
ATTENDING

- Mayor Wendy Donovan
- Deputy Mayor Isabel Madeira-Voss
- Councillor Jodi MacKay
- Councillor Wendy Elliott
- Councillor Mike Butler
- Councillor Jennifer Ingham
- Councillor Ian Palmetter
- CAO, Erin Beaudin
- Recording Secretary Laura Morrison

ALSO ATTENDING

- Director of Planning & Economic Development, Devin Lake
- Director of Parks & Recreation, Kelton Thomason
- Communications & Special Projects Coordinator Barb Shaw
- IT Manager, David Hopkins
- Interested members of the public

Agenda Item

Discussion and Decisions

1. Meeting Opening

- The meeting was called to order by the mayor at 6:00pm.
- Mayor Donovan introduced members of Council and the process of the meeting.
- Semi judicial meeting different from regular Council meetings.
- No voting will take place tonight.
- Go to second reading to Council.
- Purpose is to hear from members of the public.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

a. Staff presentation – overview of proposal & process

- Director Lake introduced himself and Rob Le Blanc from Fathom and presented on the overview of the Final Document.
- Amendments to MPS and LUB to enable East End Secondary Plan.
- Building G. small change upwards of 60 metres between property line. Building G is highest density currently however, making assumptions to set an overall density for both sides of street.
- LUB does have buffering requirements which have been added into this.
- Additional connectors between the two sides of development.
- Underground power.
- Affordable Housing – PAC actively looking at.
- Next Step go to Town Council.

Agenda Item

Discussion and Decisions

b. Public Comment

- Jim Shatford 83 bishop Ave – objection to having six storey units. Surprise change as up until end of April all documentation had four storey buildings. New zone just introduced and put in place since April. Appears only one pocket in all the Town that will have six storey buildings. Why is this necessary? Moved here 13 years ago and there has long history of debate about building heights. 292 Main St, originally intended to be 6 storeys, various meetings - end result was 3 storeys with a set back fourth. In 2020 new zoning bylaw zoning feature for 3 could have 4 if an amenity was supplied to benefit the town. Now this seems to be a right of the developer to go to six storeys. Planning process documents should show the wishes of the people of Wolfville and general agreement is three stories is traditional according to the two surveys on Wolfville Blooms. Some saw benefit of 4-8 to preserve more open space – but majority wanted highest building at 3-4 stories. There were 51 total responses with 44 saying 4 storeys or less, only 7 people wanted higher. Second request only 4 choices were given, 5,6,7 and 8 stories. Only 10 responses received 5 of the 10 said 5. Public has said what they want.
- Ken Sponagle, 15 Olsen Drive, concern re existing infrastructure. Need better roads and more access points to get in and out of town safely. Tried to raise this concern previously but no response.
- Clare Almac, 83 Bishop Ave, raised concerns about a six-storey building. Suggested there is none anywhere else in Kings County and that Council should go to Dartmouth near Wright Ave and see how large that building is to give an idea of how it would look in the Town. Four storeys is enough.
- Liam Black, 11 Main St, would like a better understanding of the composition of units is it mixed units, 1,2 & 3 bedrooms – reasonable balance. What commitments made in terms of preservation of green space.
- Bertie 'Jake' MacDonald, 16 Maple Ave. Moved here 23 years ago, since then had very little peace or quiet on Maple Ave. Seems the street is part of every construction in Town. Tired of Maple being referred to as 'Dump Road' tired of speeding cars. Have phoned RCMP who park in the church lot but as soon as people turn off from Main into Maple, the foots down to the floor. Real safety concern lots of seniors walking and dog walkers. Concerned about listening to

Agenda Item

Discussion and Decisions

machinery at 6am when not supposed to start until 7am. Concern higher than 4 storeys is too much. We are trying to increase the population but we don't have space for them. Took 12 years of fighting to stop the flooding, had to put 2 ft of fill in, nothing the Town did worked.

