



TOWN OF HINTON
Public Hearing on Community Services Reserve
Disposal - 234 Baker Street
April 15, 2014

Present: Mayor Rob Mackin, Deputy Mayor Ryan Maguhn
Councillors Glen Barrow, Marcel Micheals, Matthew Young, Stuart Taylor

Absent: Councillor Dale Currie

Secretary: Lil Wallace, Executive Assistant

Also Present: Bernie Kreiner, Town Manager
Denise Parent, Director of Corporate Services
Rhonda West, Legislative & Administrative Services Coordinator

CALL TO ORDER

Prior the start of the two public hearings, Councillor Stuart Taylor made the following statement:

"The standard of care which a councillor must approach a zoning decision with public hearings is higher than with normal council decisions. Court rulings indicate that a councillor must listen to both sides of an issue. I have strongly held views which could potentially taint the proceedings. This means, for example, if the zoning for this project is voted down that proponents for the project could potentially have grounds for an appeal. I am required to leave and will return when you are finished."

Councillor Taylor then left the room and Deputy Mayor Ryan Maguhn called the Public Hearing meeting to order. The time was 5:14 p.m.

INTRODUCTION & PROCEDURES

Deputy Mayor Maguhn informed the hearing attendees as follows:

1. The following Public Hearing is held pursuant to the Municipal Government Act.
2. The following rules of conduct will be followed during this Public Hearing:
 - 1) Presentations should be brief and to the point.
 - 2) The order of presentation shall be:
 - a) entry of written submissions;
 - b) those supporting the Community Services Reserve disposal ;
 - c) those opposing the Community Services Reserve disposal ;
 - d) any other person deemed to be affected by the Community Services Reserve disposal .
 - 3) Council may ask questions of the speakers after each presentation for clarification purposes.
 - 4) There will be no debating the Community Services Reserve disposal; however, questions to the Councillors or other parties will be accepted through the Chair.


Initial

HEARING

1. The Deputy Mayor then declared the Public Hearing relating to the Community Services Reserve Disposal open.
2. Denise Parent, Secretary advised: The purpose of the proposed Community Services Reserve disposal is to remove the designation of reserve from the lands legally described as Part of Lot 1CSR, Block 4, Plan 822 2515 (234 Baker Street) with the intent to sell the said lands.
3. Denise Parent further advised notice of this Public Hearing was advertised in the Hinton Voice on March 27 and April 3, 2014. Written notice for this Public Hearing was mailed to a number of the landowners affected as shown on the current tax roll, by ordinary mail as required by the Municipal Government Act.

Notice of the Public Hearing was posted on the subject lands.

The following written comments have been received to date:

- a) Letter from Brad Humphrey
- b) Report from the Land Coordinator

4. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Are there any late written submissions relating to the Community Services Reserve disposal?

An unsigned letter received by email from Jason Nodder was circulated to council, and is attached as Attachment #1 to these minutes.

5. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Is there anyone who supports the Community Services Reserve disposal and wishes to speak?

Albert Ostashek stated he was there to speak in favour of the reserve disposal and about Baker Street in general. He said there was a severe shortage in quality, attainable entry-level housing in Hinton. Young families and seniors need this type of housing. He felt there have been too many delays in moving this project program forward and that the time has come for council to take strong leadership and move the project forward.

6. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Is there anyone who opposes the Community Services Reserve disposal and wishes to speak?

1) Jason Nodder stated he was confused about the process and what is trying to be achieved tonight. The Deputy Mayor advised him that the purpose of this public hearing is to hear input as to whether to remove reserve status on that land or keep it the same; if it doesn't go forward then remains as reserve; if taken off, then status can be moved forward through sale process; land had slightly different boundary last year; adjusting boundary from previous process; second public hearing is re designation of zoning within the section of land;

Mr. Nodder then indicated he lives on Baker Street and that he purchased his home 3 years ago next to green space and school zone; he received a letter in the mail stating changing zoning to other zoning; in 1 ½ years this process has gone round and round; feels all his neighbors are opposed to all plans that have circulated; last plan isn't much better; senses a decision needs to be made but objectives have not been met yet; thinks the town doesn't need housing for sake of housing; we keep having to give input over and over and it's frustrating.

