

**PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**  
**13 March 2019**  
**New Maryland Centre – 754 New Maryland Hwy. @ 6:30 PM**

**Repeal and Replacement of Municipal Plan By-Law No. 03-2016**  
**and Zoning By-Law No. 04-2016**

**1. Call to Order / Welcome / Opening Comments:**

Mayor Judy Wilson-Shee introduced herself and called the Public Hearing to order at 6:30 pm.

She welcomed everyone to the Public Hearing to discuss the proposed repeal and replacement of the Village's Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws. She explained that the proposed amendments include a harmonization of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws with the recently amended Community Planning Act, the proposed re-zoning of portions of the properties at 210 New Maryland Highway, also known as the Forbes Property, Peterson's Mini-Home Park at 618 New Maryland Highway, and 6 Baker Brook Court.

Mayor Judy Wilson-Shee explained that the purpose of the hearing was to give residents the opportunity to express any comments they may have in regard to the proposed Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Law amendments. She emphasized that the Hearing was not intended to engage in debate, but rather a venue to provide public feedback on the proposed amendments. She explained that Council would give fair consideration to all previously submitted written comments or verbal statements made during the hearing prior to making any future decision on the matters.

The Mayor also noted that the applicants were in attendance to provide further clarification about the specifics of their development proposals at the Forbes Property and 6 Baker Brook Court, and to respond to any questions or comments from the public, Council, or staff.

Lastly, she provided direction on the conduct of the "Comments from the Public" segment of the hearing. She explained that for anyone in attendance who wished to provide a statement on the proposed amendments, they should approach the microphone, state their name, address, and comments for the record. After each comment either Staff, Council, or one of the applicants would answer their questions.

Mayor Wilson-Shee then invited Kyle Arsenault, the Assistant Building Inspector and Development Officer, to guide the remaining agenda for the session.

**2. Introductions:**

Kyle Arsenault thanked the Mayor for the introduction and welcomed everyone in attendance. He also advised that, in order to ensure all comments received were accurately noted in the meeting minutes, a voice recorder would be operating throughout the duration of the meeting.

Kyle Arsenault began by introducing members of Council, staff, and the applicants in attendance. The following lists the attendees:

**Council:** Mayor Judy Wilson-Shee; Deputy Mayor Alex Scholten; Councillor Gisèle McCaie-Burke; Councillor Paul LeBlanc; Councillor Tim Scammell; Councillor Mike Pope.

**Staff:** Rob Pero, Building Inspector / Development Officer; Kyle Arsenault, Assistant Building Inspector/ Development Officer; Karen Taylor, Assistant Clerk; Michelle Sawler, Recreation Coordinator; Cynthia Geldart, Chief Administrative Officer / Clerk; Rockland Miller, Public Works Supervisor; Scott Sparks, Treasurer.

**Applicants:** Justin Bowers, Justin Bowers Homes Ltd.; Fred Collins; Tanner Phillips, Tandax Inc.; Scott MacIntosh, KBM Properties Ltd.

**Public:** Elizabeth Olmstead; Ken Brown; Frank Brown; Betty Nicholson; Winston Nicholson; Tracey Boulter; Jeremy Turgeon; Gary Campbell; Dean Wood; Martine Stewart; Ron Stewart; Doug McCarty; Kent Ross; Jim Horncastle; Michelle Horncastle; Stephanie More; Bill O'Donnell; Myrna McCarty; Jane Findlater; Mariet van Groenewoud; Jim Appleton; David Wiesel; Judy MacLean; Brad Marshall; Sam McEwan; Leah Bowers; Courtney Mason; Rebecca West; Natalie LeBlanc-Boswell; Steve Clements; Heather Clements; Karen LeBlanc; Chris Boswell.

### **3. Overview of the By-Law Amendment and Public Consultation Process:**

Kyle Arsenault provided a brief explanation of the public consultation process for proposed by-law amendments. He explained that the Municipal Plan By-Law sets out the general long-range policy framework for future land use within the Village, whereas the Zoning By-Law is the administrative tool that ensures the Municipal Plan policies are adhered to on a day-to-day basis and ensures that development or re-development occurs in an orderly fashion.

Kyle Arsenault explained that the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws are reviewed regularly to ensure relevancy to the needs and the vision for the municipality and to ensure consistency with provincial legislation. Amendments to the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws can also be initiated as a result of a review process or may be requested in support of a proposed development that fits with municipal growth and development objectives. He added that public engagement and consultation is required by provincial legislation whenever Municipal Plan or Zoning By-Law amendments are being considered.

