the height after the project is finished and soil work is done.

Mr. Anstey. Cont. the grade is from the sidewalk from what I was told.

Mr. Gopen noted that Mr. Anstey should check the definition of the By-Law.

Mayor Henderson noted that under Mr. Anstey's concept of height would be reviewed and brought back to Council based on the Zoning By-Law definitions for clarity to Council.

Mr. Anstey Cont. Most important is massing and scale. The last thing mentioned by Mr. Gopen, as per the Secondary Municipal, building height

shall be. That is not what it says in paragraph 6 says it is proposed that new buildings and construction, alterations, and additions shall respect the general pattern of massing and scale of the general vicinity and adjacent properties. This may be achieved in one of the following ways - building height and footprint shall be, with a, b, and c do not deal with height alone. It is a three-legged stool and cannot consider without the other. Height is the dependent variable on the height and depth. When talking about a, b, and c, of the By-Law it is massing and scale. If you look at the diagrams provided, Kennedy Inn versus the development proposed. The Kennedy Inn masses 2000 sq. ft. versus 3570 sq. ft. When looking at 250 and 246 water street, they are two different buildings and cannot be compared to the development. If we look at the Secondary Municipal Plan in totality, I asked Mr. Gopen if it was solely for the height, and he said yes. Massing is a combination of all three. This violates the spirit of the Secondary Municipal Plan.

Franklin Cardy, 271 Pagan Street. Thank you for inviting our neighbours to speak about this proposal. I live on Pagan Street and walk past this property each day on my way to the post office or the old jail. I am the Chair of the Charlotte County Archives and Jeff Holmes is the Vice Chair. At the Archives we are concerned about preserving our heritage but also concerned with community and social development. We are pleased that the Town has developed and approved Municipal Plans or several, with carefully considered generic By-Laws to guide development decisions. It is appropriate that these developments are judged in the light of these plans and By-Laws as Guy emphasized earlier. Municipal Plan is for guidance. But judgment is the keyword. Our Council is elected to pass judgment on these issues. Are Councillors not a group of six narrowly defined experts on legal matters, economics, or planning? Our Council is elected from the community at large like a cross-section of residents. You are elected to apply common sense to development decisions taking all relevant factors into account and the broader interest of the whole community. This property is currently a vacant wasteland bringing no economic benefit to the Town apart from a few thousand dollars in property tax. I believe there is no designation in the Municipal Plan for wastelands, so the property is currently non-compliant. The property is zoned Mixed Use and there is a strong demand for residential property of all kinds in Saint Andrews. Jeff Holmes and Bill Stanley have spent several years developing an appropriate use for this property. We are talking about one particular property. But they were unable to make it work at that time and were faced with several objections. Now a new effort is being proposed and much thought and care have gone into this to find a way to make the land productive. In the spirit of the Municipal Plan and in a constructive manner for the Town, every effort is being promised by the highly reputable developer to address the reasonable concerns of the neighbourhood. I ask you what happens if this project is rejected. No one is talking about that, and you will have to face that. Who has thought about that and is there any alternative proposal for that space? You are not being asked to choose, you are asked to choose between a wasteland and a particular proposal that has been carefully thought about. If this proposal is rejected, do you imagine that after all this effort, a better one will be found for this property? So the property will likely remain non-conforming as a wasteland. It is possible, the only alternative for Jeff, the owner left with it, might be to sell to a Giant Tiger or an expanded Dollar Store. How will this fit within our neighborhood wishes and with a heritage community development that we would like to see in this Town? So, my point is the Town effectively going to leave this property foul by preventing this development. Remember the Municipal Plan is for guidance, and you are elected to consider the broader issues all across this Town. Your worship, this proposal is a serious attempt to make a significant contribution to the residential and commercial property base of the Town in a sensitive and considerate manner as possible. There is not much you can do with an apartment block to make it look like a 100-year-old building. No demand is being made of the Town by the developer, not asking for financial support,

*just being asked to proceed. There is no better offer and no other offer or in my view is one likely to be found. I strongly urge the Council to approve this proposal and show that this Council is not against much-needed development. I believe this non-conforming wasteland can be turned into productive use and appropriate use in a sensitive manner. I believe you should allow it to proceed.*

*Ray Zwarych, 49 Princess Royal Street. I am one of the ones directly impacted by this development. I looked at the pictures that were shown by the developer and not surprising they did not show the view I will be looking at every day, which is the back end of the building. If you look at the back end of the building, it is a concrete wall with a few windows in it, a door, a garage driveway, and probably a bunch of utilities hung on the back for the common areas. I disagree completely with the development as it stands. We do have guard rails as our planning department has identified in the three Municipal Plans and the Zoning By-Laws that we have. That is what we have right now and that is where this development should be looked at. The idea of creating another plan for this development is completely wrong. Send it back, create the plan, and start with it again. You have seen that there is a lot of people who do not want this development to happen and I personally will not stop fighting this development through every meeting there is for it and I am sure there are others. I am going to try my best to stop it. What I am going to say to Council is you should probably do it now, get it started the property way before you create animosity through this whole Town about it as I am sure it will happen.*