2) Mary Marlow lives across street and not in favour; main reason is increase in traffic and less space for kids to play; not safe as kids will be in back bush area, playing on pipeline, animals sleep there and kids would be playing there; current zoning should be left as is; short of school space and will need more schools, that's a good place for a school.

3) Tanya Nodder – doesn't support removal of reserve; Baker Street can't handle any more traffic; doesn't agree with design of a cove and wants to have a school there; good compromise would be a route coming off Maurer; green space is useless as shown now; would like to see seniors housing at the back, done by one contractor, duplexes or bungalows, keep cost down in R2 zone; would like to be able to kick a ball without elk droppings; doesn't like the mud and wind that happens in Mary Reimer Park; supports removal of CSR into something that addresses community for seniors housing, not increase in traffic, not higher density.

4) Rachelle Pawlowich – is opposed to removing reserve; need to keep some green space there; need seniors housing, in favour of removing reserve but also in favour of keeping some allotted green space there, not all of it.

5) Ellen Hearsey - lives in the Baker Street area; the process is very confusing and people don't know what is going on; opposes the CSR disposal, reason is because in Nov. 2013, 30 people signed a paper opposed to development; 3 things asked at that time:

- 1) senior housing – haven't seen any on plans since that time
- 2) traffic on Baker Street – opposed, bottleneck on Boutin Drive now, don't want bottleneck on Baker; only 2 ways out;
- 3) green space – request for enough left adjacent to Baker.

She stated not one of the items has been addressed; they were asked to choose between a very bad proposal and bad proposal; objects the way this has happened and could have gone better; hopes for better in the future. She then asked who was in agreement and approximately 6 audience members stood in support with her.

7. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Is there anyone deemed to be affected by the Community Services Reserve disposal and wishes to speak?

When questioned about the word "affected" the Deputy Mayor advised: If not strong for or against but have an opinion you can give it now.


Initial

1) Ken Ames – citizen in this community for 50 years, seen lots changes; in support of the disposal; this has gone on way too long; has been sent back to the table numerous times and if talking affordable housing, this costs every time people are sent back to the table; who pays for that? has to end; supports disposal; there is some reserve left there on the plan and people already have 300+ acres in behind at Mary Reimer Park; for those who commented on the disrepair of Mary Reimer Park he suggested they get involved in fixing up the park; we need affordable housing for that area; school would generate a lot of traffic, we need affordable housing; we need to dispose of this to make it sellable to developers; this makes sense for the community as a whole; not best for a few individuals who are directly impacted but best for our community.

2) Kathy Rees – saw revised plans on Monday, April 7, 2014 and while different, is still a congested site; leaves uncertainty of final plan; no provision for seniors housing or disabled like in first plan unless a person deals with private developers; no political will in this town for seniors housing to be put in place thereby encouraging seniors to leave; less of drain on municipality if seniors can stay in their own homes; if seniors have extra money from sale of home, business community might like to keep seniors at home spending their money.

She also stated that while she had council's attention that the Town needs double the number of handicapped parking stalls and parking spaces for parents with strollers, and seniors. She would like to have Hinton family AND senior friendly.

3) Aaron Cherman – lives on Baker Street; letters went out to residents in the area; people saying yes to the project are people who will potentially benefit; everyone else said no.

8. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Are there any comments from Council's planning advisors (administration)?

Mindi Petkau, Land Coordinator advised:

- Since 2010 this parcel has been considered for housing; in 2012 formal process started and has been reviewed several times; new concept plan before us so doing procedure again; school boards advised they no longer needed site for school so given the need for housing in the community in September 2013 council removed CSR designation and rezoned lands to which it now is. This is an amendment again on that; current developers need designation removed so it can be legally sold; administration looks at it from a bigger picture as a community-wide development.
- Some advantages to using this land – rental stock will go up, modestly priced starter homes will be built; lot 2 potential to affordable housing project or developer; proceeds from any sale of this land has to be used for csr disposal services, including affordable housing; 2 local businesses given opportunity to expand in our community;
- disadvantages are loss of green space; little less dense than before; concept plan doesn't have affordable housing nor seniors housing included; will be increase in traffic, will have to look at different parking options; tried to put traffic onto Maurer drive; folks next door will be upset with construction.
- Administration continues to support and recommend removal of reserve.