Kyle Arsenault explained the re-zoning application process summary as follows:

- Staff conducts an initial review of the application and consults with Council on the merits of setting dates, via a resolution of Council, to host a Public Presentation to announce and explain the proposed Municipal Plan amendments. The Public Presentation on the proposed Municipal Plan amendments was conducted on the evening of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019. A Public Hearing is then hosted to receive public comments on both the proposed Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law amendments.
- Public notification of Village residents is then conducted by mailing notices to residents within 100 metres of the subject sites, which invites residents to attend both meetings and to provide feedback

on the proposals. Kyle Arsenault noted that, to date, nine written comments had been received from residents in relation to the proposed Zoning Map amendments.

- Advertisements and background information about the meeting dates and details on the proposals were posted on the Village website, social media accounts and on the billboard sign at the north entrance to the Village. These details were also included in the Public Hearing package that was made available to all in attendance at the hearing.
- Upon completion of the Public Presentation and the Public Hearing, and after having received recommendations from the Village Planning Advisory Committee, Council may then decide whether or not to proceed with the necessary readings of Council to enact the proposed amendments.

#### **4. Review of Proposed By-Law Amendments and Background Information:**

##### **i) General Amendments to the Municipal Plan to Harmonize with the 2017 Community Planning Act:**

Kyle Arsenault noted that the first group of by-law amendments to be discussed was the proposed repeal and replacement of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws in their entirety, as required by the recently updated *Community Planning Act*.

Kyle Arsenault explained that in January of 2018, the provincial government enacted an updated version of the *Community Planning Act* which requires that municipalities update their Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Laws to ensure harmony with the newly adopted *Community Planning Act*. Kyle noted that, for the most part, the proposed changes are simply to update section references in the by-laws to align with the new Act, and a few instances to ensure wording in the by-laws also align with the phrasing in the Act.

Kyle Arsenault displayed and reviewed some of the noted changes using the projector for the public in attendance to view. He noted that the concordance table highlighted all of the by-law text amendments to be made to the document. Kyle reiterated that the majority of the changes are simply to update section references and minor wording updates.

Kyle Arsenault also explained that the Village's 5-Year Capital Expenditure Plan has been updated as part of the by-law amendment process. The Capital Expenditure Plan is required by legislation to support the Village's future planning and budget forecasting. He noted that the numbers shown on the document are conceptual only and are solely intended to aid Council with financial planning for future capital projects and acquisitions.

ii) **618 New Maryland Highway (PID 75347989) - Request to Rezone a Portion of the Subject Property from Institutional Zone to Residential Mini-Home Park Zone (RMHP):**

Kyle Arsenault explained that the first zoning map amendment to be discussed was the minor realignment of the zoning boundary for Peterson's Mobile Home Park located at 618 New Maryland Highway. Due to a pre-existing encroachment issue, a small portion of land was previously purchased by the mobile home park to address the matter. That small piece of land is currently zoned Institutional and is therefore proposed to be re-designated on the Municipal Plan Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map from an Institutional Zone to a Residential Mini-Home Park Zone.

iii) **210 New Maryland Highway (PIDs 75061945 and 75259945) - Request to Rezone a Portion of the Subject Properties from Residential Zone Two (R-2) to Community Commercial Zone (CC):**

Kyle Arsenault explained that prior to inviting Justin Bowers to present details on his commercial development proposal for the Forbes Property, he would provide a brief overview of the past public consultation and Land Use Study conducted for the Forbes Property. Kyle explained that the study was completed in 2012 by the Village of New Maryland in cooperation with Genivar Consultants to establish a possible site development concept for the property. The resulting conceptual layout showed commercial development along the frontage of the property and a mixture of higher density residential housing options for the rest of the property. Kyle noted that while the drawing is conceptual, it does embody the strategic objectives for the Village with respect to growing the Village's commercial tax base, providing services and amenities to address residents' needs, and provide diversity of housing options in a sustainable, compact development. The layout also integrates well with the existing surrounding neighborhoods and has a strong emphasis on green space buffering for these neighborhoods.

Kyle Arsenault reported that Council has received a number of letters from residents in relation to the commercial development proposal with general comments and concerns about potential surface water drainage issues, building aesthetics, traffic impacts and noise pollution.

