



TOWN OF HINTON
Public Hearing on Bylaw 960-52
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 other public hearing (re CSR Disposal of 234 Baker Street) held just before this one began, Councillor Stuart Taylor had made the following statement and left the room:

"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."

Deputy Mayor Ryan Maguhn called the Public Hearing meeting to order. The time was 5:57 p.m.

INTRODUCTION & PROCEDURES

Deputy Mayor Ryan 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 Bylaw;
 - c) those opposing the Bylaw;
 - d) any other person deemed to be affected by the Bylaw.
 - 3) Council may ask questions of the speakers after each presentation for clarification purposes.
 - 4) There will be no debating the Bylaw; however, questions to the Councillors or other parties will be accepted through the Chair.


Initial

HEARING

1. Deputy Mayor Maguhn then declared the Public Hearing relating to the Land Use Bylaw Amendment 960-52 open.
2. Denise Parent, Secretary, advised that the purpose of the proposed Bylaw 960-52 is to amend the Land Use Bylaw as follows:

Lot 1CSR, Block 4, Plan 822 2515 - 234 Baker Street

FROM:

R-1C - Single Family Residential (Class C) District
R-3 - Medium Density Multiple Family Residential District
R-4 - High Density Multiple Family Residential District
PR - Parks and Recreation District

TO:

R-1C - Single Family Residential (Class C) District
R-2 - Low Density Multiple Family Residential District
R-4 - High Density Multiple Family Residential District
PR - Parks and Recreation District
As shown on the attached Schedule "A"

3. Denise Parent advised:
 - First reading was given to Bylaw 960-52 on March 18, 2014.
 - Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised in The Hinton Voice on March 27, 2014 and April 3, 2014.
 - The following written comments have been received to date:
 - a) Report from the Planner.
 - b) Comment from Brad Humphrey, Architect
4. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Are there any late written submissions relating to the Bylaw?
 - 1) An unsigned letter received by email from Jason Nodder was circulated to council, and is attached as Attachment #1 to these minutes;
 - 2) An unsigned letter received from Mr. Nigel Knight was circulated to council, and is attached as Attachment #2 to these minutes;
5. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Is there anyone who supports the Bylaw and wishes to speak?
 - 1) Ken Ames – here to support to rezoning as submitted; what this this does for our community is it enables developers to provide different types of affordable living; parking on R-1C removes Baker Street parking issues; other two areas have parking within those own areas; Plan still has green space and also have 300 acres of Mary Reimer Park green space accessible by paved


Initial

walkway; do we need more green space? This was on council's list of priorities when running for election; strongly encourage council to make intelligent decisions on what our community needs, not just what a few people want.

2) Bill Bulger – in trying to create integrated housing in our community opportunities doesn't always come and not easily; parking is the responsibility of resident, issues like that are a red flag; we do need more housing, looking at mine expansion and this is an opportunity in that infrastructure costs are minimized; opportunity to build reasonable, affordable and beautiful housing that people need; need to do it and do it right away.

6. The Deputy Mayor then asked: Is there anyone who opposes the Bylaw and wishes to speak?

1) Tammy Coon – wants to know how this alleviates the seniors housing problem? is very opposed to this; stacking too many people in one area.

2) Jason Nodder – read his previously submitted email out loud to council (which is attached as Attachment #1 to these minutes); seems very disconnected; take R2 and make it a park and leave it as a park; that would solve a lot of issues.

2) Tanya Nodder – still feels strongly about high density, multiple family district, would like seniors to be looked after; wants R2 to be PR district; PR where presently located is useless space, can't be used for anything else; understands sale will benefit the town and money can be used for other things for the community; just asking to reduce the density; can't support the bylaw; wants uniform builder to come in and make nice neighborhood; why does it have to be this space and wreck the parks; there is so much land around us that could be built out; we worked hard to purchase our home; it just rude; we would like to come to a compromise that considers what we have been saying for 2 years; keep the cost down, sell the land, leave us a park to use; doesn't like R4 - could you do R-2 where the R-4 is?

3) Rachelle Pawlowich – in disagreement with keeping R4; whole idea was to reduce the impact of the area;

4) Aaron Cherman – wants to oppose the zoning; issue isn't with parking on Baker Street; it is with the traffic; Maurer Drive is far better suited for traffic; get rid of this altogether and no more cost.

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

1) Janet Russell – we have been working on project long time and were asked to address several housing concerns; we feel this project mitigates a lot of concerns but only by small amount; concerns for housing is huge in Hinton; if mine comes forward then more pressure on community; there are more green spaces available in the immediate area if people don't want to use Mary Reimer. R4 addresses housing needs for single people; all traffic on R4 goes to Maurer Drive. In response to Ellen Hearsey's show of support earlier in the evening (during the public hearing on the CSR disposal of 234 Baker Street) Mrs. Russell asked for a show of support. A large contingency of 2/3 of the audience showed their support by standing.


Initial

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

Carol Lukasiewich, Development Officer, stated the proposed land use bylaw:

- is looking to rezone lands at 234 Baker Street;
- this makes R1C and PR zones larger thereby reduces overall density;
- Baker Street is R1C district which is same as across the street;
- R4 district maximum density would be 32 units;
- touches existing Mary Reimer Park
- redistricting lands increases affordable housing choices available;
- provides sustainability and long-term growth and makes best use of existing infrastructure
- meets objectives of several Hinton plans.
- is supportive of council's municipal strategic plan;
- opens up home ownership opportunities.

She further commented that this parcel is not a park – zoning was never a park; district was Community Services; reserve requirement for subdivision is 10% of subdivision for parks; right now it is 15.8%.

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

Mayor Rob Mackin enquired about the land to the east and was advised it is future urban development; in area structure plan it is conceived as residential; lands closer to East River Road could be more suitable for industrial development.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Deputy Mayor then declared the Public Hearing relating to Bylaw 960-52 closed and called for a motion to adjourn.

G. BARROW - That the Public Hearing be adjourned.

Carried

Time was 6:31 p.m.



Deputy Mayor



Director of Corporate Services


Initial

Attachment #1 to Public
Hearing Minutes of April 15,
2014 (Bylaw 960-52)

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

Attachment #2
to Public Hearing
Minutes of April 15, 2014.

Nigel Knight
123 Lodgepole Dr.
Hinton

April 15, 2014

Hinton Town Council

Re: Bylaw 960-52

Statement in favour of the bylaw:

I have not worked directly with Mr. Russell or Mr. Janke on the proposal for this site and have no direct personal interest in whether this bylaw passes. I am writing this as a citizen and a business owner. I have worked with both of the proponents in the past.

I would like to express my support for the bylaw for the following reasons.

- 1) This area was never designated as green space. It always was slated for development, and is adjacent to some of the best green spaces we have in our town.
- 2) The proposed density for the area achieves the need for some lower cost, higher density housing while still incorporating some good, basic, single family housing.
- 3) Both of the above are desperately needed in our town.
- 4) The higher density part of this area will not affect Baker Street in any way so that any changes in traffic patterns will be absolutely negligible.
- 5) From my experience sitting on Council there is always resistance to change in a neighbourhood. It is Council's job to listen to these concerns but to balance them with the priorities of the community as a whole.

I hope that Council can give priority to the need for balanced development and I encourage you to approve second and third readings of this bylaw.

Sincerely,

Nigel Knight

