



SAINT JOHN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday July 13th, 2011

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Brunswick Square Storefront

PRESENT: Anne McShane
Derrick Mitchell
Heather Quinn
Gerry Lowe
Barry Harbinson
Shawn Peterson
Sara Mudge
Peter McGuire
Patty Higgins

STAFF: Sarah Herring, Planner
Jody Kliffer, Planner
Stacey Forfar, Planner
Jill Flecknell, Recording Secretary

REGRETS: Jacqueline Hamilton, Deputy Commissioner
Mark Reade, Planner
Ali Ikram, Planner
David Drinnan
Ann Crozier
Mokhtaria Benhatchi
Andrew Miller

1.0 Welcome and Review of Regrets

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00pm and advised the Committee that Mokhtaria Benhatchi, Dave Drinnan, Andrew Miller and Ann Crozier had sent their regrets.

2.0 Approval of Agenda

It was **MOVED** by Barry Harbinson, **SECONDED** by Derrick Mitchell to approve the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED.

3.0 Adoption of Minutes

It was **MOVED** by Barry Harbinson, **SECONDED** by Heather Quinn to adopt the June 14th, 2011 minutes as presented.

CARRIED.

4.0 Review of “Litmus Test” letter previously submitted

Staff reviewed with the Citizen Advisory Committee the letters that had been received throughout the development of the Plan. The letters that had been received outline specific concerns from citizens, to which the CAC discussed how the new Municipal Plan would address these questions. Some of these issues included, unfinished development, location of industry, protection of environment, urban design, implementation of distances between specific land uses, subsidized parking for commuters and policy surrounding cemeteries.

CAC members discussed the implementation of site prep permits to deal with unfinished development being left in unsightly and dangerous conditions. Ken Forrest explained that the Provincial Community Planning Act would need to be amended to regulate things like site prep. He cautioned to let staff review which piece of legislation actually is relevant to the issues and let it be examined by Legal.

5.0 Review of June 15th Open House and Comments Received to Date

Committee members agreed that the June 15th Open House at Saint John High School was well received. Ken Forrest added that he was happy to report more written responses than expected had been received and he was impressed with the quantity and quality.

A summary of all written responses was circulated with the agenda package, which Sarah Herring reviewed with the CAC. Public feedback was received regarding urban chickens, community policing, wetlands, community gardens, utility corridors/high tension power lines and affordable housing.

6.0 Discussion of CAC Questions and Comments

Concerns were raised with regards to the mapping of Wetlands and Park & Natural Areas. Derrick Mitchell raised specific concerns with the designation of lands in the Westside Estates area. Jody Kliffer clarified that those lands had been changed on the map, now approximately half of that area has been changed from Park & Natural Area to Urban Reserve because they were not on the Provincial mapping as wetlands. Lands that are owned by the City or Province will remain Park & Natural Area. Jody also noted that a Plan Amendment would be necessary to change lands marked as Urban Reserve to Residential.

Public feedback was received with regards to the need for more affordable housing, crisis centers and the placement of these uses. Ken Forrest explained that although affordable housing is regulated and funded through the Province, things like the placement of uses such as group homes and crisis centers can be controlled through the Zoning By-Law.

The approval of 1st and 2nd reading on July 4th, 2011 by Common Council of the three proposed Loch Lomond subdivisions was discussed. Gerry Lowe explained that he understood that this type of infill outside of the opportunity areas was not in keeping with Plan SJ objectives, which he understood as taking from potential infill development in the Uptown area. Sarah Herring explained that infill development can be differ in its definition depending on if its urban or rural infill. She continued that urban infill might be one or two lots, where rural infill development could mean many lots. CAC members voiced concerns that their projections for the number of infill properties might be too low, to which Ken Forrest responded that more infill that projected would be a good thing. It was discussed that development would not be discouraged in the PDA and be only allowed in the opportunity areas that are outlined on the future land use map. These subdivisions might not have been part of an opportunity area but they did promote connectivity which is a part of the new Municipal Plan to create a neighborhood setting. Sara Mudge expressed that there will always be a demand for growth in the urban areas because there are different trends in lifestyles, not everyone wants to live in the rural areas. Ken explained that these issues are good tests of the Plan as it is not black and white. Anne McShane expressed her concerns that the New Municipal Plan must be able to back itself up with valid reasoning every time.

7.0 Discussion on Zoning By-law time lines and on-going role of CAC

Dave Drinnan was not present at the meeting but he sent along a memo to add to the agenda for discussion surrounding the on-going role of CAC and the time lines around the Zoning By-Law. He proposed to: Maintain the CAC in roughly its current form going forward to participate in periodic course corrections and refinements in the municipal plan; to seed other City boards and committees with CAC members to help disseminate and promote the PlanSJ vision and provide knowledge transfer as well as use the CAC or individual CAC members to engage on the neighbourhood plans; and/or translate the current CAC into a community consultative body to be used for ongoing engagement on those many issues and opportunities identified during the PlanSJ process that fell outside the scope of land-use planning and the resulting PlanSJ policy recommendations.

Ken Forrest explained that it would be up to Council to determine the future of the Citizen Advisory Committee; he encouraged CAC members to put forth their application to become involved with the Planning Advisory Committee to allow for cross-pollination and agreed that knowledge transfer into other City committees would be very beneficial as they advise on planning matters and their decisions can dictate if the Plan gets put into place.

The Community Planning Act allows for one year after the Municipal Plan adoption to complete the Zoning By-Law review. Ken Forrest added that most likely an additional year will be needed to complete the review and this can be approved by the Minister. He explained that while the Zoning By-Law review will be more technical than the Municipal Plan, there will still be a need for public engagement.

July 15th is the deadline for public feedback; by July 22nd staff will have reviewed the draft and made necessary corrections, additions etc and this will be circulated to USI, CAC and SC. Comments regarding the final draft should be sent no later than Wednesday, July 27th. The Plan will then be sent for translation the first week in August.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the CAC is scheduled for July 27th, 2011 at 6:00pm in the Plan SJ Storefront.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Jacqueline Hamilton,
Deputy Commissioner of Planning & Development