Kyle Arsenault then invited Justin Bowers, Justin Bowers Homes Ltd., to present further details on his proposed commercial development concept for the Forbes Property.

Justin Bowers thanked Kyle Arsenault, the Mayor and Village Council for the introduction and the opportunity to provide details on their proposal. Justin explained that their proposed commercial building is intended to serve six doctors who are beginning their practice and are currently seeking office space. Justin also explained that the proposed building location aligns with the Village's conceptual layout for the Forbes Property. Justin noted that he has completed numerous residential projects in the Village for the past 5 years and he believes he maintained a good working relationship with Village staff members and Council.

Justin Bowers stated he wished to address the concerns raised by several residents living in the general area of the proposed development, who expressed their beliefs that the proposed development would decrease their property values.

Justin explained that he is certain that property values would actually increase in the general area of the development. The development would create employment opportunities in the Village and attract more people to move to the Village. Justin believed that six doctors practicing in the Village would help not only young families, but the senior population as well. Justin expressed his concern that the senior population has been leaving the Village because there are no housing options available for downsizing. Justin hoped that by bringing these doctors to the community and creating future high-density housing options, seniors would be able to stay in the Village. Justin further explained that his goal would be to construct an aesthetically pleasing building for the Village to help service the community.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Justin Bowers for providing details on the proposed commercial development that he and Fred Collins are proposing.

**iv) 210 New Maryland Highway (PIDs 75061945, 75259945, 75422535, and 75259937) - Request to Re-Zone a Portion of the Subject Properties from Residential Zone Two (R-2) to Residential Zone Three (R-3):**

Kyle Arsenault invited the applicant, Tanner Phillips, to present the details on their proposed residential development concept for the Forbes Property.

Tanner Phillips thanked Kyle Arsenault, the Mayor and Village Council for the introduction and the opportunity to provide details on the proposal. He explained that he works for Tandax Inc. which is a subsidiary of Philson Ltd., a local heavy construction business. Tandax Inc. has completed several recent projects in the Village including a residential development in the Pineridge Subdivision.

Tanner Phillips explained that Tandax Inc. is fully aware of the challenges the Village of New Maryland faces in terms of enabling seniors to stay in the Village. He is aware of recent surveys that have strongly indicated that seniors housing is a major necessity in the Village and that is what Tandax Inc. would like to provide by partnering with Justin Bowers Homes Ltd. Phase 1 of their development proposes a 36-unit development with a mixture of higher density housing options. The design philosophy behind the development is for it to be 'senior friendly' with universal design features. This concept would allow seniors to move into these homes with a minimal amount of renovations which would allow the residents the ability to stay there for decades. Examples of universal design features include a no-step front entry, wider doors, accessible main bathroom, higher electrical outlets, height adjustable vanities and cabinets, good lighting, etc. Tanner noted that the intention would be to offer both purchase and rental options with year-round property maintenance packages.

Tanner Phillips noted that if the proposed development is approved, they would intend to begin construction in May of 2019, with the goal to have the dwelling units available as soon as possible. Tanner then asked Justin Bower to present some further details on the design of the proposed semi-detached and rowhouse dwellings.

Justin Bowers explained that he believes that the Village has a market for garden homes. He reiterated Tanner Phillips' explanation that the units would be available with several different ownership options such as rent-to-own, purchase, or rental. Snow and lawn care maintenance would be an optional service and price range and unit size would vary. Justin noted that for the most part, these homes would be single level units with two or three bedrooms.

A resident in attendance inquired where the access to the proposed development would be located. Justin Bowers confirmed that the access would be a new street connecting from Crown Avenue.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Tanner Phillips and Justin Bowers for providing details on their proposed residential development.

v) **6 Baker Brook Court (PID 75065078) - Request to Re-Zone the Subject Property from Residential Zone Two (R-2) to Residential Zone Three (R-3):**

Kyle invited the next applicant, Scott MacIntosh, to present further details on his proposed residential development concept for 6 Baker Brook Court.

Scott MacIntosh thanked the Mayor, Council, staff, and residents for attending the meeting. Scott explained that he and his wife own KBM Village Properties Ltd. and have developed a townhouse concept for 6 Baker Brook Court. Scott agreed that there is an immediate need for senior housing options in the Village. He explained that the Age-Friendly Committee Survey results have shown that the majority of the respondents are looking for different options for housing, and in fact, 80% of respondents indicated the preference for some type of multi-unit rental concept.