*Jeff Holmes, 252-D Water Street. Keep in mind what the alternative will be. As Franklin said, there have been no other offers, the property has been for sale on and off for seven years. None of the people who have strong views as to how it should be developed has come along with an open chequebook. I am pleased that Mr. Rocca has taken this project on, and I believe he will do as much as he can to appease the concerns and address the concerns of the neighbours. Be reminded when you buy a property you do not buy a view. We have all been caught up on this at various times when someone builds beside you, you lose your view. That is an unfortunate part of any development. There are worse things that can happen on that corner than a 36-unit plus two commercial unit walk and lot development.*

*Robert Wier, 93 Frederick Street. We are new here and my only observation to this process is that this represents an extraordinary opportunity for Council to take the gatekeeper role here very clearly and sensitively. I am an optimist and have every hope that the concerns that are very assiduously and eloquently on both sides of this project, I would suspect. I am a signatory to the opposition to the project. I would never say I oppose building projects out of hand. I think there is always room for development and think it is necessary. I come from San Fransisco and there have been terrific sustainable projects and some unmitigated disasters. Coming here, I see some very brilliant minds that could do a deeper dive into how some of these concerns and great concerns can be ameliorated. That is where my optimism lies. This does not represent the end of the road and there are many opportunities for Council, the developer, and the interested parties, many in Saint Andrews. We once lived in Salt Spring Islands and Valdi once described Salt Spring as an argument surrounded by water. Saint Andrews, I get the whiff of that too, nothing wrong with that, it is a good thing. I encourage everyone, all the stakeholders, to not look at it as the end of the project. There is a way and a workaround. I do not think we have to throw our hands up in defeat and thank you for letting me speak.*

*Gary Irwin-Kenyon, 18 Princess Royal Street. I think the previous comments are the right way to proceed with this. There are people who really care about the Town, neighbourhood, and where we live. Nobody who signed that letter said there should be no development period. We do not want it to go forward as it is now. Echoing comments there are ways to do this without saying throw out the baby and start again. I just wanted to emphasize that*



right from Reverend Greenway. The proposal as it stands cannot go forward and we do not want it to go forward. It does not mean something cannot be done.

Bill Stanley, 70 Sophia Street. I had not intended to speak because I thought it would be well covered. Something that really is not quite said completely, and that this Town needs new residential development. It is not easy to do residential development. The reason I am speaking to you is that I was a partner with Jeff to develop this property for residential use. We worked approximately for two to three years. My job with Jeff was to determine the financial arrangements and in so doing I hired Professional Accounting Skills from Saint John. We went through various iterations of development. The space, the square footage, the number of units, the garage, the Town Platt, and we too went through a process with Council. Ultimately, we did manage to get approval and we were ready to proceed. A cautionary word here, proceeding does not mean it is going to work. As we started to put our plan into effect, to initially sell condominiums, and secondarily, when that did not work, to have apartments. There was not a positive financial outcome for the developer, in our case 18 units that were upscale. There was no way 18 units would pay for development on this property. It has to be of some scale. If it is not of scale, it is not going to work. I cannot tell you how many iterations we did. This Town needs development and thoughtful development and takes a thoughtful developer to carry this off. That is all I would like to say. If you have an experienced developer interested in Saint Andrews, and in residential housing, you have one. Word of caution, that property is not easy to develop.

Liz Irwin-Kenyon, 148 Princess Royal Street. I have listened to all the speakers tonight, and we have over 180 people signing up in our area that do not want this project. We are not against development; it is just this is the wrong project for this area. The scare tactics of its going to be barren land or a Giant Tiger, do not seem to be in the realm of open discussion. There are many other things that can be done, and it just takes, like selling a house, one buyer, and one right buyer to see the bigger picture of the historic area, neighbourhood, and traffic concerns, and would really appreciate it if you really listen to it until you think back to the neighbourhood. We elected you and we really want you to think of us first before the developer. Not saying that has happened but think of your community. If that was across from where you live if you have little kids going to school, or trouble with parking, what would you want in historic Saint Andrews? Like in Europe, they have very rigid rules so that you can go to Europe and be so happy to be there because there is a historic vibe to it. That is what we like in Saint Andrews and good apartments for everyone, proper housing. But this is the wrong project for this area.

**G. QUESTION PERIOD**

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion: 396 - 10/22**

**Moved by Councillor Gumushel**

**Seconded by Councillor Heenan**

*At 7:58 p.m. that the meeting be adjourned.*

**6 - 0**

**Carried**



Brad Henderson, Mayor



Paul Nopper, Clerk – Senior  
Administrator