Initial

9. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Do the Councillors have any further questions?

Councillor Glen Barrow asked why this land and wanted to clarify if the school had sent a letter indicating they no longer needed the land. Administration advised yes a letter had been received stating that and that they would not be building a school there. This opened up the land for other purposes.

Councillor Barrow also asked if it was possible to remove a portion of the designation only. Administration advised that yes council could remove any or part of it; done at subdivision stage; what is proposed is reflected on concept plan.

Councillor Matthew Young asked if this portion of the meeting was to discuss CSR disposal only and when does the zoning get discussed. Administration said yes, and the zoning would be discussed in the next public hearing, immediately after this one closes.

Councillor Marcel Michaels asked if there is a difference in doing removal of CSR for part of that land instead of entire parcel. Administration advised council can decide how much to remove; if don't remove any designation, then it will remain park.

Councillor Ryan Maguhn asked if CSR can be designated parks later on. Administration advised that CSR is a Land Titles designation, parks is a zoning designation. The CSR question is dealt with first as it limits authorized uses of land, which affects the zoning.

10. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Do the Councillors require further information? No.

ADJOURNMENT

The Deputy Mayor declared the Public Hearing relating to the Community Services Reserve disposal be closed and asked for a motion to adjourn.

R. MACKIN - That this public hearing be adjourned.

Time was 5:56 p.m.

Carried



Deputy Mayor



Director of Corporate Services


Initial

(#1)
Attachment to Public Hearing Minutes
of APRIL 15, 2014. (CSR)

Unfortunately, due to employment obligations I will not be available to attend the public hearing slated for April 15th. My lack of attendance at this proposed meeting does not lessen my concern as to its importance. I have been actively involved as a concerned citizen and tax payer in all stages of the 234 Baker street issue.

I believe the most recent version of the plan is a step in the right direction. However, there are still too many unanswered questions. My main concerns are what is to occur with Lot 2, and the lack of usable green space.

I believe that there is a solution that is a reasonable compromise for all parties involved. I propose that Lot 2 be set aside as a park and given a PR designation. This I believe is in the best interest of the neighborhood current and future.

Why this is a good idea.

- It allows for a reasonable amount of development onsite. Including, affordable rental and single family homes.
- It retains a reasonable and usable portion of the lot for recreation. This is not only a benefit to the current residents of the area, but to the future residents as well. The current portion of the lot intended to remain as reserve is little more than a drainage ditch and a right of way for a pipeline. It is equally unsuitable for building and recreation. For this reason, the zoning on this piece of land (Lot 20CSR) is inconsequential.
- It reduces, if not solves the potential parking issues on Baker Street.
- It restores the faith of current residents and tax payers in the decision making processes of the Town, administration and council alike. There has been an abundance of input from current residents that seems to have been pushed aside again and again. The creation of a PR designation on the lot is a reasonable compromise.

The alternative is to go ahead with an R2 zoning of Lot 2.

Why this is a poor idea.

- No usable portion of the lot is retained for recreation. Thus robbing the neighborhood both current and future, of a cherished and commonly used meeting and recreation area.
- It creates an undesirable density of homes for both current residents and future residents alike.
- The creation of a terrible parking issue on Baker Street that will be a problem at the onset of construction and worsen into the future as our town grows. Regardless of how parking is designated (north, south, or both sides) there will be major issues.
- If Lot 2 is zoned for development with no set plan the consequences are potentially disastrous.
- A decision of this nature will basically demonstrate to all the concerned citizens and taxpayers who took time and effort to give feedback and suggestions throughout this very long and often questionable process, you do not matter.

Hinton, we can do better than this. If the Lot 2 portion of this tentative plan is zoned as a park (PR designation) we all win.

I am not a developer, a town administrator, or a town councilor. I am not trained in the processes in which these decisions are made. I am only a concerned citizen and tax payer that hopes those entrusted to represent myself and fellow citizens make good choices. I believe zoning Lot 2 of the tentative plan as a park (PR) is one of those good choices.

Thank you,

Jason Nodder