Scott MacIntosh explained that he and his wife have lived in New Maryland since 2001 and have been very involved with the community. Scott stated he wants to develop something cost effective and worry free with regard to outdoor maintenance of a rental property. The proposed residential units are intended to have two bedrooms, two bathrooms, appliances, air conditioning, one-level and attached garages.

Scott MacIntosh explained that he originally submitted a proposal for a 4-unit concept, but due to feedback from local residents and the Planning Advisory Committee, he revised his design to the proposed 3-unit design with a much smaller building footprint. The new concept only requires a single variance approval from the Planning Advisory Committee due to a driveway being proposed for each of the three units.

Scott MacIntosh concluded by stating that he is looking forward to proceeding with the project and is willing to hear any further feedback. He added that he hopes to develop similar projects in the Village in the near future.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Scott MacIntosh for providing details on his proposed residential development.

5. **Comments from the Public and Council:**

Kyle Arsenault explained that the final agenda item was the 'Comments from the Public and Council' and then opened the floor to residents in attendance to ask questions or provide statements on the proposals discussed.

Kyle reminded all in attendance that anyone who wishes to provide a verbal statement on the proposed amendments should approach the microphone, state their name, address, and comment for the record. After each comment, either Staff, Council, or the applicants would answer the question, if required.

**Natalie LeBlanc-Boswell - 118 Phillips Drive:** Ms. LeBlanc-Boswell expressed concern with the development at the Forbes Property and the effects on the nearby community garden. She expressed her feeling that the garden is very important to Village residents and stated she has been extensively using the garden for several years. Mrs. LeBlanc-Boswell explained that she is able to grow enough vegetables in the community garden to provide food to her family all year long. She questioned if there is a plan to move the garden. She noted that she already ordered her seeds and started her seedlings for the coming season and does not have the option of having a garden on her own property. In its current location, the community garden has full sun and a new fence was just installed last year.

**Kyle Arsenault:** Kyle explained that neither the current proposed residential or commercial phases of development would physically impact the community garden. Access to the garden would be restricted due to the construction in the area and there would be safety concerns if resident were permitted to access the community garden.

**David Wiezel – Gravenstein Street:** Mr. Wiezel began by noting that in addition to the current six members of Council at the meeting, there were also five members of the first Council of the Village of New Maryland in attendance. He said he wanted to make the point that the seniors housing issue has been a community concern for many years and has certainly become a priority at this time. He explained that looking back to the 1980s and early 1990s, the two priority issues in the Village were building a new school, since the school at that time was only for grades one and two, and the incorporation of the Village. Another issue in the early 1990s was the need for recreation for Village residents and a Youth Advisory Committee was formed for the task. Now, the Village has a Seniors' Advisory Committee, and some of the people on that Committee were on the Youth Advisory Committee in the 1990s.

Mr. Wiezel continued by noting that seniors at some point will be planning to downsize and eliminate their lawn care and snow removal responsibilities. The only option currently for them is to sell their homes and move into the City of Fredericton. Mr. Wiezel stated that seniors are involved with churches/volunteer groups and support local businesses and do not contribute to traffic in the early morning or evening unless it is necessary. It is the seniors in the Village who are the visible presence during the day. They may be out walking or doing yard work and, in a sense, they provide security since they are present in the Village throughout the day.

Mr. Wiezel noted that, two years ago, Council sponsored a meeting called “A Day for the Ages”. The main topic highlighted at the meeting was that seniors in the Village and surrounding areas are looking for housing options, so they do not have to leave their friends, neighbors, social groups, etc. He noted that we are getting to a stage where no one can afford to ignore this problem and Mr. Wiezel explained that he is glad to see the focus on providing those housing options at this time. He said he was absolutely thrilled as the first Mayor of this community to see this Council addressing our biggest pressing need. If the housing options are not here, people would leave and not be replaced. Mr. Wiezel went on to say that the Village should be proud of the status of being an “Age-Friendly Community”, however, the Village cannot be age-friendly without housing for seniors.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mr. Wiezel for his comments.