- Ken Chadwick, 80 Carriageway Court. Infrastructure concerns, water pressure at top of street is abysmal, less than 13 psi, talked to Town about this several times, they measured it and said it was at 30 psi. This is a huge development, not sufficient pressure in developments we have now, haven't seen anything in the plans on upgrading this type of infrastructure. New development will be brought right up to the property lines of the existing developments with no buffer. Now we have a lovely hayfield, it looks on the plan that those village sites are really close to the property lines. Is there any consideration given to put in a walking pathway or trail between the existing developments and new ones?
- Caroline Whitby, Maple Ave, followed process closely, spoken out before. Believes process has been an important one and a lot of good work has gone on. Not going to please everyone, but feel as we get to this end point we suddenly seem to be in a rush. Push for a decision by the 20th. The last info that was put out publicly was only available a week ago, there have been lots of small changes, little details will make a difference to the success of these plans. They are good changes. Concerned about height and some adjustments have been made. Has anyone done the math since 2021 based on approvals provided within the town including west end yet to be built but which is a higher density. Need to be cautious about what we are building but do believe right process but need to work a little longer. Question in relation to the 42 acres talked about, understand C2 zone is part of this but is that part of 16 UPA density, is the Town compost site included in this, is the 16 UPA on Kenny Lands included in the approx.. 4 acres on Kenny Lands. Comment made 25th May Special COW that Maple Lands not looking to proceed – would like clarification around whether or how that is going to impact village square.
- Wayne Woodman 50 Sherwood Drive, Infrastructure – obvious we need more than Main Street as an access through town, bottleneck wherever you go anytime. Everything under ground been working on

Agenda Item

Discussion and Decisions

last few years - haven't seen them in the planning anywhere. Access from 101 – need more than two serving 6,000 need more for 12,000. Following demographics, it's become clearer that in actual fact populations are declining rather than increasing. Within 10 years can probably see population decreasing here as it is everywhere else.

- Megan MacIsaac 10a Maple Ave, is council open to receiving additional questions via email? Send additional questions to Director Lake.
- Nancy Hicks, 84 Bishop Ave. Lived here almost 23 years, seen population get more concentrated in seniors. Don't see in plans anything that would attract families and we need youth in the area. Where would children play? Don't see anything for seniors, what would they do? No place to meet and greet. Needs to be a real community centre not only outdoors.
- Andrea Lynn, 74 Sherwood Drive. Town doesn't have infrastructure for this rapid increase; sewers, streets, space to live, everyone will be crammed into tenement buildings. Watching same kind of development in West Hants, huge housing developments of thousands of people. Building height is a concern. Remember comments here years ago that to fight a fire of anything higher than 3 storeys is a problem. Last November we were told by the Premier the population of NS is going to double by 2040 – what does that mean? We are an aging population and therefore more liable to be decreasing in size regarding the demographic curve. Also, we are now part of DIANA (Defence Initiative Accelerator for North Atlantic). We have no choice of what's coming here. Council need to take a global look at what we are allowing here and in our communities.
- Jeremy Banks, 5 Locust Ave. Don't think the plan goes far enough, it is classist and ableist. It is fit for people who are rich who can afford parking, density, car. Housing is in such high demand that the height requirements are going to exacerbate already expensive housing in Wolfville. Student housing the cheapest accommodation in Wolfville has risen from \$500 to \$700 or \$800 dollars a room in last two years. Limit supply we will increase demand. This plan is ableist for people who can fit in cars, ride bicycles and walk. Not transit orientated – means I don't have to be able to drive, walk or ride a bike to get to grocery store because there is transit. This plan in relation to transit says it will happen at some point. Need to plan for it today. Wildfires

Agenda Item

Discussion and Decisions

are out of control. We are limiting this planet and impact climate. Not enough parking requires a parking lot larger than the mall in New Minas. You need 1400 parking spots for this plan. In a state of climate emergency and housing crisis, I don't understand people saying we don't have room in Wolfville, maybe if we made more zoning to allow for more housing in Wolfville we would.

c. Response/Clarification from Staff

- Too many queries to answer at this time but will bring points of clarification back to Council meeting on 20th June.

3. Adjournment of Meeting

- Meeting adjourned at 7pm