**Kent Ross – 191 New Maryland Highway:** Mr. Ross began by noting that he was attending this hearing with his father-in-law, Jim Horncastle, and his wife Michelle Horncastle. He noted that they live across the road from the subject property and own several properties directly across the street. Mr. Ross explained that he reviewed the letters of support and opposition for the by-law amendments and he had two main issues to discuss. One is the need for seniors housing such as town houses and residential development. While he had no issue with the residential development, he advised that he did have an issue with the proposed commercial development. Mr. Ross explained that he and his family are concerned that their property values will decrease. They are also concerned with the amount of traffic that will be generated by the commercial development. He explained that, in New Brunswick, most doctors have an average of 1800 patients, and with six doctors proposing to move into the commercial building, that could generate approximately 10,000 patients. That would translate into a great deal of traffic on streets that are already highly congested in the mornings, at noon, and at supper time hours.

Mr. Ross also brought up concerns regarding the disturbance that neighbors will have to endure from snow removal equipment at night, back up alarms, and amber strobe lights from the equipment. He also suggested that cars exiting the doctors’ offices onto the highway to head north will be crossing the highway where the traffic separates into two lanes with the turning lane for Castle Acres. This, he suggested, has potential for a traffic safety issue. Their concern is also with the viability of the business model. In the past businesses have had difficulty staying open with the City of Fredericton being so close. If the doctors do not stay in the building, it could be filled with a succession of smaller and smaller businesses moving in and out. Concern was also mentioned with regard to the additional units that won’t be occupied by the doctors and the type of businesses that would be permitted in the building.

Mr. Ross explained that they would have no opposition if the residential development was placed at the front of the property to buffer the commercial development that could be located further back on the property. In that sense, people would choose if they wanted to live in the residential units neighboring a commercial property. As it is now, he felt that the commercial property is being forced onto people who have lived there for years and who purchased their homes to live in a residential area.

In closing Mr. Ross said that he hopes the residential development is approved, but not the commercial development.



Kyle Arsenault thanked Mr. Ross for his comments.

**Mariet van Groenewoud – 65 Oakland Farm Lane:** Mrs. van Groenewoud explained that she is very interested in the community and has served on Council in the past. Due to that experience, she has seen the history and development within the Village, and she noted that development is never easy when it is discussed because there will always be concerns involved. But in the interest of the community, she stated that she supports this commercial and residential development. She explained that as a member of the Seniors Advisory Committee she is aware of how important it will be to have housing options for downsizing and to introduce doctors into the community.

Mrs. van Groenewoud continued by stating that she feels this development would be good for the community and that she hopes that all the concerns raised by residents can be addressed by Council, keeping in mind that people often think that things will be worse than they actually turn out to be. She hoped that there could be some compromise so the changes could be satisfactory to everyone.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mrs. Van Groenewoud for her comments.

**Jim Appleton – 96 Cortland Street:** Mr. Appleton explained that he and his family moved to the Village in 1987 when Cortland Street was a dirt road. He thanked the developers at the meeting for having the courage to come forward and put their own money into these projects and take that risk. Mr. Appleton stated that it is his belief that without developers coming into the community, the community would not grow.

Mr. Appleton noted that government does not develop the private sector industry, or commercial development and homes - that's the job of the private sector, such as developers. He stated that he hoped this group of developers would be given the opportunity to build the commercial and residential projects. He stated that bringing doctors to the community is not a 'tough sell'. They pay their bills and people need them. He explained that when Dr. Tom Barry left the community, it was a loss.

Mr. Appleton explained that his parents lived in the Castle Acres Subdivision for over 20 years, but in 1998 they were forced to leave the Village since they had no option for downsizing to a one-level home. They ended up moving to Nashwaaksis where they purchased a garden home with over 1300 square feet and a garage. They lived there for another 20 years. As a result, they no longer attended New Maryland United Church where they had been life long members and they no longer participated in community events or shopped at the local businesses, so their move was also a loss for the Village. Mr. Appleton also pointed out that further south of the Village in the communities of Fredericton Junction, Tracy, and Hoyt, they are experiencing the same demographic issues as the Village. They too would be looking for housing options in the future, so the market exists for this type of development.

Mr. Appleton concluded by thanking the developers and Council for the opportunity to share his thoughts.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mr. Appleton for his comments.

**Stephanie More – 43 Peterson Avenue:** Mrs. More explained that she has lived in the Village of New Maryland for five years and has been using the community garden since she moved here. She was concerned that neither Council nor the Developers advised residents of the development plans and the effects on the community garden. She believed there should be discussions for relocating the garden or providing an alternate access to the garden. Mrs. More suggested that although it would be nice to have doctors in the Village, she doubted they would be taking any patients from New Maryland.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mrs. More for her comments.

**Dean Wood – 32 Baker Brook Court:** Mr. Wood said he wanted to reiterate one of his concerns regarding safety of the proposed development at 6 Baker Brook Court. He explained that in the past week he has had two separate traffic incidents while turning off the highway onto Baker Brook Court, and in both cases, he was almost hit from behind by another vehicle. He felt that the corner does not have enough visibility for a large building to be constructed on such a small lot and that it would impact the ability to see around the corner.

Also, Mr. Wood believed that due to the lack of available storage space in the units, the garages would be used for storage and cars would end up being parked on the street. Site lines would be blocked and there would be potential for a serious traffic accident. Mr. Wood was also concerned that the development of a 3-unit townhouse would set a precedent for future development of the remaining empty building lots on Baker Brook Court. Mr. Wood concluded by advising that he opposes the re-zoning of this property.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mr. Appleton for his comments.

**Douglas McCarty – 47 Crown Avenue:** Mr. McCarty explained that when he moved to the subdivision in 1975 there was a water problem. He said they went from a well, to an above ground swimming pool for a reservoir, to what we have now. With all this proposed development he wondered if there was going to be another water problem.

**Kyle Arsenault:** Kyle explained that the Village currently has enough water capacity surplus for approximately 40 to 50 more residential units, therefore the current water supply is sufficient for all of the proposed developments.

**Ron Stewart – 9 Baker Brook Court:** Mr. Stewart expressed concern about the development at 6 Baker Brook Court setting a precedent and that he would like to ensure that Council realizes the importance to the property owners on the street. He said that he realizes the importance of providing new housing alternatives, and fully supports that. However, he believed that the lot for the proposed development on 6 Baker Brook is too small for a 3-unit rental property.

Mr. Stewart explained that if you look at the site plan you would see that the driveways are facing Baker Brook Court, therefore this should be the frontage of the property and not the New Maryland Highway side. He disagreed with the interpretation of the Zoning By-Law that the frontage of the lot is deemed to be on the New Maryland Highway. Because of this interpretation, what he believed to be the rear

yard is considered as the side yard, and therefore is allowed to be only 1.8 metres (6 feet). His concern is that the rear wall of the building being only 6 feet away from the property line, the neighbor who lives on the down hill side would have his privacy seriously affected by this development. He stated his belief that this lot has been empty for many years because it's not big enough to build even a single dwelling.

Also, Mr. Stewart noted that other concerns were outlined in his letters to the Mayor and Council.

Kyle Arsenault thanked Mr. Stewart for his comments.

Kyle Arsenault asked if there were any further comments and upon hearing none, he invited the Mayor to close the "Comments from the Public" segment of the hearing, provide the closing comments, and to motion for the adjournment of the Hearing.

## **6. Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

Mayor Wilson-Shee asked three times successively if there were any further comments in favour of the proposals. She then asked three times successively if there were any further comments in objection to the proposals. No further comments were made.

Mayor Judy Wilson-Shee concluded the Public Hearing by thanking the all of the applicants for attending.

She also thanked each of the residents for attending and explained that public input is inherent to the by-law amendment process to ensure residents have an opportunity to be informed, and to have a mechanism to express their input on land use approvals that are requested of Council.

Mayor Wilson-Shee also explained that the public notification and public consultation process mandated by the applicable provincial legislation was concluded with the adjournment of the Public Hearing. She advised that Council would further consider the Applicants' requests for enactment of the proposed by-law amendments and after thorough deliberation, a decision by way of vote at a future formal session of Council would determine the status of the amendments. She noted that Council may elect to enact the draft By-Law amendments as requested, enact an amended version of them, or refuse the application and terminate any further proceedings.

Mayor Wilson-Shee noted that if anyone had remaining questions about the by-law amendment process, they should contact either Kyle Arsenault, the Assistant Building Inspector/Development Officer or Rob Pero, the Village Building Inspector and Development Officer, at any time.

Mayor Wilson-Shee called for a motion to adjourn the Public Meeting and thanked everyone again for attending.

**MOVED BY** Councillor Tim Scammell and **seconded by** Deputy Mayor Alex Scholten to adjourn the meeting. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**Session adjourned at 7:45 pm.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk