



**Public Meeting of Council
Tuesday, May 07, 2013 at 7:00 PM
The Crowbush Room, Rodd Royalty Inn**

Mayor Clifford Lee presiding

Present: **Deputy Mayor Stu MacFadyen** **Councillor Rob Lantz**
 Councillor Jason Coady **Councillor Danny Redmond**
 Councillor Edward Rice **Councillor Mitchell Tweel**
 Councillor Terry Bernard **Councillor Melissa Hilton**
 Councillor David MacDonald **Councillor Cecil Villard**

Also: **Roy Main, CAO** **Donna Waddell, DCS**
 Hope Gunn, PDO **Laurel Palmer Thompson, PDO**
 Linda Thorne, AA

Councillor Lantz: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We still have a few minutes before we're going to get started but we're having staff bring down some additional chairs. I don't think we're going to be able to seat everyone but we're going to do our best. I know that not all of you are here for the same issue and I'm expecting that perhaps some of you will want to leave after your issue is dealt with; so hopefully that will provide seating for some of you that don't get one.

So we'll just take a couple more minutes before we get started. There's still people coming in. Thanks very much.

(Pause)

Mayor Lee: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll call this meeting to order. I do apologize for the lack of chairs but I can tell you the staff at the Hotel are in the process of coming down with more chairs. I want to welcome all of you here tonight. It is really great to see such a large, large crowd. It's certainly one of the largest crowds I think City Council has ever received.

(Applause from audience)

Unidentified audience member: Just say no.

(Applause from audience)

Unidentified audience member: We could all go home.

(Laughter from audience)

Unidentified audience member: Say no to what?

Mayor Lee: Oh, if life was that easy. I do want to - I want to be very clear, though. Tonight's meeting is really to allow city council to receive public input. There's been suggestions out there on the Internet, that I've seen in the last few hours, suggesting this is a done deal. Neither application is a done deal. City Council has never even discussed either application. And I can tell you this is an extremely important part of that process in processing these two applications for development. And what you people have to say does matter. And that's why City Council is here and obviously that's why you're here tonight.

Before we move into the first application, we have one minor resolution that we need to pass from Planning Board and then I'll turn the meeting over to Coun. Rob Lantz, who's Chair of the Planning and Development Committee. And before I forget, I should introduce the Members of Council. At my far left is Coun. Danny Redmond, Coun. Mitch Tweel, Coun. Terry Bernard, Deputy Mayor Stu MacFadyen, Coun. Cecil Villard, Coun. Eddie Rice, Coun. David MacDonald. And as I said, Coun. Lantz. To my right is Coun. Jason Coady and then Coun. Melissa Hilton.

Mrs. Waddell, the first resolution. Or, only resolution, I should say.

Mrs. Waddell: Thank you, Your Worship. Moved by Councillor Lantz and seconded by Councillor Coady that the request for reconsideration under section 4.28 and section 4.52(b)(f) of the City of Charlottetown Zoning and Development Bylaw for the building permit issued for a single family dwelling at 5 Ambrose Street, PID #351775 be rejected.

Mayor Lee: Questions called. All in favour? Contrary? Motion carried unanimously. Thank you.

Councillor Lantz, do you want to introduce us to our first application?

Councillor Lantz (Chair): Yes. Just a few words before we get started, Your Worship. Good evening, everyone and thank you very much for coming out tonight. Especially on such a beautiful night. And I heard someone shout that they'd like to get home and I appreciate the levity but we have a process to go through here. We hope to give as many people the opportunity to speak as possible. And of course we appreciate the time and effort that everyone takes to come to public meetings. As the Mayor says, this is one of our largest. It's certainly the largest I've been to in six years on Council. We obviously have very engaged and passionate members of the community tonight and that's a very good thing. I like to see that. As, you know, as a municipal councillor, we often don't get a lot of engagement and interest from residents. And so this is, this is a good thing to be up here and have the opportunity to hear from you all tonight.

And, frankly, we never know in advance, when we agree to go to a public meeting on any application, what type of response we'll get. We often think that something will be extremely

controversial and nobody shows up; and then sometimes the opposite is true. I think in this case once we decided to go to the public consultation phase, we learned quite quickly that we could expect a very large crowd here tonight. And we've heard from many of you on both of the rezoning proposals before us here tonight. We've got a pretty good idea of how many people feel. You'll, you'll have the opportunity, if you like, to get up and reiterate those comments that we've received by e-mail and phone and, and in person, if you, if you choose to.

So we do have two significant applications for rezoning. And, of course, any property owner has a right to make such an application and expect a fair hearing from Council and from the community. Before moving to a public meeting, all such applications are reviewed by Planning Board. And the Board includes ordinary residents of the city, representing all wards of the city, and some of them are here tonight. They take the time to, to attend the public meetings as well and I thank them for, for their service to the Board and for, for being here tonight as well.

So we're here tonight in accordance with the policies and procedures of our zoning and development bylaw; and particularly section 4.264. It says: Council shall conduct a public meeting to receive the views and opinions of the public and the Applicant. All decisions of Council are subject to appeal, as many as you would know, through the Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission. And the process, the deliberations, the debate of Council are very carefully scrutinized in any appeal process so we're also, always very careful in how we adhere to those, to those procedures. Do we follow the process? Have we considered good planning principles? Councillors must not prejudge any application before the process is complete, including this consultation phase. Gathering the views and opinions of the community is very important in this process and it's always a strong consideration when making a decision on anything like this. So it's important to reiterate: No decision has been made. This is not an after-the-fact consultation, which are not unheard of in Prince Edward Island.

(Laughter from audience members)

So we will move to the second agenda item.

Unidentified: Keep going, Rob.

Chair: - which is for 50 Kirkdale Drive, PID# 544270. A request to consider an amendment to Appendix A, Future land use map of the official plan from institutional to medium-density residential and an amendment to Appendix H, Zoning map of the Charlottetown zoning and development bylaw to rezone a portion of the property at 50 Kirkdale Road, PID 544270 from institutional zone to apartment residential R4 zone. All of the procedures as outlined in the zoning and development bylaw have been followed, 22 letters were sent out to property owners within a 100- metre radius of the subject property as per the bylaw. Six responses, including one petition with 148 signatures, have been received to date in opposition. Copies of the letters are attached. Notice of the proposed rezoning was advertised in *The Guardian* newspaper on April 27th and May 4th. Notice was posted on the property on April 22nd and 26th as per the bylaw.

So we will, we'll have a presentation by the developer detailing the application. When the presentation is finished, there will be an opportunity for everyone to provide comments and ask

questions. Council's role here is primarily to listen but we can answer questions around process, or other things that are not specific to the application. We must ask anyone wishing to speak to please proceed to one of the microphones here tonight and state your name for the record. The meeting is being recorded for a transcript and we need everyone to speak in an orderly fashion. It won't work if we're shouting across the room and, and so on and so forth. So thank you for your cooperation on that. And with that, I will invite Pastor Stephen Bray to come and present this application.

Pastor Bray: Thank you to all the Members of Council and thank you for everybody being here. And on behalf of Grace Baptist Church, to all of you that are here in regards to our application, let me first say thank you for being here and also my heartfelt apologies for any undue stress or confusion that this application process has caused. And any blame to bear, we apologize because that was not our intent at all.

To probably explain this as best as I can, I'll give you a little bit of history. Last month, Grace Baptist Church celebrated its 40th anniversary of the privilege of being a part of the City of Charlottetown and being able to minister here. And when they established a church up at Kirkdale, I believe the purchase from Jack Bell was about 10 acres of land; and a development was then put in place in which residential homes were done and things of that nature, and the church was built. And there was always a vision by the church, even back in the late 70s, into the early 80s, to have a church, to have a day school to reach all segments and age brackets of our society. And about 30 years ago, we were able to get a day school started and we've been able to successfully run that for the last three decades. And that's been a great blessing to us and, I believe, our community as well. And in the early 80s, there was almost, there was a plan in place to build and construct a nursing home. A third party had approached us and some things had been done with that. At that time, it was set aside. And we have been zoned institutional; and so that has certain restrictions to it. And we have prayed and talked together as a church, wanting to know how we can reach out into our community, be sensitive to the needs of our surrounding areas. As a member of the clergy, I am often invited with Members of Council, to a lot of social issues and meetings of social conscience issues in our city; and the recurring theme has been the need to address seniors. Whether that be nursing homes, community care, affordable housing or housing in general. And we got to talking and praying and discussing as a church how we could reach out into our community. We've enjoyed the opportunity to do that with our day school, from four years old up to, up to Grade 12. And yet we have an aging population. We get a lot of calls from seniors that ask for help and so we started looking at our property and how we could develop that and how we could integrate these things.

One of the things that stood out to me, as a pastor, was often the answers to affordable housing are approached from a couple of different ways. Either the private sector to private investors and - or, the idea, also, of what we call segregation or isolation. So if we build these units, usually they're built somewhere and they're totally dedicated to a certain social status or social class and its segregation. Well, of course, as a church we believe that we're all equal and we should all be able to integrate and do these things. And I remember I was at a meeting where the Mayor was at and he presented a paper from a national study and survey, what's affordable - and it really just pricked my heart - for seniors. And so we got talking again, as a church, and we looked at our zoning; and it said community care or a nursing home. And we really felt at that time that

we were looking around the community - we saw a number of nursing homes already established and they were expanding. But the idea of housing - and it's interesting that today - I know an article came out and said that the waiting list for seniors looking for housing has doubled in the last five years. And so we thought that we could build an apartment complex, as a church, if that would work; and we would be able to have a series of apartments. We also - we decided to go with the number 49. That odd number is because we wanted to have one that could be furnished; but I've had some dealings with Red Cross and been burdened that often when families are displaced, they're graciously put into hotels. But it's, it's often hard if you're a family of four, five or six to be in a hotel. And we thought it would be neat to have a, an apartment, potentially, that displaced families could turn to, and look to, and be a way for us to reach into our community. And so we wanted to explore the idea of building a seniors' apartment complex that was for seniors.

Understand, for us, we're very early in the process as a church. We just put a building committee in place that are totally answerable to the congregation. And the process was to go and find out what we could do, what would it look like, what would it cost? But in our discovery of that, before you even go and ask banks and stuff about financing, the first question they say is: Are you zoned that way?

So we went and met with the planning department in a very brief meeting and said: What does institutional zoning mean? And what does - does that qualify for us building an apartment complex? And we were told: No, it doesn't. You'd have to apply for rezoning. And then we were asked: Well, what does that mean? And so we were told and then we came back to the church leadership and to the church and we went through that process and said: Well, we can't even figure out if this is a viable option until we go down this process. So we went back and signed the application process.

Truthfully, we have as many questions as we have answers. Our desire is to build something of quality, to reach into our community with an integration idea so that people that are able to pay whatever the market rate is for apartments and so on and so forth would do so. But we would reserve a certain segment of those apartments for others who are not able to pay those things. And as a church, we could work with them and really see an integrated possibility. We also saw an integration possibility with our school. We have found that seniors love kids. And we've done many things - one of the biggest events at our school is Grandparents Day. And so we decided that if we could do this, we'd create opportunities to have seniors reading with children and all these types of different things. Please hear me - please hear me and understand: This is purely, for us, an investigative process. We would love the opportunity to do this. But even if this was approved, we'd still have to see if we can secure the finances; we'd still have to look at: Does it all make sense? Can our church bear all of the financial responsibilities? And then ultimately that proposal would be put before our congregation and then they would vote.

Again, as the members have said here, there really hasn't been any backroom deals. We've just been really wanting to be aware of the social conscience of our city and how can we help; and develop our property in a way that best reflects the city and its goals and objectives and morals. And so that's the road we've gone down to. This is really just a very, very early conceptual drawing with ideas, as we've been working with members.

We are - we are also aware of the idea of Ellen's Creek and I just want to tell you about our burden for that. I got a call, probably two years ago, in my office from, I believe, one of the provincial engineers asking for permission to come onto the property and - because they wanted to check things out with Ellen's Creek. And at that time, I didn't even know, or we didn't even know, were aware that we actually, our property line actually ends in the middle of Ellen's Creek. And they had said that they wanted to do some work with that. And we immediately started the process of seeing, how can we work - and I asked them, you know, what can we do, even in giving back that in a buffer zone; because we would love to see that walking trail down, extend all the way down to Capital Drive. And our thought process, with a seniors' apartment complex of independent living seniors, would be that we could create a building site so that the back end of it would look down on Ellen's Creek and we would create a very green space, a place that seniors could really enjoy. Whether it was benches and flower beds and so on and so forth, or even a gazebo. And something that would really just protect Ellen's Creek.

I have to admit, I don't have a lot of knowledge in regards to the construction phase. I know Jeff is here from Fitz and Snow that can ask that, answer those questions. But we do take seriously the conservation of that creek and how beautiful it is. That's something we want to do. In fact our kids in our school, just today, went around the property cleaning up the garbage and stuff, and pulled a number of items out of that marshy area there that happens throughout the winter.

So, really, that's the heart and the vision of the process and the project? We did try to look at traffic flow as best as we can. You know, adding up the numbers, the people that have approached us, based on rumours and stuff. I've gotten calls from different provinces as far away as British Columbia, of seniors that have asked if this is going to happen and can they have an apartment there and so on and so forth, and how many cars that, that would, would be there. But we thought that with that age demograph and their lifestyle, that it would be the least damaging to the overall traffic flow of our particular subdivision. You know, we even looked at the traffic patterns of having our school there. And about eight years ago, we had about 200 kids in our school; now we have about 140 kids. And the offsetting of these vehicles, and so on and so forth. So we tried to do our homework as best we can. I hope everybody understands even if this was approved, all it would mean is that we have something that we can now sit down with banks and at least find out if we qualify, what that would look like, what the expenses would be and then what, would that be feasible for us? Because this would be a project entirely funded and operated by Grace Baptist Church.

The way - I was really burdened because our Mayor, passionately, at that meeting that I was at on housing, talked about the need for help. And I really felt that it was right for, for some people who point the fingers at churches that we, we talk about love; we talk about morality; we talk about care - and often we expect the government to pay for everything. And I felt it was time for us as a church to step up and put our money where our mouth is, and if we were going to do this, for us to do it. And but we obviously have to be good stewards over these things. But unfortunately we can't even evaluate the entire process without knowing if we have permission to do it. So as best I can, I thank you for your indulgence. Again, I am deeply sorry if we caused our community or our neighbourhood any undue stress. It was never our intention. We didn't survey the immediate surrounding area of neighbours, not because we wanted to avoid you or anything, but because we quite honestly don't have the entire project all figured out yet. We're,

we're just trying to do it. We just know we have a burden to develop our property in a way that reflects, again, the values of what we want to be as a community. And one of the things I know I've been very proud of, of being a part of Charlottetown and this Island mentality of PEI, is we want to care for each other. And it's seen over and over and over again as things happen here. And so that's really what our heart is. Our vision is to care and minister as best we can and do it in a way that impacts our neighbourhood as little as possible and yet, hopefully, opens up the door for us to be a good reflection of who we are. So that is - that's everything that I can think to say.

Councillor Lantz (Chair): Okay.

(Applause from audience)

Thank you, Pastor Bray. And now we'll open the floor for any questions or comments. And again, just - we have to have everyone come to a microphone and state your name for the record if you'd liked to speak.

Ms. Wilkinson: I'll be the first. I'm Rose Wilkinson. And we live in a residential area. And we really do not want any type of apartment building built in our subdivision. Nothing. Seniors. Nothing. You can't say it's for seniors. How can you say that? If a 30-year-old comes to you and wants to rent that apartment, can you say: No, you can't get in there?

Pastor Bray: As, as - our understanding of it has been is that we are allowed to designate what, what it stands for, what it represents and that, yes, we can put a -

Ms. Wilkinson: Have you checked that out to make sure that in fact you can do that?

Pastor Bray: We have - when we've talked with provincial government level, as long as it's designated that, up front, it's clear that that's what it is.

Ms. Wilkinson: Well, we really hope that it will never be rezoned.

Pastor Bray: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Conrad: My name is Duncan Conrad. And I'm a resident of the Highland View Park subdivision, better known as Grace Baptist. Been living there for 26 years. As a matter of fact, first home in that subdivision. And then seven years ago, built a new home to retire in, based on the concept that it was a single family residential area.

Now, no one will debate the merits of, of your ideology in terms of looking after seniors. But I guess we also have to look at the greater good of the neighbourhood. And if you look at your schematic there, those of us who live in the subdivision know how treacherous it is to come out of that intersection where Kirkdale and Braemore meets now. We all know the history of that street and how busy it was and worked very hard to get it closed off over a number of years ago. Had the good fortune, in my earlier days, before the City became amalgamated, to sit on the Planning Board for West Royalty; and that property was a part of that, that proposal for the

official plan at that time, and we rejected any changes to it during those days for all of those reasons.

I know you've expressed consideration and concern for Ellen's Creek. The reality is that when we looked at the bigger changes that were going to happen farther down on the subdivision a number of years ago, we brought in residents who were engineers to look at what the impact would be on a major development like this. And it was not good news for that, that watershed area.

I guess the other thing that I'd want the Council to know, that's not directly related to your application but it's in the greater picture. If you look at our subdivision - and as I say, I've been there for 26 years - there's probably a number of others in this room that have been there a lot longer than I - we're still working on ditches throughout the subdivision. Sidewalks - the only reason we have a sidewalk is to accommodate the children going to your, your school. That's the only area that sidewalks exist in our subdivision. The playground that's, that's there is hidden in behind several, several houses.

There are just a whole lot of other things that we'd want, would want you to make and think that our subdivision is kind of a second class citizen. So to add to it, the additional complexity of 49 units, with as many as a couple of hundred cars a day coming out through that intersection into an already busy intersection on the Lower Malpeque Road - and that's increased tenfold over the last few years with the, the addition of the offices down there - will create a, a problem for all of us.

So I'd ask the Council, in their wisdom, to reject this application. Thank you.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Craswell: My name's Gary Craswell and I live in Highland View Park, which is what's on my deed but it's called Grace Baptist subdivision, that's alright. I guess my concern is I've lived in Grace Baptist subdivision for 33 years. My children went to the church, daycare, and everything else. And I may admire your, your thoughts on this; but again, I look at it, our subdivision as a whole, as a whole community. And I'm looking at, you know, we have three or four duplexes in the whole neighbourhood and I remember going to many council meetings before amalgamation and saying: No, we don't want to zone this a duplex. It's a family community. I look at the traffic flow on the Lower Malpeque Road; there's 175 cars. I counted them coming out of that green scab on the side of our landscape called APM building. And, like, there's 175 cars in that parking lot coming in and out of there every day. There's going to be additional cars coming out of this area. That corner, many times, has been rejected. I've sat in my living room window and seen many people go around that turn and not quite make it. It's amazing you weren't picking up cars in Ellen's Creek, with the kids. And I admire that. I saw them all, coming back today. It was great. But again, I just think there's many of us here. We really enjoy our neighbourhood. We enjoy it as a, as a community of, neighbourhood of single homes and families; and that's what I think what your base is too. And I'd just like - I remember

when my son Nicholas wrote a letter to the late Joe Ghiz, when he was in Grade 6 trying to get the road closed off; and we closed it off the Industrial Park. And again, I remember going through meetings when they were going to build a Skate Country: Don't worry. It'll just be for the kids to go to Skate Country. Once you zone it, fine. No problem. Skate Country then became a nightclub. Skate Country then became a car dealership, which was a lot better than a nightclub. It's the same as down at the high-, with the little school down at the corner. We changed it from institutional to 'APM-ville', or whatever. And all of a sudden, you know, we're going to have a strip mall. And all of a sudden now we have a high rise in there that's totally throwing off our landscape as - and the city plan says that. The city plan says that they were, look at our landscape, going to look at keeping our intrinsic values with it. But that's my say. Thank you.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Unidentified: Hello. I have been living in this neighbourhood for the last 32/33 years. I'm a senior. And your petition caused me great stress and anxiety. I heard that you tried twice before and you failed. Why are you trying it again? You said that what you want is good for the community. If you really cared for the community, you'd not have come up with -

Unidentified Audience Member: Hear, hear.

Unidentified: - this plan.

(Audience applauds)

You said that you care for the creek we have. Have you ever heard of this, the watershed group?

Pastor Bray: Umhum.

Unidentified: You did?

Pastor Bray: I've heard of - yes, I've heard of the -

Unidentified: Did you ever care to come there to the meeting, our meeting and find out what's going on?

Pastor Bray: No.

Unidentified: I don't think so, because you don't care. Okay? You were providing us with a very sentimental address, saying your love for the seniors, nothing else is causing you building this building. This is the third time you tried. And I'm absolutely sure it will fail again. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Hughes: Good evening, Clifford and Council, Pastor. Gene Hughes. My wife Electa and I moved into Kirkdale Road, on 61 Kirkdale Road, in January of 1985. We strongly oppose the development of the 49-unit apartment building and want the rezoning application denied. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Ms. Dickinson: My name is Rebecca Dickinson and I live in the Grace Baptist subdivision. I'm not quite sure I have decided either for or against, but I do have a concern about traffic flow. I know that there are seven or eight bus stops in the neighbourhood. My concern is that once that intersection at Kirkdale and Braemore becomes more hectic, I already realize that in the morning around bus time when the bus comes in, that Kirkdale is so close to the highway where the lights are, it gets bottle-necked so people are taking the other exit on **Oldmoore**. And my concern is that that will become even more busy. And the way the bus travels through that neighbourhood, I'm just, I'm concerned about the children because my children have to catch the bus on a very busy corner. I'm fortunate enough to be able to see the bus stop from our window; not everybody is that fortunate. And some of the corners are just very, very tricky; especially if there's a lot of young drivers in our neighbourhood. And I've been very concerned about where the bus stops are. So I'd just ask you to consider that. Considering that there are no sidewalks as well. So I think that there would have to be some considerations for safety of bussing and children that need to be - especially where traffic will be diverted through the subdivision to the other exit. Thank you.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. MacDonald: Hi. I'm Keith MacDonald. I live on 48 Kirkdale Road. Just - my backyard just faces on the church there. And Stephen, I know your motives are, are pure of the heart. And I know that anything that you've done, there's no evil, sort of evil plan behind it. And I just want to reassure everybody who lives there that this gentleman here - and I'm sure the congregation he represents, their motives are pure of heart. But Stephen I have to be honest. That building is just going to be ugly. Just -

(Audience applauds)

Almost as ugly -

(Audience applauds)

Almost as ugly as the APM Centre. And, you know, it just really is, it's blight. I'm not sure I understand why you would want to have something there when it, it takes away part of the playground that the children in your school enjoy so much. It really just is - I guess that's all I can say, it really would be ugly. And just if you could reconsider it in that, you know, sort of in that perspective and maybe think about your ministry to seniors and providing some kind of

community care. If you could - I don't know if there's any way you could move it off of the, the property that you have there. That might be a, might be a good idea.

Pastor Bray: Thank you, Keith.

(Audience applauds)

Ms. MacCormac: Your Worship, Members of Councils and Planning Board, I'm Cindy MacCormac and I live at 33 Westhill Drive. I've lived there for 15 years. My daughter has attended Grace Baptist. I strongly oppose the development to go in for multiple reasons. My biggest reason being is Ellen's Creek. There has been a watershed group on there for 12 years. The City, along with the Province, has sunk hundreds of thousands of dollars into restoring Ellen's Creek. There was an impermeable surface put in when the APM building went up; and there were huge issues when that went up. And the group on the watershed has been working hard to restore Ellen's Creek. I also know a big policy that the City does have is: We are a green city. We are an environmentally conscious city. We do have a parkland 'conservationist'. We do have a sustainability officer. And it's something the City does support, along with our seniors, too. There's also lots of land in that area, probably within 100 metres' distance, that there will be two more apartment buildings going up; across the street from Grace Baptist, beside the Holiday Inn, is zoned to be, that there could be a seniors' complex. There is another seniors' complex going in West Royalty. It's a four-unit complex going behind the mall. So we do, we are supporting our seniors and different housing in West Royalty.

(Audience applauds)

Councillor Lantz: Would anyone else like to speak to this application?

Mr. Wilkinson: My name's Charlie Wilkinson. I would like to reiterate the traffic problems and the - the intersection where the driveway to the apartment, proposed complex would intersect with Kirkdale Road, would be almost blind if you're coming down the hill. A totally unsafe intersection. Tremendous more traffic at the corner, both corners. Capital Drive and Lower Malpeque, Kirkdale and Lower Malpeque. And I'm also concerned what happens if the rezoning goes ahead, and you don't. Perhaps that property could be sold; and perhaps we'd be looking at bigger and better propositions. Thank you.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Cutcliffe: Wayne Cutcliffe. My wife Marion and I, we've lived in this subdivision for 30 years now. I guess we were one of the earlier ones there; and there was lots of green space and lots of open areas and that sort of thing when we were there. And people have mentioned various kinds of things. And I know - in Grace Baptist Church, I know our kids, when they were growing up, they really enjoyed that hill because it was a place for them to go, and sledding. And, and I think that it really was a place for kids to play. And we live in Lorida. Now, the bottom of Lorida, there was a nice, big park set aside there for, for children and that. And that

whole thing got changed because a developer wanted to put some houses in and the whole thing. And City Council sort of said: Okay, we'll change that whole park and we'll move it around and move it along there. And as people have said, it's harder - that park right now for the kids, because it's certainly been, been reduced. And the thing is, as many other people have said, I think the issue is not your motive. I mean, your motive is fine. And I think people in the room would support your motive and that, but really it's the impact it has. And I think when people go in there - there are zoning laws. And people go there with the assumption that those zoning laws are going to be respected. And I know 20 years ago, someone making a comment to me, a negative comment about City Council and simply saying that, you know, the zoning laws are not worth very much because if people want them changed, then they'll go and get them changed. And I hope that that type of thing has changed; because as people said, you know, the dynamics - if you put that biggest space in there - and seniors might be there but there's going to be people coming in and visiting them. They're going to be active; they're going to have cars. There's going to be a lot of traffic. And there's been a number of issues in that subdivision with traffic flow and that over the years. And I think, you know, people are very concerned about the fact that let's keep it the way the thing was zoned and hopefully you can find another way to achieve your own objectives.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Mogan: My name is Darragh Mogan and I chair the Ellen's Creek Watershed Group. And we've been involved for about five or six years now in trying to preserve and protect that small little creek. Let me tell you what it looked like at the culvert at **Old Moore** five years ago. That's just an area of where there's a north entrance into the, into the subdivision. The culvert was there and it was rock bottom. Now, three and a half feet of silt. The banks just caved in this spring and it's blocking the creek completely, despite the efforts of people to unblock it three or four years ago. Our experience with the APM Centre, whatever might be said, everybody had the best of intention. It was a bloody disaster. The whole forest area was removed completely. The slope of the parking lot puts the silt, the salt and the tar right in the creek every spring. There are no fish in that creek anymore. And all it is is reeds growing up on whatever it can, on silt. Our concern - despite the fact that we respect the motives of the church, and we do, and I've been a neighbour of the church for quite a while. We respect it. The effect, no matter what engineers do, of a building like that, on the slope into the creek, will add to the east branch, or, the west branch of the creek what APM did on the, on the east branch. It will be a disaster. I've written to Mayor Lee, on behalf of the Ellen's Creek Watershed Group, to outline our grave concerns - not with the motivation but with the actual practicalities of it. Thank you.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Smith: My name is Kevin Smith and I've been living, there, in the same subdivision for quite a number of years. And my statement is towards the residents right now, that if we let this go ahead and they rezone this, and they'll put in one apartment building, there's no reason why,

in five years' time, they don't turn around and put in a second one. I'll tell you one other thing. This may be a benevolent gesture on their part but it's not entirely benevolent. They're doing this for profit. Let's call it like it is. They're not doing it for nothing. They're not giving the apartments away; somebody is picking up a rent cheque somewhere every month, the first of every month. I can tell you right now that our apartment, our homes right now will not see a financial gain if this goes in. We'll see a financial loss because if anybody is going to buy a home in our subdivision, they'll see the apartment building, or buildings, that will start dominating the landscape. Are we ready or are they ready - are you, sir, going to tell me that if my home is evaluated today at a certain dollar and when you put up your apartment building, or plural, in so many years from now and my home is devalued for a certain amount, you're going to reimburse me the difference of that amount? I don't think so. Are you going to do it for the rest of the neighbours that I have right now for the past 10 or 12 years? I don't think so. So let's call it what it is. Benevolent or not, it isn't. It's financial gain for the church, for what you're trying to accomplish. It's financial losses for us. That's my statement.

(Audience applauds)

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

Councillor Lantz: Okay. We could probably be here all night if everyone wanted to speak, but I got a pretty good sense of how people feel about this application by their applause for the speakers. But if there's anybody with a burning desire to get something off their chest here tonight, then let's, proceed to the mic and we'll, we'll try to wrap up this portion of the public meeting. Going once; Got a taker.

Unidentified: One more. It's a great gesture. And as hearing the word tonight about having that project down at the bottom of the hill, who says it has to be there? We have a lot of space up there. What's wrong with the other side of the hill up toward the main road? Away from the creek, on the other side, facing the highway, there's another building up there, isn't there? Not too far from the church. And that stands pretty high and no one says anything about that. So why not have something up there, level with that, away from the creek and still covering both ends? Just a suggestion.

Pastor Bray: Thank you.

Unidentified audience member: Very good.

Ms. Breining: My name is Ilona Breining and I'm a real estate agent. And as you, planning department, can see how many people care. They care. So we are here because I don't understand myself either than the planning department once they say, this is residential. So why they trying to change? I will be old one day for sure but there is - I live on Upton Road and I'm here 17 years so I can speak, I guess. But there is Upton Road. So still cannot get it. There is a new industrial park. Why they don't put there, put it there on the, on the waterside, apartment buildings or, or senior citizen buildings. Why they bother that Braemore area and, and they want to change again like commercial? So I still stand up for my Braemore people and, and Kirkdale and, and Upton Road. And I don't want to change anything. This is just so, make me nervous

because once you say it's residential, why you want to change it? And we in Charlottetown, we have so many things what we have to do and, and correct and for children's safety as, as just, lots of people said, for traffic reason. So why don't you start there? And why don't you try to push those people - look at that. It's not just 30 or 40 or 50 people; 300 or 400 or 500 people. I don't know. I didn't count. But I against with the whole changing for sure. And if you will hate me, you will hate me. I don't care. But I against -

(Audience applauds)

I don't want to - I want to stay residential.

(Audience applauds)

So last, last sentence. Sometimes I feel that the planning department running without head for sure. They have no clue. No clue.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klassen: Hello. I'm Erik Klassen from Upton Park. And what I have to say applies to both subdivisions. This is a process. This is step 1. And there's going to be a vote of what we present here today for both subdivisions. If the vote goes positive on our behalf, then there's appeal process. And you heard the ugly word, IRAC. Now, IRAC can overrule anything or anyone. However, that's phase 2, if that happens. Now, the vote could go against us and Council could vote in favour of the builders. We don't know. But my caution to everybody here - you're here; this is a good time to remember. If we go to, have to go to IRAC and they overrule the ruling of Council here, we better be thinking of class action lawsuit because that's the only recourse you'll have after. So now that we're all here, be aware of that. This is not the end. Okay? It applies to both subdivisions. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Councillor Lantz: Anyone else? Once. Twice. Oh, here we go. I'll ask anyone else who intends to speak tonight to come and line up at the microphone now and then we'll - after we get through that line, we'll try to wrap up this portion and move to our third item.

Mr. Bradley: Does this come up? Hello.

Unidentified audience member: Hello.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Mayor, Council Members. I heard Steve?

Pastor Bray: Yeah.

Mr. Bradley: Okay.

Councillor Lantz: Could I ask you to state your name as well, please?

Mr. Bradley: Certainly. Brian Bradley. I live on Porter Drive –

Councillor Lantz: Thanks.

Mr. Bradley: - in Parkwest. I recently bought a house in the area. I've been there about two years, just about. We moved in when my little guy turned one, I guess. And we love the area. We love the surrounding area. And we bought a place where we thought would be a great place to raise a family. And I think you can just look around the room tonight. I heard the word integrity, integration come up a few times; and I think we have already, a pretty good integrated community already. I mean, we have people here, out tonight to show support for the community we all believe in and we are invested in. I mean, if you look around, you have people of all ages, different types of families, different backgrounds, different languages. And I think we're all here tonight because we're pretty passionate about this issue. We feel very strongly against the rezoning. I heard a few people talk about putting it somewhere else. Maybe moving the building on the other side so it's a little hid. But you know what? It's not going to solve any of the problems. We're talking about integration. Only thing I see it integrating is the traffic in front of my house where my little guy plays. I mean, we don't have the biggest lots in there. We love it. But it kind of pushes us and squeezes us a little bit. Just like the infrastructure. I kind of laughed last night because there is a traffic issue in the neighbourhood. There's a speed issue already in Parkwest. And there is a lovely little sign that kind of reminded people of the speed that they were driving at. Now, the kids were out having a great time. They were all running to see who could go the fastest. One boy got 28 kilometres an hour. They were having a great time. And that's what I love about my community. Everyone can go outside. Everyone can play together. We integrate well as it is. However, I am deeply concerned if we run a road right to the Lower Malpeque Road, what will that mean for our families? What will that mean for the kids who go out to play and chase outside? I'm not interested, for the record, in rezoning. Not at all. Because I believe in what we have already. And what we have is great. And we're all invested in that greatness. I'd like a show of hands on everyone's behalf of how great we love our neighbourhood and how much we care about it and how against we are rezoning.

(Audience applauds)

Now, just to paraphrase someone who said a comment earlier. City Council, in your wisdom, I ask you to not approve this rezoning. And you talked about - and we started off - we're a great community. We have a lot of fun. Right? We're all laughing. We're a lovely group. Starting off, Haha. This is great. But when it comes down to it, we really believe in our community and it's the reason why we're here tonight. Please, I think you know how to vote.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Hillier: Good evening. My name is Keith Hillier and I live in the Parkwest subdivision so I'm really here for the, the next application but I think you just want to get through all the speakers. I'm no expert in traffic –

Councillor Lantz: In fact, actually, we'd like people to wait until the –

Mr. Hillier: Okay.

Councillor Lantz: - the next application's been presented before we get to the, the questions and comments on that application. I think Brian's comments were probably mostly directed at the Windsor Park application, considering he lives next door in Parkwest. So if that's what you're addressing –

Mr. Hillier: No. That's fine. I don't mind - I thought you had said that you wanted to get through all the speakers. But it's just - okay.

Councillor Lantz: Just for Kirkdale Drive application. We'll wrap that one up if, if everyone who intends to speak has had a chance. And then we'll, we'll go through the same process for, for the Windsor Park application. So this is last call for speakers on the, the Kirkdale Drive application. Going once, twice. Sold. Okay. Thanks very much, folks. Appreciate everyone coming out to, -

(Audience applauds)

- to have your say. I expect some of you won't want to stick around on such a lovely night, with hockey games on TV too, if you don't have an interest in the Windsor Park. And that would certainly help to loosen up some seats for those who are standing. Again, thanks very much. I'll give everyone a few minutes to shift around and then we'll get to the next item.

Meeting paused briefly

PART 2

Meeting reconvened (8:00 p.m.)

Councillor Lantz: Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we're ready to move to our final item. The process will be similar to, well it will be exactly the same, in fact, as the last item. We'll have a short presentation from the representatives of the Developer and then we'll open the floor again for questions, comments, concerns. I'm not going to go through my whole preamble that I did at the beginning of the meeting. But I assume most people were here for the first item as well and heard most of that. The description of the application itself is quite lengthy, so I'm going to jump into that before we have a presentation by Phil Wood, here.

Windsor Park Subdivision, PID 664136 and 1016294, and those parcels approved in Phase I of the subdivision. A request to consider an amendment to Appendix A, Future Land Use Map of the Official Plan from Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential and Commercial; and for an amendment to Appendix H, Zoning Map of the Charlottetown Development and Zoning Bylaw to rezone properties located within the Windsor Park Subdivision, located between Royalty Road and Sleepy Hollow Road, PID 664136 and 101629, from Low Density Residential Single R2S zone to a mixed-use neighborhood concept plan, which includes single detached residential, R-1L Zone, Low Density Residential, R-2 zone; Medium Density

Residential R-3 Zone, and either Apartment Residential R-4 Zone with Business Office Commercial C-1 zone or Mixed Use Corridor, MUC.

The Applicant also has requested an amendment to Appendix H zoning map to rezone the parcels approved in Phase 1 of the subdivision from Low Density Residential Single R2-S to Single Detached Residential R1-L. Only those properties currently owned by the Applicant will be considered for the rezoning unless we receive further requests or letters of support by the other property owners in this area.

All the procedures as outlined in the Charlottetown Zoning and Development Bylaw have been followed. One hundred and fifty letters were sent out to property owners within a 100-metre radius of the subject property as per the bylaw. Thirty-eight responses have been received to date in opposition. Copies of the letters are attached. Notice of the proposed rezoning was advertised in *The Guardian* newspaper on April 27th and May 4, 2013. Notice was posted on the property on April 22, 2013, as per the bylaw. Now, I did say 38 responses were received. I have attempted to forward all the emails I have received to Planning Department, where they need to be recorded. I have received multiple emails from some of you and tried to forward them all but we'll certainly make sure that everyone's questions or comments that were received by email were forwarded to the Planning Department, that 38 number may not be the final tally by the time those are all forwarded to Planning. But if you are submitting email comments, the address to use is planning@charlottetown.ca and feel free to copy any of your councillors.

So with that, we have Phil Wood, consultant for the Applicant, property owner, who will run us through the proposal.

Mr. Wood: Thank you, Rob. I am here tonight on behalf of the Developers. My name is Philip Wood, I'm a consulting urban planner based in Charlottetown. I have a cold tonight so I'll apologize for sniffing through this but hopefully I won't lose my voice. The developers are with us here tonight, Duncan Shaw and Darren MacKay, over in the corner. I'm also joined by Derek French. Derek French is an engineer, an urban planner and a surveyor and he very ably has helped us with some of the technical aspects of this design. And he'll be helping me with the Power Point presentation tonight. We're also joined by Jonathan Lewis of EXP. Jonathan is a traffic engineer from EXP in Fredericton, New Brunswick.

Unidentified audience member: (Unclear) here.

Mr. Wood: Yes, there's quite a few of us. The City very early on identified, obviously, this is a fairly large-scale development, even in terms of the existing approved subdivision, but certainly in terms of the proposed changes. Traffic was identified as a potential concern early on. The City actually developed terms of reference themselves for the traffic consulting study that would be funded by the Developer. And Jonathan is here tonight to speak to that. I'm going to go through my Power Point presentation and I apologize if it's a little lengthy but it is a complicated application. And then Jonathan will stand up and he's promised to be as brief as he can to explain the format and the approach and the findings of the transportation study, because I know traffic is certainly an issue to everybody. So the first thing I want to do is look at the site.

Unidentified: Excuse me; we can't see that, this room cannot (unclear).

Mr. Wood: Yes, I'd absolutely agree with you.

Unidentified: Well, how can we correct that? Can you turn that or -

(Several unidentified audience members speak)

Unidentified: Because we're blind over here.

Unidentified: Yes.

Mr. Wood: I understand completely. We certainly identified that earlier on when we came into the room.

Unidentified: Can you move it?

Mr. Wood: I physically can't move it but -

Unidentified: So much for the planning (unclear).

(Audience applauds)

Unidentified: You can't proceed with this until we can have a look at it.

Unidentified: We'll try.

Unidentified (Phil Wood??) 8:09:36: I don't know if this is going to restrict the view on this side of the room but - okay, come on over. Can you see now? Is that getting any better?

Unidentified: No, we can't -

Unidentified: What's it like over there, can you see it?

Unidentified Audience Member: Mayor and Councillors, thank you for accommodating everybody in the room. (Unclear)

Applause

Mr. Wood: How are we doing? Is that any better? It's certainly better for the folks over here. The Members of Council now probably can't see the screen but - are you okay?

Unidentified: Yes, we're good.

Mr. Wood: Okay. Okay, we can flip to the first -

Chair: (8:11:06) I'll just jump in for a second and let everyone know that a report by Phil Wood on this application is available on the website. If you can't see maps or different, various things here tonight, he has made available a document that's on the City website and many of you have received it by email and I'm sure it's been passed around but if you're unable to see this well, then perhaps that document will help out.

Unidentified Audience Member: Quick question, the map that's used in the letter received is different from the map that's (unclear).

Mr. Wood: I think you're going to see a number of maps here in -

Unidentified Female: No, there's one in particular that is different, different roads, different -

?? CITY REP?? : 8:11:49 I'll ask Mr. Wood to address that. There's also a few available seats down in this end of the room if everyone, anyone wants to move down here. Take it away, Phil.

Unidentified audience member: (unclear) we got in our letters?

Mr. Wood: I'm not sure what went out in your letter so it's hard for me to say but as we go through the presentation the map that we have in the presentation is the final map. It's the proper map. When you get to that perhaps you could let me know if there's a problem -

Unidentified audience member: It is different -

Mr. Wood: It is different? Okay. Because I had a feeling that when the letter went out, we had had ongoing meetings with Recreation and with Planning Committee, with the Planning staff and there have been changes ongoing in response to the various consultation meetings we had with City officials.

Unidentified: (unclear) show all the (unclear) document?

Mr. Wood: So this is the letter that came out from the City.

Unidentified: The City (unclear) the original (unclear).

Mr. Wood: Okay.

(Several unclear comments from audience)

Mr. Wood: Yes, Hope is clarifying for me. I know there were, I'm a little confused because there were a couple of letters went out. I know in terms of the first phase of Windsor Park, the developer I believe sent a letter out and the City always will send a letter out to everybody within a certain radius in terms of rezoning application. That letter that went from the City was the first map that was drawn. And there have been some changes and I can point them out in terms of the plan. But the overall concept is similar in terms of densities, things like that, but there certainly were some changes in parks and some of the details and that was directly in response to our meetings with Sue Fraser of the Park staff.

So this is, I think I can see it okay, this is the parcel of land we're talking about. Obviously there is a boundary around it. This is nice because you can actually pick up the first phase of Windsor Park which originally was Royalty Heights. We have, if you look at the surrounding land use, I think there were people that mentioned Upton Park. This is Parricus Mead, **(8:13:55)** an interesting name for a subdivision. And, of course, one of the closest neighbors, the Park West subdivision here. And if we look at - one of the biggest issues in terms of the site is the potential for through traffic. I think I noticed Bush Dumville here earlier. Bush, are you here?

Bush Dumville: Right here.

Mr. Wood: There he is. Bush had, as the MLA for the area, had talked about some of the issues with Transportation. The bottlenecks on the Malpeque Road and I think he had had discussions a number of years ago, just as a concept, about the possibility of Upton Road actually

running north and connecting up to Route 2 at some point, to provide another route north. Fair, Bush?

Mr. Dumville: That's correct.

Mr. Wood: Yes. And he was spot on. The reality is, if you consider the traffic along the Sleepy Hollow Road here and the traffic coming down the Lower Malpeque Road, even without development on the site, once the connection is made across this site, there's the very real prospect that there's going to be through traffic moving through this subdivision and our traffic consultant can certainly speak to that. The issue is we have a number of destinations on the Upton Road and if you think about the West Royalty Industrial Park down here, the new Biocommons Park, the Trans Canada Highway itself, and of course the Charlottetown Bypass Highway. And right now, everybody in the neighbourhood will know that as you're coming down the Lower Malpeque Road there is no connection onto the bypass. You have to find your way over to the Malpeque Road. So the potential, once there is a road connecting through here, for people to want to bypass through this subdivision to get down as an easy access onto the Bypass, to come down to the Industrial Park, to the Biocommons, to the Trans Canada Highway to head to the Bridge, is fairly significant. So it was one of the things we had to look at in terms of design. There will be some potential for through traffic, let alone the amount of traffic that's generated on a site that's 146 acres. So the other factor in here, of course, here's the school, this I think is the nursery. We'll get into some details when I get through the various, for the next few pages. If we can go to the next screen? The next few pages I'm going to go through rather quickly and just summarize what I just talked about. See, it's 146 acres, you can see exactly where it is. One of the features that's quite prominent on the site, and I'll get into it later on, is this Maritime Electric power easement. And it runs from pretty much the southeastern corner, all the way up to the northwestern corner of the site. It's 18 metres wide and it will have an impact in terms of future development and also offer some opportunity for green space. Next slide? What's that?

(Unclear comments from audience)

Unidentified: (unclear) the power line.

Mr. Wood: Yes, yes, well you can't get walkways on power lines with Maritime Electric but we'll get into that later. It is green area and offers green space around the houses.

(Various unclear comments from audience)

Unidentified: Give us a break. Don't show us anymore. (Unclear) us that.

Mr. Wood: This is an indication of the preliminary approval, it was in - in 2007 for the 539 lots and I will show that design in a few minutes. And there's a reference to the existing zoning which is R-2S and again we'll get into that in detail in one of the later slides. This just references the fact, of course, that it formerly was the Royalty Heights Subdivision, was purchased by Sherwood BMR and sister companies, holding companies that are associated with Sherwood BMR, and has now been renamed as Windsor Park. This just really talks about the previous land use, that it was farming, and the issue is, to the north of this site and along Boisoners Creek, along the west, of course that is the boundary of the municipality and it's the boundary, our shared boundary with the community of Miltonvale Park. This refers to, of

course, some of the surrounding subdivisions that I've talked about, Parricus Mead, the West Royalty Soccer Complex, the bio commons, some of the land uses that are around the general area. Next one? And this just talks to the general lack of any retail or other services in this quadrant of West Royalty. If we look at, you know, are there any shops, are there any services available, the answer obviously is, not in this general area. The closest cluster would be at the bottom of the Upton Road and the Trans Canada Highway, we have that little convenience store and a restaurant. Most people in this neighbourhood and in the future neighbourhood will have to drive all the way to the West Royalty stores, unless there's some -

(comments from audience)

Unidentified Audience Member: Oh, oh, (unclear) oh yeah, that's a good selling point, yes, yes. (Unclear) yeah, sure.

Mr. Wood: Next slide.

Unidentified: And we talk about obesity.

Unidentified: We're not stupid.

Unidentified: Wow.

Unidentified: That's right, wow. Our homes. We've been here for 26 years and you're trying to take it away from us. We won't tolerate this shit.

(Applause)

Mr. Wood: Okay, the first thing we did when -

Mr. Lee: Phil, I'm going to jump in for a second. Folks, can we just let the representative of the developer finish his presentation?

Unidentified: He's goading us with his comments.

Unidentified: Sorry?

Unidentified: Why doesn't the developer get up and speak?

Unidentified: Yes, yes.

(Audience applauds)

Chair???? 8:19:49): This really **isn't/is** unusual for professionals in the field, but here comes Duncan.

Applause.

Mr. Shaw: I'll let Phil carry on because I hired an expert, because I care about this project.

(Unclear comments from audience)

Mr. Shaw: Sorry?

Unidentified: Should have hired me, I would have taken the job. First three points are exactly our points. This is silly, absolutely silly.

City REP??? (8:20:10): Okay, we'd like to let you have your chance to let him speak.

Unidentified: Very well, carry on.

City REP??? Because what we tried to do was follow the City's official plan, as it's outlined to us, to meet the needs of the community.

Unidentified: We don't need any official -

Unidentified: Don't need any.

Unidentified: Ask the community.

?? City Rep?? That's what we're here tonight to do.

Unidentified: The answer is no.

Mr. Shaw??? Thanks for your input, but if we let the gentleman finish, we're glad to listen to you.

Unidentified: Well, let him finish but don't insult my intelligence, telling me I'm going to have a green area underneath power lines. Think we're stupid?

?? City Rep? Never intended to -

Unidentified: We're not stupid.

Mr. Wood: (?? 20:50) Alright, if I may, when we were first presented with this piece of land, when Duncan and Darren came to see us, the first thing we talked about was looking at the Charlottetown Official Plan. Those are the design parameters that we're required to follow. And the Charlottetown Official Plan is fairly specific. Document was developed in 1999. It's currently under review. If you look at the major items that are in there in terms of subdivision development, the key one is that general statement: Our policy shall be to allow a mix of residential/commercial/institutional and recreational uses in new subdivisions which are established provided there is a comprehensive site plan which ensures the development is well related to both its internal and external environments. So you can see that the official plan is calling for some evolution in terms of suburban development. There is an encouragement for integration of mixed uses. And as we go down further, some higher densities. It would be apparent to me that there's people in the room that don't agree with that. So if we look at 2 and 3, but this is the current Official Plan which was adopted by Council in '99. Two is encouraging more compact urban form and if you look at this again, as Rob stated, most of this report is online on the City's website and you'll see the references. I didn't want to end up with pages and pages and pages out of the Official Plan, so we just pick up the highlights. And you can go and actually check on the pages in terms of context. So moderately higher densities in neighbourhoods. There is the emphasis in there to try to accommodate higher densities. Infilling existing serviced areas, trying to make more efficient use of existing infrastructure, encourage compact, contiguous development, more (unclear). Again, trying to make better use of existing

infrastructure, trying to be efficient. Maximizing efficient use of infrastructure. Same basic premise. Use existing underground service to the fullest capacity before extending. And of course there is servicing surrounding this site. Efficient use of civic infrastructure, again the same issue. So a lot of about, you know, a lot in here in terms of efficiency. Encouraging diversity. Permit moderately higher densities and new, in new neighbourhoods, again. Alternative forms of development in any new neighbourhood, so again encouraging diversity. Protecting trees, natural areas, potential green ways and trails, facilitating pedestrian, cycling use, physical linkages, again some emphasis on healthy lifestyles. And this is a key one: Enable people to continue to reside in their residential communities as they move through various ages and stages of their lives. And if you think about that as people's housing needs change over time, in many of our suburban subdivisions, we pretty much have a homogenous form of development without a whole lot of variety of housing options. This is suggesting, and again these aren't my words, folks, this is the Official Plan. This is suggesting that there should be an opportunity for people as they become empty nesters, as they age, to have different housing opportunities, to be able to stay in their neighbourhoods.

Number 5, land use compatibility integration, show that new development is harmonious with its surroundings and this is kind of the major proviso. We've talked about integrating what is a somewhat different form of development in the suburban Charlottetown but here's the big caveat: ensure that new developments is harmonious with its surroundings, preserves existing neighbourhoods, development of existing neighbourhoods should be physically related to its surroundings, height, massing, and setbacks. So any of this new development has to be sensitively integrated into the surrounding neighbourhoods that are there now.

This is the integrated community sustainability plan, the other key document that council has adopted. The federal government, the Infrastructure Secretariat required ten municipalities, ten largest municipalities in Prince Edward Island to adopt these integrated community sustainability plans, really to show some vision in terms of infrastructure expenditures, to look at how the municipalities are planning for a sustainable future. And if you look at the City's integrated, this ICSP, we call them, the key items that are in there, that jump out to us are protecting water resources, and again that certainly was a strongly felt issue in the last discussion, watershed management, storm water management planning, ecological environmental impacts, encourage integrated transportation plan, linkages, trails, bike paths and public transit - again trying to reduce energy costs and trying to get people more active. And trying to create connections between communities. Connectivity of green spaces, same basic issue, trying to develop park systems where there are walkways tying them together. Tree protection again and protecting habitat and wetlands. So here's another one, optimizing use of municipal infrastructure - basically the same issue that was highlighted within the Official Plan and we'll get into some stormwater management issues a little later when we look at the specific plans. More dense development, reducing sprawl. The one thing we know about traditional suburban development across North America is that it does use a lot of land. It's not terribly efficient and we have had an awful lot of agricultural land taken out of development. There are movements in many communities across North America, probably most, to more efficient use of land, and trying to reduce sprawl. And again, energy consumption becomes another factor in all of that. Number 4, promoting active lifestyles. Again, we're back to these pedestrian, cycling trails, park systems, trying to get people out and about and become more active. And then this social and cultural factor, in the Charlottetown ICSP, the cultural element is stressed very strongly. And if we look

within a subdivision, obviously that relates to places to gather - schools, parks, trails - density does promote social interaction and is always a debate. As a planner, I'm often up in front of meetings like this, talking about density and usually hearing some of the comments I got here today. I've been doing this in Stratford, by the way. I did the original official plan in Stratford back in '97 and I've done several reviews and the whole community of Stratford, we've seen that transition from a completely single family community to embracing a lot more innovative forms of housing in recent years.

If we look at housing trends and the underlying factors, the question becomes, okay there's, if you look at the 1999 Official Plan, there was obviously this encouragement to a slightly different form of suburban development. We're talking about bringing in mixed land uses, trying to encourage maybe some commercial development within the suburban areas for neighbourhood commercial services. Try to encourage a more efficient use of land and higher densities. More variety in terms of housing options and allowing people to be able to stay in their community longer. So what's underlying this? I mean, what is the rationale behind some of those statements that are in the Official Plan? I can tell you the planners from the planning partnership in Toronto are already engaged. They are starting their neighbourhood planning exercises. The first one was in East Royalty several weeks ago. There are I think three coming up May 21st, 22nd, 23rd, I think. I think the one in West Royalty might be the 23rd. It's the 22nd or 23rd. When you go to those presentations, you'll see an awful lot of these same comments being made. These are the underlying trends that are affecting urban development today. The aging of the population, if we think about, you know, baby boomers have probably affected everything in terms of society as they've moved through various age categories, again, excuse me for sniffing. If we look at, getting behind in my notes, the baby boomers today, I think the leading edge of the baby boomers is 67, 68, somewhere in there. The earliest beginning of sort of that baby boomer bump is somewhere between 50 and 55. Obviously we're developing a subdivision here and the new subdivisions we're developing across Charlottetown, they're being developed for the folks that are going to live in those neighbourhoods. And if we look at who's in the housing market today, it's a radically different mix of people than it was 15 years ago or even 10 years ago. And of course a lot of that is related to aging. We now have people with very different housing needs who are in the marketplace. We've got lots of empty nesters, children have grown up. And many of them want to stay in their neighbourhoods. So we're looking for a demand for a different mix of housing opportunities within new subdivisions. That's part of the rationale. If we look at the health concern item, it's number 2, again when you hear the presentation from the planning partnership, they have a very detailed presentation in terms of health concerns, health risks. Aging is obviously a factor in terms of health care costs. But so is our lifestyle and lack of activity. Suburban subdivisions since the 50s have been known as car-oriented developments where people are encouraged to jump in their cars to go almost everywhere and despite the earlier comment, you still have to get in your car to go to the West Royalty Shopping Centres, you do, if it's five minutes or ten minutes, versus possibly having some of those services available within walking distance. And try to get people out and walking. So this is one of the underlying directions in terms of the new direction for subdivision development, is trying to create more linkages, a healthier lifestyle, get people out walking and moving. The next one - that gets back to those active transportation references. The energy costs and climate change, we all know every time we fill up our cars, what a massive impact we've had from the cost of fuel and how that's impacting all our lifestyle changes, choices. We look at the kinds of cars we're buying. There are major efforts in terms of communities across North America to try to come up

with designs that are more energy efficient in terms of district heating, trying to allow people to walk to work, walk to shopping centres. Public transit is a big factor here and one of the things that's a key issue in terms of public transit is some critical mass. You need ridership. If you look at the average suburban area, if you've got a mass of single family homes throughout an area, trying to figure out where you're going to come up with efficient stops for a public transit system is extremely difficult. We normally like to see some critical mass or at least a corridor that will help give ridership and make those routes economical. The next one is number 4. Yes?

Mr. Miller: I live on the Upton Road, I've attended many types of (unclear) for the last 40 years.

Unidentified: Microphone, please?

Mr. Miller: But what the hell has this got to do with anything?

(Applause)

Mr. Miller: How long is this presentation, sir? Half hour, forty minutes?

Mr. Wood: Well, I, there is one more item on this page. I'm sorry, sorry about that. Okay, I'm trying to give -

Unidentified: (unclear) game plan.

Mr. Wood: The issue is to try to explain some of the rationale behind the policies within the Official Plan and within some of the work that you're going to see later on. If we just look at development costs, development costs have skyrocketed in Prince Edward Island. If we look at development costs of an average lot, it's a huge factor in terms of housing affordability. Within the last 15 years we've gone from, we used to use a figure in our office of \$15,000 per lot. We're now up, in Charlottetown, to close to \$40,000 a lot, just for servicing costs to put a lot in place. Then you're still looking at land costs and other things. So the cost of land has gone up significantly. The cost of infrastructure is driven a lot by fuel costs. And then we look at housing costs, which have also gone up. And if we look at, one of the examples we often use is the Hillside Meadows subdivision in Cornwall which is sort of a starter subdivision. If we look at when that development started about eight years ago, the average house going in there for a starter subdivision was in the 170s. And we're now at the point where the houses being built in there are now 240, some of them are as high as 270. Been a dramatic increase in the cost of standalone, single family houses. And affordability has become a massive challenge. Council has to deal with some of these issues in terms of aging of the population, different housing requirements, affordability. So I'll -

Unidentified: Why do they have to deal my house being \$270,000. That's what I bought.

CHAIR 8:33:59 Ladies and Gentlemen, can we, the less we interrupt Mr. Wood, the sooner he'll finish his presentation and we'll have the opportunity for everyone to speak, please?

Unidentified: Okay, I got lots to say.

Mr. Wood: Okay, the last item on here is sustainability and that, you know, that just relates to just about everything we're talking about in terms of long term sustainability. So if I got to the next one, let's look at the current zoning. So what do we have right now in terms of the Windsor

Park development? It's an R-2S zone and if you look at R-2S, essentially it's single family houses and 25 percent of the lots can be used for either single family or for duplex development or for semidetached. So if we just scroll through this, and you see the lots are basically 72.17 feet wide, they're about 100 feet deep. This is the zoning that's there now.

Unidentified: We're okay with that (unclear).

(Applause)

Mr. Wood: And in 2007, based on this zoning, the next slide will show the current subdivision design. That's still more on the zoning. So this is the current subdivision design. And this was the design that was approved in 2007, there are an awful lot of issues with the subdivision. This is the first phase that has been developed now. All of the rest of this is approved in principle but has not yet been developed. If you look at it, one of the issues that jumps out at you right away, there is a Maritime Electric easement that runs through here and we mentioned it earlier.

Unidentified: That's a green zone.

Mr. Wood: You'll see that the plan shows a road running on the length of this and also shows a number of houses. Clearly, that can't happen legally. You can't build anything on the Maritime Electric easement except Maritime Electric will usually allow us to cross streets over it and they often will allow walkway, particularly on a relatively low voltage line like this one.

Unidentified: Is the approval (unclear) for the City?

Mr. Wood: It has approval in principle. Yes. And if we look at the road system, we can see that there are an awful lot of straight roads through here which encourage speeding and we look at a case of the number of intersections. There are seven intersections just in this stretch alone. So the road system is not terribly efficient. It's not making efficient use of land. And what it's not doing is trying to segregate residential areas. We think about that through traffic movement. You have to think about, okay, where's it going to go through and we can see, if you're coming through here, I can either go this way or this way. Coming through this one, there are several different options. There's quite a bit of traffic loading onto all of these streets.

Unidentified: We would (unclear) developer to improve this design.

Mr. Wood: Well, we -

Unidentified: It's better for snow removal if it's straight, because if there's too many circles, they can't get all the snow off the roads.

Mr. Wood: Well, I would think that speeders coming through your neighbourhood, and it was raised earlier, would be a bigger concern to you.

Unidentified: We take care of speeders in our neighbourhood.

Mr. Wood: The other issue would be the parks, you can see there is a small park up in here and there is this long park along here. There are no parks in any of the rest of the area and you can imagine - this is a great park down in this corner. It's beautiful. But if you're a mom or a dad

trying to get your kids down to this park, there really is no way down to it. It does not facilitate pedestrian connections. There's a big issue in terms of storm -

Unidentified: (unclear) park land -

Mr. Wood: There's a big challenge in terms of storm water management, you can see the flow is basically this way and we've created dams all along, so it's not well designed for storm water. If you think about public transit, the question is where would you put a stop in here and how would you differentiate. And in terms of housing diversity as called for in the Official Plan, obviously this is all single family and semidetached and duplex development and there are no local services.

Applause.

Unidentified: Keep it that way.

Mr. Wood: I'll scan very quickly. We, there are a number of, if you look at the current housing market, we've seen huge increases in demand for semidetached houses in particular, and increasingly now for townhouses, particularly owner-occupied townhouses. So they would be condominium townhouses.

Unidentified: There's all kinds of vacancies in Charlottetown, what are you talking about?

Unidentified: Here, here.

Unidentified: What seniors can afford those -

Mr. Wood: Okay, I'll just, we'll scroll through these housing options very quickly. So these are just some of the types of semidetached houses that are being built today. Years ago we heard about sort of, you know, Reeves Estates or Hillsborough Development, and you can see this is the kind of development that's happening. You'll notice that these are very, very similar and this is what happens with semidetached if the lots are quite narrow. You'll see where we've tried to make the lots a lot wider that would allow a much better design in terms of the design of the semidetached. And you just scroll through these, these are just some examples of the kinds of semidetached houses that are being built around the region today. And then we went to some townhouses to get you some idea of the kind of townhouse development because there's quite a few townhouses in this proposal. And there is big demand - we gave an example, this is, many of you will have heard of Marshall MacPherson, he's a builder primarily in Stratford but he builds all over the area. Marshall is a higher-end builder and he actually determined that there was a market for condominium townhouses. We've seen sort of lower-end townhouses in the region for a number of years but not too many people targeting higher-end with, you know, good amenities, granite countertops and hardwood floors and all the kind of amenities people expect. So these are the two phases that he developed recently and they're probably the best examples we have in the marketplace right now, of these higher-end condominium townhouses. We have some pictures of Edgeview Court and you'll notice it is directly adjacent to Golf View Drive. These are four and five hundred thousand dollar houses, directly adjacent, and the transitions worked extremely well and has been no impact on these, no negative impact on these property values. So let's just scroll through these pictures. This is actually looking down, you'll see the townhouses in the back and there's some very, this is a particularly large house here. If we keep

scrolling through, this is the front of them with sort of brick fronts and you can see there, they've been very popular. These units sold originally for I think about 159, they started at. The second phase, once this took off, the second phase sold out before it was even built. They've now got resale for around \$200,000 on these units. So they've become very popular and there's big demand. The problem is finding lots of land to build these on. So if we scroll this, this is Cameron Heights, and you see these more, have parking in the back. You can see the juxtaposition again of single-family houses with these town houses. So if we just keep going, go through those pictures and we can get to - everybody will be happy - we can get to the final design. Again, apologize for sniffing. These are just all examples. You'll see these are two-story. We get to some one-storey townhouses and certainly there's demand in terms of seniors' housing for these one-storey townhouses. And we think there's particularly opportunities for seniors' housing in this location.

So that moves us on to the revised concept and you can see what's proposed here, very much focused on this corridor. There are two answers that you can use in terms of through traffic coming through the subdivision. One is what we term traffic calming mechanisms, and that's where you try to frustrate the movement and slow it down. The other option is basically to designate a collector road and say okay, rather than having through traffic moving through these residential areas like the first phase of this development, let's create a collector and route all this traffic through here, direct it to one spot. Now, when we consider the traffic counts along here, if you look at the previous plan, from here up to here, if you look at the road that, it was almost the same route, but it had a few more curves, there were 64 driveways along that route, along what could be a primary collector. If you add in the 25 percent for the semidetached, there's something like 80 driveways. If you look at this plan, by putting multiple residential clusters and controlling the accesses, there's a total of 14 driveways here, so it's a lot safer and we've tried to cluster the higher density or medium density development along this collector road. And we can see, we also suggested the possibility of putting some commercial development in here to provide local commercial services that people can walk to. If you look at the net impact of this, if we look at Phase 1, and I'm sure there are people here from Phase 1 now, if you looked at the former design, of course we had roads connecting all the way up here, we had another road connecting all the way up here. We had a lot of through traffic coming through this subdivision. If you look at this we've now completely blocked it off. It's basically a circle. The only through traffic, and we've heard a few comments about this is a primary collector, there is certainly a potential for people to come down and use this. Our preference in fact would be to close this off, so there's only one collector coming through and have one point of access. This is really a Fire Marshal issue, and if the City would let us, we would rather close that off and just have this whole area closed off so we have a cluster in here with no through traffic, a cluster in here with no through traffic, clusters in here, so we tried to create very safe clusters for all the neighborhoods to defeat through traffic, so there's nobody going through here unless you need to be there. And all of the through traffic and all of the high volume traffic and all of the public transit would be along this corridor. That's probably enough for me.

Unidentified: No, no, no, you have to talk about those apartments now.

Mr. Wood: Okay.

Unidentified: We didn't see -

Mr. Wood: NO, I'm willing to answer any questions. Maybe we could bring Jonathan up for the traffic issue and then we'll stay up here as long as you want and answer any questions you have.

(Several audience members speak at once)

Unidentified: If there is a 200-apartment building, what (unclear) talking about.

Mr. Wood: Yes, there are 275 apartment buildings shown in this plan, 275 units.

Unidentified: Where's the pictures of it?

Mr. Wood: These are the apartment units that are shown and these of course are townhouses, proposed for townhouses.

Unidentified: And every one of them has a car.

Unidentified: And before you get to your presentation, where's the pictures of these pretty apartment buildings and your pretty commercial buildings?

Unidentified: Yeah, yeah.

Unidentified: Where are they?

Mr. Wood: Well obviously apartment buildings can be a different of types. Our hope would be that at least one of these is a community care. If you look at the notion of trying to allow people to stay in a community through various phases of life, you look at that aging phenomenon we were talking about, there is a huge demand coming in terms of seniors' apartments and community care facilities.

Unidentified: Why don't you just -

Chair: Okay, folks we'll have to, if we're going - if that concludes Phil's presentation -

Mr. Wood: Yes.

Chair: I'd ask everyone to proceed to the microphones, if you wish to speak.

Mr. Wood: We'd like to have a transportation engineer speak, I think, to his report, since it was required by the City.

Unidentified: He's got so many things he's got to talk about, forget (unclear).

???CHAIR??(8:45) Well if the applicant's presentation is not complete, then we should not be moving to the comments phase of the meeting. Can you give us some indication how long the traffic presentation will be?

Unidentified: Probably 8 to 10 minutes.

??? CHAIR? 8:45:54 Okay, folks, I know that patience is wearing thin but we need to try to keep the process as tight as possible here and everyone will have an opportunity that wants to speak here in a few minutes. So we'll just -

Colin MacDonald: I believe it would serve the public interest to scrutinize each consultant individually, as opposed to as a collective. Unless everyone is taking notes here. Okay? There are a lot of seniors and younger individuals probably with children at home. I believe it's unfair for the developer and his paid consultants to sit up here - Colin MacDonald, by the way, Park West Subdivision. I, sit up here for, I'm assuming they'll be up here for probably two hours. It's a public consultation. I think it would be best if both parties had an opportunity for the seniors and the younger people here - if we start speaking at about 10 o'clock at night, I don't believe that serves the public interest. I apologize if I'm not in order with the Rules of Order. I just felt that comment needed to be made, thank you.

???CHAIR? 8:46:34 I'm going to give five more minutes for the presentation. Five more minutes. I'm going to time it on my phone here, please, and then we're going to go directly to questions and comments.

Mr. Lewis: Right, thank you, my name is John Lewis. I'm a transportation engineer and myself along with my colleague, Peter Alby, did the traffic impact study for this development. I'll try and go through this pretty quickly. First off, what was the purpose of this traffic study? Really there was three questions we were trying to answer. One, what is the traffic impact of the development. Two, does the development create any new traffic deficiencies within the study area that would not be there in the future without the development? And three, how can these deficiencies be mitigated?

So in terms of the study area, the City provided us with the list of intersections to include in the analysis, and they included the following. At the bottom of the screen you can see it's the highway arterial at Upton Road. We have Royalty Road at Upton Road. The Lower Malpeque Road at Royalty Road. Lower Malpeque at Westway, and Lower Malpeque at Sleepy Hollow Road. So the first step in the analysis was looking at how things are working out there right now and how they'd work in the future without the development. So in order to do that we went out and we collected peak hour traffic counts at all five of those intersections and inputted them into a transportation model that we developed. And then we supplemented that with site observations to make sure that the model was telling us, or actually representing what is happening out there. Overall we determined that all of the existing intersections that we noted there are operating under reasonable levels of delay, with the exception of the Upton Road Highway Arterial. That intersection is already nearing capacity. The left-turn movement off the highway arterial onto Upton southbound, very busy, long queuing, high delay, both the morning and the evening. So the City indicated that the Province is looking at upgrading that to a roundabout to solve that existing capacity issue.

The next step is to estimate the amount of traffic that will be generated by the development. To do this, we used the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation manual. It's based on trip generation studies completed across North America for various types of development, including residential. So in terms of the full build out of this development, we estimate it will generate 539 vehicles during the AM peak. That's 123 in, 416 out; 673 during the PM peak; that's 425 in, 248 out. And about 7300 total vehicles per day. It's about 3650 in, 3650 out. Next, in terms of traffic assignment, we assigned this development traffic to the study area of streets and intersections. We determined that most traffic will utilize either Upton Road or the Royalty Road, Lower Malpeque, given that the majority of commercial and employment centres

for the City are both to the south or the southeast of the proposed development. We determined that a smaller percentage of traffic will also utilize Sleepy Hollow Road or Westway Drive.

In terms of the traffic impact of the development, we added the development traffic on top of our base future volumes inside our traffic model. We ran the analysis again, and again we didn't find any new traffic deficiencies within the study area. All the study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable delay thresholds. One thing we did note is that the volumes at Royalty Road, Upton and Paddington, they're going to become much more balanced in the future, obviously with the high delay coming from the development, it's going to be more north/south traffic within this intersection. It's currently stop controlled on Paddington and Upton, so as the volumes become more balanced, it'll make more sense to either upgrade this to a four-way stop or to a single lane roundabout.

We were asked to look at the specific impact on Lower Malpeque Road. In terms of vehicle delay, for vehicles turning off either Sleepy Hollow, Westway, or Royalty Road, we say increases in delay of one to seven seconds per vehicle in the morning and afternoon peak periods. The other spot that it increases delay is when you have vehicles trying to turn left off Lower Malpeque Road onto Sleepy Hollow, Westway, and Royalty; as the vehicles stop to turn left, you can block through vehicles; so in order to accommodate this, we look at auxiliary left-turn lanes. Charlottetown didn't specifically have warrants for when to use them, so we used warrants from another jurisdiction that we commonly apply across the Maritimes. When we do this warrant analysis, we determine -

Unidentified City Rep (8:51:14): One minute

Mr. Lewis: Okay, left-turn lanes would be warranted at Royalty and at Westway, although only at Royalty it wouldn't be warranted with - sorry, without the development, it would still be, there should still be a left-turn lane warranted at Royalty. In terms of the specific impact on Westway drive, based on sight observations in our traffic counts, the street currently functions as a local street. No curb, no sidewalk, narrow pavement, daily traffic volumes less than 800 vehicles per day. In terms of the development impact, it's fairly small in terms of volumes. However, given the design of that road, and given that there's still excess capacity north and south on Royalty and Sleepy Hollow, one of our main recommendations was consideration should be given to removing the proposed vehicle access between the development and the existing Westway drive but retain a pedestrian cycling connection.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Lewis: So the cycling pedestrian - (alarm sounds) two more minutes I can finish up.

Unidentified: No.

??? CHAIR?? (8:52:32) Please finish up as quickly as you can.

Mr. Lewis: So yes, so again remove the access, maintain pedestrian cycling connection, just it's good for inner-development connectivity. If it needs to be maintained for emergency access, they can use a gate or breakaway bollards. Other considerations, we looked at sidewalk considerations, pedestrian connections and cycling infrastructure. We also reviewed the potential for cut-through traffic on Paddington Avenue and we also, although we don't consider

it to be an immediate problem on Paddington Avenue, we recommended some strategies that could be looked at in the future to help accommodate that, any cut-through traffic.

Finally, recommendations, again the main one is to consider closing the vehicular connection between Westway drive and the proposed development. Maintain this as an important pedestrian connection. We have, consideration should be given to constructing auxiliary left-turn lanes in Lower Malpeque Road at Royalty and Westway. I have a star there at Westway. If recommendation one is followed through on and that connection is removed at Westway, then the left-turn lane on Lower Malpeque would no longer be warranted. Recommend monitoring traffic volumes at Royalty and Paddington and converting to a four-way stop or roundabout in the future. Recommend constructing sidewalk and neighbourhood pedestrian connections as we recommend within the report. And just as an overall final statement, the traffic impact to the proposed development can be accommodated efficiently by the existing infrastructure and the specific impact on Lower Malpeque Road is fairly small.

Unidentified: Stay where you are.

Unidentified: (not speaking into the microphone) (unclear) can you or someone tell us that (unclear).

Mr. Lee :(8:54:15): Okay, we will answer that question as soon as Erik's done. That will be the second question. Erik's got one quick question.

Erik Klaussen: Okay, you're an engineer, I'm an engineer. Yes, go ahead.

Unidentified: Please speak into the mic.

Erik Klaussen: Hello, yes, Erik Klaussen, Charlottetown, Upton Park, Winsloe or whatever, Charlottetown. Don't know where I'm at. Anyway, I've been there, fourth residence, so I'm one of the oldest residents there, been there about 26 years, 88. Upton Road, every time I turn right and come down Upton Road, I bless my heart I don't have to turn left. With this proposal, you used some numbers, I think I caught 700 extra cars. Well, if my math is right, 250 people, one apartment building, that's one car per person; 250 people in another apartment, 750 people in three apartment buildings, not counting the houses. Man, I think your numbers are wrong. Number two, what morning did you check -

Applause

Mr. Lewis: It would be easier if I -

Mr. Klaussen: What morning did you check the traffic, Sunday morning? I don't know when you checked that traffic. Number two, you're an engineer from New Brunswick. You know our soil structure here is inadequate. That Royalty Road is a suicide road. I bike and I'll tell you, there's not enough room when the bus comes down and I'm on my bike, thank God I can jump off and fall two and a half feet off the road. Because when that bus comes down, another car, you're in dead man's alley. I can see kids, bikes, getting killed because of this proposal.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: Upton Road is no better and also the soil structure there, by the way I was Dredging Superintendent for the Province of PEI for about 15 years, I know soil structures. It sucks. You cannot maintain a road with this type of traffic. I don't care if you're driving old 25-year old cars or what, you cannot maintain those roads. There is going to be ruts, problems, bumps, and with this traffic, I don't care how you design your roads, in a circle, straight up and down, inverted, whatever you want, it's not going to work, okay.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: Now, the - by the way I do like your report, you're pretty factual. However you have to consider the extra volumes that's going to be happening. This through traffic, I notice that nice little design goes through that green area and now you're going to have to fight somebody who has money, the power companies. They will not let you put that road through that, I just say in that one of those little sketches you had up there, one of the presentations. So when you're dealing with them you're going to have a tough opponent, okay?

Now I want to talk to the other gentleman, you were going on about the housing cost and this land going up so high. Well back when, my dad made a dollar a week, you know, our salaries have gone up and we have nice houses, so your terminology, why you're going to do this to have affordable housing for people, well everything goes up, your salary goes up, lot prices go up, that's life. And I take a disrespect of somebody who is going to take my valued interest in my home and my surroundings and try to devalue it. And that's what this is all about.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: To the potential owner, I don't know, or developer, gentleman in the blue, I didn't catch your name but I understand you're interested in basketball. And I refereed basketball and you know, when I was doing Colonel Gray and Rural, and it's third quarter and I'd say to the other referee, hey, let's stop the game because Rural's ahead, we like Rural. It's four quarters, we can't pull the rug from underneath the teams because it's not fair. You don't change the rezoning because you want to make money and hurt the other people that are there. That's not fair. It's not right.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: Let's talk money. Why was this subdivision sold to you? Because the other man didn't have the patience to develop the homes that, people are there, yes it's at, there's not a volume problem right now. These are nice homes, they don't want to lose their investment. And I'll tell you one thing, I wouldn't want to lose my investment, no one does. We like what we have, we don't want to change it. And if you look in Charlottetown and you break out your wallet, if you should have done it, bought land that's already zoned for this type of thing, you would make money.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: Now I know other people want to speak and I'll be very quick. On this point, yes, this is one phase and please, people here, you think this is over? Not by a long run because we're dealing with people with money, very polished presentation, all those things, the first presenter, you can't argue with that, biking I do it daily. All those things are good things but

that's a facade, that's not what the real issue is here. Those are great things, has nothing to do, in other words, I (unclear) says I should have an apartment in my back yard because it's going to give me a better life, you know? Give me a break here, you know? You know?

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Klaussen: My next point and final point is, I thank everybody for being here, the Councillors and everyone else who is supporting against this thing and remember, we may have to - and there's a few lawyers in our subdivisions - I have a lawyer in the family, we may have to do a class action suit if - if I feel that this vote goes against us or if it's overruled by IRAC, because that's something else we have to deal with. And don't ever kid your boots, that contractor/developer and these people, they know all about IRAC and IRAC is a committee of a couple of people that can be swayed because they like these fancy words. It's going to create employment, it's going to get people living in their own subdivision. I'm a senior, I'm a baby boomer, born in '47, do you think I'm going to live where I'm at right now, in a big four-bedroom house? No, I'm going to sell and get my equity, right? Thank you. By the way, I'm against the rezoning. Against.

(Audience applauds)

Unidentified /City - Mayor????9:00:33 Phil, can you show us the pictures for the apartment buildings, is that what you're looking for?

Unidentified: Yes.

Mr. Lee?????? Size of the apartment buildings, do you have that there?

Unidentified (9:00:42): Do you have me on, Phil?

Mr. Wood: Yes, obviously you have to realize the process. We did try to give some idea of the types of semi-detached housing and townhouse housing that might help, that might happen on this site because they're fairly new concepts in terms of the greater Charlottetown area. As far as the apartment buildings, it's a rezoning application. If the rezoning doesn't happen, apartments just won't happen. There are a number of steps in this process. Even if Council were to grant approval to the rezoning at this point, there still would be, the next step would be subdivision approval, and all of the details of the roads and the parks and all of those issues would still be vetted again. And then as far as the individual development application, the building permits, those apartment buildings would have to be approved individually and they would have to be in full compliance with the zoning bylaw provisions of the R-3 and R-4 provisions.

End of CD#2 (8:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Public Meeting Reconvened, 9:03 p.m. - CD 3

Note: duplicate sound at the end of CD2 and beginning of CD3) Text not repeated in this portion)

Unidentified audience member: But as a point of reference, -

Mr. Wood: We didn't -

Unidentified audience member: (unclear 1:12)

Unidentified audience member: - Dr. Habbi's apartment buildings are 32 units. So it would be three times the size of that building.

Unidentified audience member: Wow.

Unidentified audience member: Oh my god.

Unidentified audience member: Yeah.

Mr. Wood: If, if they were single buildings. Yeah.

Unidentified audience member: For 103 units, -

Mr. Wood: Yeah.

Unidentified audience member: - 32 times 3 -

Mr. Wood: If they were, you know, a single building. Obviously these are blocks of apartments, blocks of R-4 land. And what we did was calculate what was the maximum number of units that could be built on that amount of square footage. That's all we did.

Unidentified audience member: I guess it didn't play well to give us a picture of that, did it?

Unidentified audience member: No.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Wood: I guess I certainly -

Chair: Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to go to the mics because there are people standing at the mics. So if you're sitting at your seat and you want to speak, please proceed to the mic and get in line. Thank you.

Ms. Myers: My name is Hayley Myers. I live in Parkwest. I don't know if any of you have spent much time there other than Jason, who's our councillor, but if you drive through there on any given day, after school, on the weekends, you're going to see kids. A lot of them. There are 40 on that white strip - to the right of his plan, there are 40 kids below senior high level. And they're out all the time. We don't have sidewalks. My kids are out there on roller blades and bikes and in their little motorized jeeps and they're weaving in and out of cars that, as it is, my heart's in my throat all the time. And you want to add 300 extra units, which is, you know, 1000 extra people; all who could potentially have cars. We see people cutting through our subdivision all the time as it is. I don't care what your traffic study says. I worked from home for six years and I saw how many cars were coming through my neighbourhood. So your studies are great; but spend some time there. And all these people that are here, when it was first zoned R-2S and that initial plan went out, there was no uproar. Everybody was fine with the way it was zoned. And everybody is fine if it stays the way it is zoned.

(Audience applauds)

But I do want to say to the developer that you can keep coming at us and we're going to keep coming back.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Miller: Thank you. My name is Dan Miller and I live on the Upton Road, one of the few houses there right now, 249. What I see here for the Upton Road scares the hell out of me. And I'm glad my kids are grown up and gone. I've only been here six years. The road was poor up until last year. Thankfully, it got resurfaced and we've got the best - we've got the best drag strip now this side of Oyster Bed Bridge.

(Audience applauds)

And I kid you not. And I, and I kid you not. I mean, I've watched cars drag race down Upton Road. Okay? It's a two-lane road. A small, country, two-lane road. And we're going to use that as a thoroughfare? What are we going to do with it? I mean, I had to cut trees 150 feet up from my house this weekend, the boughs down, trim 'em back so my wife could see up the road when she pulls out in a small car. You know? It's country living. If we're going to bring in this - I haven't seen anything or heard anything here this evening that makes me all warm and fuzzy. Not a damn thing.

(Audience applauds)

The other issue that I have is with the infrastructure. Okay? Right now at my house, my water pressure, if I go to the bathroom, and if I got to the sink to wash my hands - which I do all the time, by the way.

(Audience laughs)

Okay? Well, I gotta wait for the toilet to finish filling. You know? Because for all I get out, I might as well spit on me hands. So now we're going to add all of that up there. I mean, last year, we were very near having no water. So what's, what's being done there? Not one presenter brought that up.

Unidentified audience member: No.

Mr. Miller: You know? That's infrastructure. How do we support that stuff? You know? Mister Developers, are you bringing another water source?

Mr. Shaw: (unclear 5:40) We discussed with the City that we might -

Mr. Miller: That you might?

Unidentified audience member: That you might. Yay.

Unidentified: Duncan, Duncan, why don't you get up here?

Duncan Shaw: What?

Unidentified Male: Why don't you get up here too?

Mr. Miller: Okay?

Mr. Shaw: Sure.

Mr. Miller: The traffic analysis said something about 7,200 vehicles. All told, 3,600 in and out. Yeah. And the intersection at the arterial route and Upton Road can be a nuisance. You're absolutely right. But it's a nuisance on all these intersections. You know? The guys coming up the bypass, they get to the Upton Road, well they're half-way out the intersection in order to see anyway. You know? Nothing up there has been gauged to what's coming. Nothing. Okay? So maybe from the City perspective, we need to do a whole lot more planning on the infrastructure up there before we even consider a development of this magnitude.

(Audience applauds)

Now, you can probably tell by my voice that I'm a come-from-away. You know? But not that far away. We've been here six years. I mean, PEI is a great spot. But, boys, progress is here, let's get on with it but we gotta keep up with it. So you're the money bags. You know? And if you're not now, you're going to be if all this comes through. You know? Maybe we could do a little cost sharing. You know? Maybe there's an inconvenience fee for me on Upton Road because of the increased traffic. You know?

(Audience applauds)

Eh? I mean, share the wealth; share the misery. Thank you very much.

Ms. MacKenzie: My name is Anita MacKenzie and I live in Windsor Park. I can't tell you how upset I am about this whole proposed development. We spent a lot of time driving around Charlottetown - we were living in Summerside. We decided to build a house in Charlottetown. We spent a lot of time looking to see where we wanted to live. People made reference to Hillsborough Park and Reeves Estates. If I had wanted to live there, I would have bought a lot there.

(Audience applauds)

Instead, we chose a low-density neighbourhood and now you're trying to take all that away from us. If, for some reason, this development goes through and we decide to sell our house and buy another lot in another low-density neighbourhood, what's to tell me that I'm not going to be standing up in front of another mic at another night when some developer comes in with some idea?

(Audience applauds)

There's apartment buildings all over Charlottetown. Every time you look around, there's more and more apartment buildings. What about developing neighbourhoods that are single-family dwellings?

(Audience applauds)

Ms. Seller: Hi. My name is Shanda Seller and I am against this. I have lived in Upton Park since I was seven years old and I just purchased my first home on the Upton Road.

(Audience applauds)

I have a one-year old daughter and I am not pleased with this at all. But my concern is the schooling. With this many people going up in apartment buildings, is everyone going to go to West Royalty School? Like, I want my child to go there. Did you develop what school zones, is things going to be changed? I'd like that answered.

Mr. Shaw: Sorry. You'd like to answer -

Ms. Seller: You weren't listening to me?

Mr. Shaw: I was -

Ms. Seller: I am wondering with this many apartment buildings and this many children that are going to be brought into this community, what school are these children going to be going to? Because West Royalty school cannot supply that many children.

Mr. Shaw: Honestly, we would look at - if it develops, the Province handles the schools. It's not in my area of expertise to tell the Province where to send the kids to school.

Ms. Seller: Okay. Well, that's really a big concern of me because I purchased this home. I -

Mr. Shaw: I can understand why -

Ms. Seller: - am an educator. And I would really want my child -

Mr. Shaw: Yeah.

Ms. Seller: - to go to the school that I am zoned for. And with this many children, I'd like to know what's going to happen with that. Also, just - the Upton Road is going to be extremely, extremely busy. Many children in Upton Park go across the school to walk to West Royalty School. There's not even a sidewalk on that road. So I am not - I'm against this.

(Audience applauds)

Jeff Doucette: Hello. My name is Jeff Doucette. I live in Windsor Park and this question is for Mr. Wood. I'm not going to get into the reasons why I opposed the subdivision. I'm sure it's going to be touched on enough throughout the night. It's my understanding, maybe I'm wrong, that this particular area and the development that you're proposing is zoned R-S2 in the Official Plan which Mr. Wood pertained to quite a bit during the presentation and how they're trying to follow the official plan. So it seems to me in reality that the future land use in the Official Plan, not actually following it but you're, it seems that you're ignoring.

(Audience applauds)

Unidentified: Would you like a comment on that, or?

Mr. Doucette: Well, I'm just kind of wondering, within the official plan, it states that the future land use should be low residential.

Mr. Wood: Yeah. Of course, I know it was long and dragged out and I'm sorry for that. But there is an awful lot of detail within the official plan. One of the issues that Council has faced since 1999 is an inherent problem within the official plan. The official plan has all the language that I spoke to in terms of encouraging a different form of suburban development with a mix of densities and a mix of land uses - that's clearly articulated within the plan. But then, the general land use map that is at the end of the plan actually designates all the large, undeveloped blocks of suburban land as low density single family. So there is a contradiction within the plan in terms of its policy and its map. And that, that has happened to generate a situation where the zoning bylaw also was in contra-, so we have a bit of a conflict within those documents that hopefully will be resolved in the official plan review that's going on now.

Mayor Lee: I'm going to interject here, Phil, and I'm going to take exception to your comments that two different sets of policies that the City has contradict each other. If there's a contradiction - there may be a contradiction in the official plan and what you want to do with this piece of land. But to suggest that there's no place in the city where you can build apartment buildings, there's no place where you can put up commercial development doesn't put the bylaw and the official plan in, in opposite ends of the spectrum. I, you know, I take exception to your comments that there's a contradiction in the City's official plan.

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Wood: Obviously, this is what I do for a living and I do stand by my comment. There is a definite contradiction -

Unidentified (Tweel?): I guess, Phil, I served on city council for 25 years, too, and I listened to the citizens of this community and that plan that's in place was developed by the City -

(Audience applauds)

Mr. Doucette: Thank you.

Mr. Wood: I stand by my comment.

Keith Hillier: Thank you. I guess Round 2. My name is Keith Hillier. I live in Parkwest subdivision. And this has been a really interesting night. We got nice lectures of things we could have easily downloaded from the internet. I always thought the development business was about making a profit. That's what I thought business was about. But no, it's not. It's about worrying how long I'm going to have to drive to get my Tim's or get my lotto tickets. You know what I mean? They're concerned about that. And green space. And they're worried about when I get old. Bullshit. Okay?

(Audience applauds)

Here is the real issue here, ladies and gentlemen. A developer has a piece of property zoned R-1. They can't make the type of profit they want to make so let's put more stuff on it. Alright? That's what it's - it's all about business.

(Audience applauds)

That's why business exists. Okay? And business is not bad. It's good for the community. But here - and I appeal to the Members of City Council. I ask you to think about your values and your ethics. Because what the choice you have is to devalue the property of people who worked hard and lived in the community for many years, to put more profit in the hands of developers. That is the choice. And that is the decision you have to make. So I appeal to you, I appeal to your values, your sense of ethics and also the trust that I, like many people, bought in that area because it's zoned R-1. And I have to say, you've taken away from your credibility because you didn't have the balls to come here tonight and show the apartment buildings.

(Audience applauds)

You showed fancy single family homes. Right? And you can't tell me - I used to work in real estate at one time and you can't tell me you have no idea what the buildings are going to look like. So I appeal to that. And last but not least, I just want to make a statement on a personal basis. I have made my last purchase at a BMR centre. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Unidentified audience member: Three cheers!

Unidentified audience member: Yes!

Unidentified: Darren.

Unidentified male: Darren, go.

Darren Foulkes: Yes. Darren Foulkes. I also live on Westway Drive. I also have two very young children. My question is, I guess, a question of process. I'm confused - I'm sure many of us are. We hear recommendations, recommendations. What does that mean? If the zoning is passed, I heard a recommendation: close off Westway Drive at the south end. That is imperative. So whose decision is it to do that? Who has the authority to connect it? Or, better still, who has the authority to shut it off? And we need that guarantee that if this happens that Westway Drive will be clo-, shut off. That's a question.

Unidentified audience member: It's not going to happen. You're talking like -

Mayor Lee: I guess, Darren, Council will make the decision if the road is closed -

Mr. Foulkes: Umhum.

Mayor Lee: - or if it's not. As Council, we'll make the decision, if the rezoning goes through or not.

Mr. Foulkes: So that decision is made when? Before or after this vote on Monday? I'm assuming after. That's an -

Mayor Lee: I would think after as well. It's pretty hard to open or close a street -

Mr. Foulkes: That's -

Mayor Lee: - if you don't have a rezoning approval.

Mr. Foulkes: So it's up to the City, then, to decide. Can we have - before we make an informed decision, we need to know what the plan entails.

Mayor Lee: I'm sorry?

Mr. Foulkes: Before we can make an informed decision, we need to know what the plan entails. And that plan, we must have Parkwest subdivision separated from this 400-unit -

Chair: If I could try to shed some light. I think, you know, when an application comes to City Hall, they work with planning staff and they, they tweak the design and, and there are suggestions tossed back and forth. And I think one of the things planning staff recommended was that, to cut through traffic into Parkwest subdivision, was to either close that road or to, or to change it so that it's not a straight through. But the issue of, that we're considering here tonight is the rezoning. The concept plan of the road layout and everything else is, is something else, like Phil alluded to earlier, that takes place at a later stage. But none of that happens if it doesn't get rezoned. So the land use question is what we're here to consider but, you know, certainly happy to try to answer any of those process questions for you.

Mr. Shaw: Sir, a comment if you don't mind?

Chair: Yes.

Duncan Shaw: I have no problem closing the road.

Darren Foulkes: Thank you.

Unidentified audience member: It's not your decision.

Unidentified audience member: It's not your decision.

Duncan Shaw: I'm just saying - you're right. It's not. But I have no problem closing the road.

Darren Foulkes: Okay. This is on the record by the way.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah, I know. Go for it. I have no problem closing the road.

Darren Foulkes: Just one more point. It's on accessibility. I read the public notice on the City's website this morning. It said that the application was available for viewing; come down to the planning department between the hours of 8:30 and 5:00. I did that this morning at 8:30 with my four-year-old daughter. We walked into City Hall. Here's the application but I can't show it to you. It was this thick. It was this thick. But I couldn't look at it. Well, she could show it to me but I couldn't open it. I couldn't touch it. How can we make an informed decision if we can't see the application, is my question. And, I mean, I was called at 11:10 saying: Well, you can look at it online. Here's the link. And I got the paltry 20-page whatever it is that we can all see online. Mr. Wood here, in the confusion at the beginning, about the maps, alluded to the fact that he didn't even know what the City had sent out to us. So obviously is, wasn't the application. If the application is available for us to view, we'd like to view it. Thank you. I am against this development.

(Audience applauds)

Lori Barker: Hi. My name's Lori Barker and I live on Westway Drive. And I wish I had words to really articulate all of the concerns but I think everybody has certainly touched already on the main facts. For me, we moved - our family, we have a two and a half-year-old and a one-year-old, into the subdivision a year and a half ago. And we chose to live there based on what we knew was happening. We made an investment. We - not just money. We made an investment for our family. We've gotten to know people. This is where we want to, you know, establish our roots. That choice is now being taken away from us. And that's the problem. There's tons of merit to all of the things in your presentation. I understand trends; I understand where suburban planning is going. I understand all of that. Do that with new land that's zoned accordingly for it from the get-go.

(Audience applauds)

Right? We want to talk about city planning. Plan. Don't turn our lives and our investments and our families upside down; plan. There's plenty of other fields, going onwards.

Unidentified audience member: Hear, hear!

Lori Barker: We can look at those investments and - you know, I don't want to make this about a personal thing; but this is very personal. And I would love, actually, to see those on the panel raise their hands who would like to see three apartment buildings, two streets over from their home.

Unidentified audience member: Yeah.

Lori Barker: I would love to see that. Because when you guys cast your votes, you need to put yourselves in our shoes. You're representing us, the people. And imagine if you were in our subdivision being impacted this way. Because that's the only way you're going to make the right decision.

(Audience applauds)

James Johnston: Hi there, ladies and gentleman. James Johnston is my name. I live on the Royalty Road. I'm not an engineer. I'm not a traffic engineer. I'm not a planner. I can't call the Mayor by his first name like the developer here. However, I am a resident of this community; have been for 24 years. My wife's grandfather farmed the land in question. Her uncle farmed the land in question and her father farmed the land in question. And this has been our only, our only residence for our entire married lives. So I think that qualifies me to speak a little bit about the community. I've been there not as long as everyone but as long as many and most in this room. And throughout that time, I've watched the community grow and develop from what was farmland to a single-family residential community. And by and large, that's why most of the people who live in the area, live there, I believe, anyway. That's my, that's my opinion.

(Audience applauds)

As, as a former resident of the community of West Royalty, Coun. Lantz, you talked about engaging, you know, seeing people engaged in the City and in the community. It's been difficult for many residents of West Royalty to become engaged and - but I think you can see tonight

through the turnout here and, and people's speeches that, by golly, you got some people engaged now. So to the Members of City Council, I would, I would ask you not to disengage this community one, one more time. To the, to the developer, you know, I understand that this is, you know, that this is about progress and about growth and I also understand that it's about, it's about making money. I expect you can, you can still make a, you can still make a profit off this community and I think most of the people in this room would welcome your improvements to the, to the current, current design. But City Council, there's - this is just, this is just a, a - this is just a bad idea. As the lady, as the lady before me said so well, none of you would welcome 200 or 300 apartment units, and I don't know how many townhouses in your backyard. So think about that, please.

(Audience applauds)

Karen Moore: Hi. My name is Karen Moore and I live in Parkwest subdivision. My lovely backyard will be backing on your beautiful apartment buildings and God knows what commercial space that you have. Mr. Shaw, I would like to ask you: Where do you live? What's in your backyard?

Duncan Shaw: I live in Meadowbank.

Karen Moore: Where?

Duncan Shaw: Meadow-

Karen Moore: Speak up, please. Use the mic.

Duncan Shaw: Is it on?

Karen Moore: You may be taller. I'm a little woman but I am really upset.

Duncan Shaw: Okay.

Karen Moore: And I will meet you toe to toe on this.

Duncan Shaw: Okay.

Karen Moore: So where do you live?

Duncan Shaw: Currently, Meadowbank.

Karen Moore: Meadowbank. What's in your backyard?

Duncan Shaw: Grass.

Karen Moore: No. Don't be facetious with me. What's in there? Nothing.

Duncan Shaw: Correct.

Karen Moore: What's going to be behind you? What's future development there?

Duncan Shaw: Okay. Let's, let's talk about that.

Karen Moore: No, no. I asked you a question.

Duncan Shaw: No, no - okay. There's nothing.

Karen Moore: And what's going to be there in the future?

Duncan Shaw: Probably nothing.

Karen Moore: Because your pockets full of money have supplied you with that.

Duncan Shaw: Let's talk about that. Before that, I lived at Hillside. Hillside Meadows, Phil's starter home development. Behind my house was a row of semi-detached -

Karen Moore: Obviously you moved.

Duncan Shaw: I still own the house.

Karen Moore: You moved because you didn't like it.

Duncan Shaw: No -

Karen Moore: If you'd liked it, you'd be back there.

Duncan Shaw: No. I didn't move for that -

Karen Moore: And you'd be putting this in your backyard.

Duncan Shaw: I didn't move for that reason. And trust me -

Karen Moore: Okay. You've got all kinds of money. You buy the land and put your house with those in behind it.

Duncan Shaw: Okay. But if you want to ask a question about my living circumstances, it's fair to let me tell you my living circumstances.

Karen Moore: Okay. Go ahead.

Duncan Shaw: And anyone who said why I moved, unless you're a mind reader, you don't actually know. Okay? Behind my house was a string of semi-detached lovely homes owned by people who took great pride. Any given day, the yards were neater than mine. A retired gentleman lived behind me. Weed in his yard, didn't dare. Lots were in mine because his was much better kept than mine. Lovely neighbourhood. Semi-detached. Those of you that felt offended at the idea of the drainage system, and those sort of things being put in green space, I too have kids. I walked my young son in a stroller down what I later found out was a drainage ditch. And it's a lovely area. Okay? I didn't know it was a drainage ditch because it's wonderfully landscaped. Right? I - thank you for defending the Rural - Rural ballplayer, by way of background.

Audience member: Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: Appreciate it.

Karen Moore: What difference -

Audience member: (unclear)

Duncan Shaw: I appreciate it. Okay?

Audience member: (unclear)

Duncan Shaw: I hear you. Before that, I started my company here on a credit card. Okay? I did move a couple times because my wife went back to graduate school. Previous to Hillside, we were in Halifax in a house that bordered the electrical easement. And yes, my children did play under the electrical easement. Okay? I had a baseball field under the electrical easement and no one - everyone survived. Previous to that, we were in Windsor, Ontario with a 66-unit apartment building in my backyard that bothered us not one bit.

Karen Moore: Okay. I'm going to tell you on behalf of all of us here -

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: - it bothers us.

(Audience applauds)

Duncan Shaw: Thank you.

Karen Moore: That's my backyard.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: You bought this lot of land with the zoning.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: So you're so smart and such a moneymaker, why didn't you buy land that was zoned for what you want? Don't cram this down with the other fella's pretty presentation. That's malarkey.

Duncan Shaw: Okay.

Karen Moore: Your concern about the prices of real estate and housing, that you're going to condense it all -

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Karen Moore: You're going to put about a six, at least six-storey unit apartment building behind my house. Look at the little teeny little bit of green space running through there.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: And if you're so smart and your buddies behind there fix the current plan that you found loopholes in that's zoned for low density residence. That's what we bought for. We bought, back about seven, eight years ago.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Karen Moore: It was a farm.

Duncan Shaw: Right.

Karen Moore: We were never told it was going to be rezoned into low density; we found out by coincidence.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Karen Moore: At a home show. We're right on the property border.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: We don't mind that single dens-, low density single dwellings and a few duplexes. We're not opposed to that. You can make money off of that.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Karen Moore: How much money do you need? Because this is not in our best interest. This is in your financial interest. And your buddies behind you, they're being paid well to present a lovely presentation. How much do you expect to profit off of this with 45 - I counted them - townhouse developments there?

Duncan Shaw: The whole subdivision?

Karen Moore: Yeah. The way it is. It's going to be a heck of a lot more than the other; because you wouldn't want it this way if you weren't going to make more money.

Duncan Shaw: Honestly, in a 10 or 15-year time horizon, your guess is as good as mine.

Karen Moore: Lastly -

Duncan Shaw: So, first - okay.

Karen Moore: Answer the water question.

Duncan Shaw: Well, okay. Yes. Well, let's back up. First two things, thank you for considering me smart. It doesn't happen that often. I appreciate it. Two, we're not doing this to wreck anyone's home value.

Karen Moore: You are.

Unidentified audience member: You are.

Karen Moore: You are. You're doing it right now.

Duncan Shaw: No, no, no, no. No, no, no. No, no. Back to - you can only tell me my motives if you're a mind reader. Right?

Unidentified audience member: Oh, come on.

Duncan Shaw: Okay? We are not -

Karen Moore: Do you take me as an idiot?

Unidentified audience member: Yeah, really.

Karen Moore: And all of us in this room?

Duncan Shaw: I am not doing this to wreck anyone's home value. You may disagree on the impact but you can't look at the motive and say: That's - why would I get up in the morning and say: Let's build something to wreck someone's home value?

Karen Moore: Make money.

Unidentified audience member: You own the supply store, that's why.

Karen Moore: And you own the building supplies, yes.

Unidentified audience member: You sell more plywood, you make more money. That's why you want bigger buildings.

Unidentified audience member: Buy us all out.

Unidentified audience member: Okay. Come on, man. Seriously.

Karen Moore: You cannot fool us with your pretty, fancy diagrams and your eloquent speech about it. It's downright down to dollars and cents.

Duncan Shaw: It's a business. We are doing it to make money. That's not a lie.

Karen Moore: You don't care about the residents.

Duncan Shaw: Not true.

Chair: Okay -

Karen Moore: They you won't do this. Do not do this.

Chair: Okay -

Karen Moore: Answer the watershed question then I'll move on.

Chair: Okay. Thanks. I think we know how you feel and we'll get the answer to that question and then we'll go to the next mic over here.

Duncan Shaw: The watershed question or the water supply -

Karen Moore: Well, okay. The water. How are you going to supply water to it? A gentleman already said he can't flush the toilet and wash his hands at the same time.

Duncan Shaw: Honestly, we're in discussion with the city utility on how to handle it. There has been suggestion of us building our own well; and there's some other discussion. And we're discussing with the city utility what to do with it.

Unidentified audience member: Where is that going to take place?

Duncan Shaw: I'm sorry?

Unidentified audience member: Where?

Duncan Shaw: Where what? I'm sorry.

Unidentified audience member: Where are you planning on building your own well? Why don't you build the apartment buildings on that land instead?

Karen Moore: Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: Well, the well would be within the development.

Unidentified audience member: (unclear) and then develop the (unclear) field out at the end of-

Duncan Shaw: I don't believe so. Okay -

Unidentified audience member: On your own road?

Duncan Shaw: Again, it's - it's in discussion with them because they know their plan to supply the water.

Unidentified audience member: They've been planning that for five years, or more.

Duncan Shaw: I can understand that.

Unidentified audience member: At least the city's -

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Chair: And like the road configuration, all of which is hypothetical unless the, you know, the property is, is rezoned and continue to develop. Keep in mind that it's already approved for - there is an approved subdivision plan that is quite dense too. We do have issues with -

Unidentified speaker: Yeah. But we're talking about 300 extra -

Chair: - water supply right now.

Unidentified speaker: - units. Right?

Chair: Go ahead.

Unidentified speaker: That's a lot. I just want to point out, back to financial. You were talking about the example over in Stratford and how this great home didn't depreciate in value.

Duncan Shaw: Sorry.

Unidentified speaker: Phil was talking in his presentation -

Duncan Shaw: Okay.

Unidentified speaker: And he was saying: Look, over in Stratford, there's these multi-houses here and this nice house didn't depreciate in value. So all the other homes in Charlottetown appreciated in value and that one stayed the same? That's not good. Really. Right? Are we going this way or?

Denny Barkhouse: Duncan, what are you doing, man? Like, seriously. We're not that stupid. Look, I'm going to take a different approach. The presentation was great for our side. I mean, you made almost every single point; traffic, going up through Upton right up to the Number 2 from the Trans Canada. Let's not forget. That's traffic coming from the Trans Canada. That's a point. That's what we're trying to say. That commercial space? Come on. It's going to be a gas station at some point. That's the potential for it to be that. Look, all the points. Jonathan, sorry that you're the guy that has to stand here and take this but listen, one great point. Cut off Westway. That's awesome. That was the one single thing you guys said tonight that actually made any sense at all.

(Audience applauds)

One. Now, Duncan, I'm going to take a different approach.

Duncan Shaw: Okay.

Denny Barkhouse: I think you have an opportunity here. I think the City has an opportunity. I think the city planners have an opportunity. Let's build an active environment. Let's build an active neighbourhood. Let's put some - let's put a rink in there. Let's put basketball courts and tennis courts and parks and swimming pools. Let's do that.

(Audience applauds)

Look, I understand business. I'm in business myself. Obviously not at the scale that you are. Someday I will be. But I will definitely be keeping in mind the people that I'm affecting as I go through this process. You have an opportunity. Duncan, you have an opportunity to leave a legacy. You have an opportunity to build a neighbourhood. Seriously. Screw the money; make a little bit of profit. Not a lot. And do something good that you can drive by with your children and say: I was a part of that. I was a part of that.

(Audience applauds)

Be proud of what you do. Money - I was brought up: You be proud of what you do and the money will follow you. You do the right thing; the money will follow you. Don't follow the money; you'll do the wrong thing.

(Audience applauds)

Chair: Sir, can I get you to state your name? We didn't get - we didn't get the name of the last speaker there. If we could just get it for the record.

Denny Barkhouse: I did that on purpose. Denny Barkhouse. Westway Drive. Denny Barkhouse.

Chair: Thanks, Kenny.

Unidentified audience member: Denny.

Unidentified audience member: Denny.

Unidentified audience member: Denny.

Chair: Denny.

Denny Barkhouse: D E N N Y.

Chair: Thanks, Denny.

Mark Richards: Mark Richards, 66 Essex Crescent. I'm a little dot on your map there. You know, he's right. You're just about ready to piss off all West Royalty, my friend. That's not a very good legacy at all. You know what? You make a lot of money off this. There's no - I mean, everybody can see it. Even in the existing proposed subdivision that I bought into and I'm feeling like a little bit of a sucker right now, you make us buy all of our materials from your store. You know, we're putting up with that as it is. I don't even - I don't even quite know the legalities of that as it is. Now, I've built there for a reason. I, too, develop properties. And I'm pretty sure that you'd be quite pissed off if somebody came up right next to you and threatened to lower or devalue your property. Okay? What would you do in the event that somebody threatened your profits?

Duncan Shaw: Threaten my profits?

Mark Richards: If somebody was to threaten your profits, what would you do to them?

Duncan Shaw: Okay. This is a little broad, hypothetical -

Mark Richards: Okay. Let's just say -

Duncan Shaw: I run a building supply store with a Kent monstrosity to be built in the backyard, at the moment.

Mark Richards: Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: I understand threatening to profits. So -

Mark Richards: So how do you feel about that?

Duncan Shaw: It's - you know, it's a challenge.

Mark Richards: It's a challenge. You're challenging us, to a good degree. Now, I have four kids. I built in that neighbourhood because well, it looked like a really good neighbourhood to build in; because the future looked like there was a lot of other R-1 zoned homes that were going to go in there. Now I'm about four lots down from a potential highway. How do you think that makes me feel?

Duncan Shaw: I don't view it as a highway, Mark.

Mark Richards: Well, your little buddy behind you sure does.

(Audience applauds)

And seems to think that it's a bloody good idea too. Which I find - you know what? Like, really - okay. It's really hard to put into words how ripped off and pissed off I really am. Okay? Okay, I come from a coloured background. Alright? I used to do drugs and stuff like that. The only other time I've been that ripped off was from a drug dealer. Okay?

(Audience applauds)

You, my friend, do you consider yourself a greedy man?

Duncan Shaw: No.

Audience member: Yeah.

Mark Richards: Then what the hell are you doing?

(Audience applauds)

Stick to the plan, dude. Stick to the plan. Everybody's bought into the plan. Good plan. You make everybody buy all the materials at your store. Fine. We'll do that. You make us do it anyway. But do this? That, I think, speaks to what your real intent is. And you're greedy. If you weren't, you wouldn't do that. Do what the guy before me said. Do something positive. Don't insult us by making a green space underneath a power line.

(Audience applauds)

I'm against it.

(Audience applauds)

Chair: Folks, 9:30 now. We're two and a half hours in. I said I wanted to let everyone speak who intended to speak. As I said earlier, if your concerns have been raised by someone else and you don't have a burning desire to stand at the mic, then maybe we could just leave it at that. We'll try to get everybody up and wrap up before 10:00, I hope. And let's try to keep it a bit civil. I think that, that Duncan's been called greedy enough tonight. I think he's got that point. So please, please just try to be civil. I know that everyone's very passionate about this. And we want to hear your concerns and get them on the record and be home by 10:00. Go ahead.

Brian Bradley: Brian Bradley. I'd like to re, introduce myself. Brian Bradley, Parkwest. Mr. Mayor, councilmen and councilwomen, developers, I heard something earlier that caused me great concern. Before we get to that, I'd like to hear from Mr. Shaw what went into this - in about 60 seconds, what went into this planning? What, what is the process on your end? Who was involved? I'm just curious. In about 60 seconds.

Duncan Shaw: You going to time me on your phone, Rob? Or do I get -

Brian Bradley: No, that's fine. Just approximately.

Duncan Shaw: We looked at the original plan, recognized some issues that we were uncomfortable with; the first being an engineer pointing out the environmental difficulty of it.

We engaged professionals - because I'm an accountant by training. I'm not a planner. We gained professionals, namely Phil, some of the engineering staff, to look at the opportunities with the land, what would fit within the neighbourhood; went through four to five, before we let anyone else see it, versions. And yes, it is a business. We evaluated the financials. We evaluated the economics. We evaluated the environmental. We evaluated against the city's Official Plan, which to me, was a criteria to develop a piece of land against. We took it to the folks at Planning and then it became part of the official process from there, that you've heard about a couple times tonight, how it flows.

Brian Bradley: Okay. Can you explain to me what went into, what process went into the decision to close that road earlier?

Duncan Shaw: The Westway Road?

Brian Bradley: Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: The -

Brian Bradley: What was the process -

Duncan Shaw: The northwest road on the left or the Parkwest Road?

Brian Bradley: Is it Westway, folks?

Unidentified: Westway.

Brian Bradley: Yeah?

Unidentified: You're talking to me, right?

Brian Bradley: Yeah. Westway. Now, what went into that decision? What process was followed? Who did you consult before you just made that decision? I'm just -

Duncan Shaw: To close it?

Brian Bradley: Just to close it like that -

Duncan Shaw: To close it or open it has been discussed at length between ourselves, the folks, the professionals that we engaged, folks in planning, the City folks. As someone mentioned earlier, it's not entirely my decision to close it. I'm just saying I have no problem with it.

Brian Bradley: Because it looks to me like it's open -

Duncan Shaw: So, so I -

Brian Bradley: - on, on that map.

Duncan Shaw: It is. So that is what's going to City Council.

Brian Bradley: Okay.

Duncan Shaw: But as I made the point, -

Brian Bradley: Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: - it's a collaborative process with many people involved. I personally have no problem, you know, with the suggestion - we, we only got the traffic study here two or three days ago. Three days ago? Two days ago?

Unidentified: Last Friday. Yes.

Duncan Shaw: Last Friday. And that recommendation is there. Again, trusting the professionals in the area, he made the recommendation to close it with a breakaway barrier for, you know, safety purposes.

Brian Bradley: Okay.

Duncan Shaw: And I have no problem with that recommendation.

Brian Bradley: Okay. Because correct - I'm new to this process. This is the first time someone has imposed something like this on me in my backyard. I'm, like, you know, earlier I mentioned I'm a new homeowner.

Duncan Shaw: Umhum.

Brian Bradley: To me, it looked like it was a decision made on the whim. And that concerns me because we're talking about rezoning an area to allow a higher population to go in there. And we're talking about a commercial property that's supposed to go in there as well. Well, what happens if we make a decision on the whim to change that, decision on the whim to add more apartments to these buildings? How much thought is going into this process? Have you been consulted?

Duncan Shaw: Sir, may I answer that question?

Brian Bradley: Certainly.

Duncan Shaw: Months. Hundreds of hours. I have the bills from many different types of professionals looking at it. Honestly, you may disagree with the output, but please don't dispute the effort of how much we've put into this to try and do a project that's an addition to the community. You may - like I say, I fully understand you may disagree with the results but we have worked very hard to put this project together. So please, if I said something that gave you a misconception, we're making decisions on a whim, I apologize because that's not what we're doing.

Brian Bradley: Okay. Well, I just wanted to give you a chance to talk to that. I'm -

Duncan Shaw: Thank you for that.

Chair: Okay. I think we'll -

Brian Bradley: But I'm still having difficulty understanding.

Chair: If you've got any more questions -

Brian Bradley: Because on a map, it's open.

Chair: - let's see if we can get them answered quickly here.

Brian Bradley: That's all I have to say.

Chair: Okay. Thanks. Let's -

Duncan Shaw: Thank you for letting me clarify that.

(Audience applauds)

Richard Schroeder: Hello.

Unidentified: Hello, sir.

Richard Schroeder: Jeez, that's loud. Alright. My name is Richard Schroeder and I have that little property right there off of Sleepy Hollow Road that seems to, unfortunately, jut fairly far into your plan. And I'm - I found a lot of - yes, right there. Initially, I had a lot of very furious feelings inside. And you had mentioned harmony. The gentleman over here had mentioned harmony. And you're surrounding me with, it looks like, a million townhouses and duplexes on each side, bringing my value of my property down. Now, right now I have no - I have one neighbour who's right beside me there. And one across the street. I guess that's not Charlottetown. And I don't - I love neighbours. Neighbours are great. And I expected this place will be built up at some point. And a community - you know, it's good to be part of a community. And I like, also, people who can make profit. That's awesome. But making profit to the detriment of, of my investment seems a little distasteful. So that's all I wanted to, to say.

(Audience applauds)

Duncan Shaw: Thank you.

Todd Gregory: My name's Todd Gregory. I live on Essex Crescent in Windsor Park. I just wanted to give a little different perspective coming from someone who doesn't have a family. I'm a first-time homebuyer. I basically, you know, emptied out the savings accounts; broke the piggy bank and you know, went to the bank; got a, got a mortgage. I looked around, like you. Lots, lots of hours went into this. And it's an investment just like what you're doing. I bought into this neighbourhood at the beginning because it was a very nice place. I liked the underground electrical work, a lot of R-1 houses going up. It was just a nice neighbourhood that I thought that I could get, you know, a good place to live for many years and then turn around later on in my life, when it's time to make a decision, and sell it for, hopefully a higher value. Adding townhouses and apartments and duplexes does not increase the value. And I know you said in your presentation there's townhouses over in Stratford that, you know, started for 159 and sold for 200 but I don't think we're taking into consideration that those numbers are probably based off the housing crash in 2008/2009 when things were terrible. And now housing prices everywhere, no matter if it's a townhouse or an apartment, have gone up in the last little while. So, you know, I lived in an apartment over in Stratford and I can, I can tell you right now I wanted away from it. You know, nothing against anyone who, who does live in an apartment or, or around an apartment. But there was noise complaints every night, cops in and out of the - this

is one of the new apartments over in Stratford. When you walked out of the apartment, there was the smell of garbage. There was about 100 garbage cans around. There was traffic in and out of the neighbourhood. It was just - it was too much. So I made a conscious effort to move to this area in hopes that the plans would stay the same. And I guess what it really boils down to is if I had have known that there was going to be apartments and townhouses and commercial property in that area at the time, I may have made a different decision. But I feel like I've kind of been scammed and, and had the rug pulled out from under my feet because I already made that investment with all of my savings. And now I'm being told that my property is basically going to be devalued because you want to do something different. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Jeannette Brake: Hi. My name is Jeannette Brake. I live in Parkwest on Parkway Drive. I share a lot of the concerns of people here today about traffic, the school. I'm not going to touch on those because they have already been talked about. I do just have a couple of notes here. I'm going to read from them so that I get my point across. Just to the Council, I hope that you take into account all of the concerns of the people here tonight and reject the proposed rezoning and uphold the current zoning that is in the neighbourhood. The Council -

(Audience applauds)

Thank you. I don't understand why the residents of Charlottetown always have to consistently defend the neighbourhoods that they've put money into. You know, we pay a premium to -

(Audience applauds)

- live in these communities. And we pay a premium to, pay for property taxes in this communities. Why is the onus on us to defend ourselves for purchasing in what we believed was low density residential housing? And that's all I have to say.

(Audience applauds)

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: Hi. My name is Kurt Lascow-Pooley. I live on Alderwood Avenue. I just have a few questions. First main question. I think I know your answer but I thought I'd double check. The tree line on the edge that leans into Alderwood Avenue, is that going to be taken down or, or kept up?

Duncan Shaw: Which tree lines?

Unidentified: Top right there. Up, up, up -

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: Yeah. Just along there.

Unidentified: - up up. Right there.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: All along there. Yeah.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah. There's no reason to cut it down.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: That's going to be kept the same. Okay. Myself - my wife and I moved over from, as you can gather, the UK about three years ago. And we saved pretty hard for our

first house. And we paid quite a high price and we pay high taxes which we thought - because of the standard of living. And that's something that's obviously going to significantly devalue our house. And we don't know how much yet. But that's something that's going to have quite a big financial, financial restraint on us. And I think that's something that a lot of families are going to have to sort of deal with. And just a quick question. I think the point got lost slightly earlier, in talking about people's backyards and you also, what's in your backyard. The question I have is: It's all very well you saying that you had an apartment on your backyard or an electrical power house. Was any of that built while you were there? Or did you buy your house knowing that was there? Because obviously then -

(Audience applauds)

Duncan Shaw: The apartment building was (unclear) built while I was there).

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: Because that obviously has a big, big devaluation. That's something that we're all facing. And we're obviously -

Duncan Shaw: I made money on that house.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: - we're really passionate about. And obviously I think everyone in this room -

Duncan Shaw: And I guess honestly and you know, you know, I may be shooting myself in the foot but let me speak, you know, really bluntly here for a second. I made money on that house that I sold - bought it with a field behind; sold it with an apartment building. The house on Hillside that backs onto duplexes, I bought it; 14 months later I listed it for almost \$8,000 more than I bought it for, on the realtor's recommendation, backing on the duplexes. I pulled it off the market because we had an employee in trouble and needed a home. So it's now sort of a loaner. But you know, that house in 14 months, it appreciated substantially backing onto duplexes. Which is why I hope you believe when we say there's no intention here to anyone's property value. Because I've had this experience twice and property increased in values both times.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: I find that hard to believe and I'm fully expecting ours to be decreased.

(Audience applauds)

Just one quick point. Obviously mine - other people want to talk. I just echo what everyone said. Our street, Alderwood Avenue, it's a great thing to see the children playing.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: We, we are very fortunate to have a seven-week old girl who I hope -

Duncan Shaw: Congratulations.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: - one day - thank you, one day will play on the street or have -

Duncan Shaw: Yeah.

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: - the opportunity to. And I think there's going to be a significant traffic increase. And I, I'm really worried for, for the kids. And I think this is going to have a detrimental effect to the kids playing on the street, which is a horrible thing. I think.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Kurt Lascow-Pooley: Thank you.

Dan Gabler: Well, first of all, Duncan, I appreciate your courage in standing up in the hot seat. And I -

Duncan Shaw: You didn't give me a lot of choice, Dan.

Dan Gabler: Well, no. Yeah. Maybe. Anyways, I'm -

Duncan Shaw: You know me. I don't shy away.

Dan Gabler: Hopefully I don't make your seat any hotter.

Duncan Shaw: That's okay.

Dan Gabler: But some of my first points I wanted to address to one of the key documents that the councillors are going to be looking at. And that's the, your planning staff's report. And so my first paragraph - excuse me if I read. I don't want to miss anything. (Reads) I wanted to thank you for making public the city planner's report so that we have a chance to see her comments. I was expecting to see an analysis weighing the pros and cons of the submission. Apparently this planner likes the idea of what she referred to as, quotation, "complete neighbourhoods." A fancy word being used here to describe high density development; stacking commercial, huge apartments, basically everything but a crematorium, all within the space of two city blocks. Of course I'm joking about the crematorium. I suspect that if the developer wants it, it would be a logical extension of what she described as allowing people to age in place in the neighbourhood.

(Audience applauds)

Duncan Shaw: I knew you were getting that crematorium in there tonight. I knew you were.

Dan Gabler: She suggests that this is more desirable to the, than the current plan. We have 353 names on a petition that strongly disagree with her vision of a desirable family-oriented neighbourhood.

(Audience applauds)

We have 350 names - 353 And there's also forms if you want to make it 354. We have 353 names on a petition that says that we love the current R-2S low density, family friendly residential zoning and we don't want it changed at all, ever.

(Audience applauds)

I'll just read in the event that some people aren't aware of the wording of the petition. Petition to stop the rezoning of Windsor Park. We enjoy its existing R-2S low density residential designation, vote to deny the rezoning application for Windsor Park. We, the undersigned, would like the planning board and city councillors to deny, vote no to the proposed submission to change the existing R-2S zoning in Windsor Park. Many of the concerned residents have already voiced their own personal reasons why this proposed zoning change should be denied. Many of the reasons are shared in common and include: We moved to this area because of its existing zoning, low density, primarily single family residential R-2S, which provides the quality of life we want: minimal traffic and attractive, quite, urban landscape, a safer play environment for our children and so on. And it preserves the value of our properties.

(Audience applauds)

I have to tell you councillors, I'm angry. I am angry at the process. The process is backwards. I'm angry that I have to come to this meeting to defend my rights as a property owner, to enjoy my home and to live in the kind of low density, family-oriented neighbourhood that I chose to invest and to live in. How many people in the audience feel the way I do?

(Audience applauds)

I have been told all about due process and that we have to entertain just about any scheme that is put forward. I think that the bylaws have been written backwards. I think that the bylaws need to be amended to include a simple fairness test. Require the developer to get the support of at least 10 percent of the surrounding residents before any new proposal can be brought forward.

(Audience applauds)

I would think that if any change is fair to the people who live in the community, then it should be an easy task to get this first 10 percent support. In this case, I would challenge the developer to find two percent of the surrounding residents who are in favour of his scheme. How many people would agree that this proposal serves the interest of the developer much more than the interest of the community and surrounding residents?

(Audience applauds)

What is a desirable residential neighbourhood? It is exactly what we, the residents, define it to be. We, the residents, own this neighbourhood. Not the developer. Not the councillors or mayor. We want it to keep its existing zoning, the basis of why we live in it. The councillors and mayor are here to represent us and our interests. Once the developer has sold off all of the lots and made his money, he will be gone. We will be left to pay the price of the decision that is made this month, if it should turn out bad. We pay some of the highest property taxes in Canada. Don't let us pay this price as well. How many people feel the way I do?

(Audience applauds)

At the end, I'm going to present you with the petition but I have one last thing. I'm reminded of what John F. Kennedy once said: The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men should do nothing. So I am standing up here for what I believe in. I urge you, Councillors,

to deny the Applicant's proposal and respect the wishes of the people who live in this community.

(Audience applauds)

I guess I jumped the gun. I didn't state my name. I'm Dan Gabler and I live in Windsor Park.

(Audience applauds)

Chair: Okay. I see Becky at the mic.

Rebecca Dickinson: Yes. Rebecca Dickinson.

Chair: And I see some people standing at the back of the room. I'm not sure if they're standing there or, or wanting to get to the mic. But, again, I'm going to ask that we try to get everyone up as, as soon as possible. It's almost 10:00.

Rebecca Dickinson: I can't help but think that this looks like urban sprawl to me. Just like what's happening in all these larger centres. Calgary, Toronto. Whatever city in Canada. And I just don't like it. I don't think it matches the Island mentality and the Island way of life that people desire. I see a lot of people in this room that have young families. And just from living in West Royalty, I sense that most of them may be two income families working very hard just to afford the neighbourhood that they live in and to maintain the home. That probably is their biggest asset and I just don't feel that this matches what people have been working hard to invest in. I think probably a lot of people here maybe have left the Island to go away to school to be educated; have had that big city experience but have chosen to come back to the Island because that's the life that they prefer and that's where they want to raise their children.

(Audience applauds)

This is going to be one of the biggest neighbourhoods in Charlottetown in 10 years and I can't help but feel for the people - I live in Grace Baptist so I'm a little bit removed, however on the same side of the city. I can't help but feel for the people that live in this smaller section that's already there because in 8, 9, 10 years, when people are moving in, when these people are upset because of what's happening, they want to sell their house and move, how are they going to sell their home? The property value has gone down and people are moving in buying brand new stuff. They're not going to want the pre-existing stuff that's already there. They're going to lose value. They're going to want to move to the country because that's what they signed up for in the first place. So they're leaving to find that again. Nobody's going to buy the 15-year-old house that's right there on the corner. They're going to go to the back of the li-, and pick out something brand new. So then you're going to have all these houses for sale that nobody will want to buy because they'll want to be updating kitchens and all that kind of stuff, when they could just walk in a turn-key home down the street. And then all these houses will be for sale. What's that going to do to the real estate market in Charlottetown when people won't want to be buying these houses? I just wonder if that's been thought about. When it's being built in stages, there will be different stages of, and ages of homes.

Duncan Shaw: Yeah. Right.

Rebecca Dickinson: And that's really going to affect the value.

(Audience applauds)

Duncan Shaw: That's your analysis.

Kevin Bustard: Hi. My name is Kevin Bustard and I, I live in Parkwest. I moved in there two years ago with my family with the intention of: This is the place where my girls are going to grow up. Duncan, I'm going to let you off the hot seat here. I have a question for Mr. Wood and I forget the name of the traffic engineer. I'm sorry. It was a while ago. A lot of the things you presented at the beginning, your five points that you spoke about, could a lot of them not be taken care of with the original plan? Just rerouting traffic, restructuring the single house dwelling and some duplexes rather than the apartments and townhouses?

(Audience applauds)

I am looking for an answer. I don't want to cost you a contract or anything but I would like an answer.

Philip Wood: The answer is some of them can be and some of them can't be. The problem is when you're talking about aging and different types of housing -

Kevin Bustard: Okay. So we can look at -

Philip Wood: - those things are very -

Kevin Bustard: - single level duplexes?

Philip Wood: Yes. If we're looking at -

Kevin Bustard: So there's no stairs for seniors and such.

Philip Wood: But if we're looking at a fairly homogenous kind of subdivision where we have, basically, all single family or perhaps semi-detached, -

Kevin Bustard: Mm.

Philip Wood: - that's a very good fit for young families. It's a good fit for certain people within society. It's a bad fit, perhaps, for empty-nesters or seniors. So there's a number of the things in there that need to have a more diverse neighbourhood in order to be accommodated. But you're absolutely right. There are a significant number of those items that could be incorporated into a redesign of the current, current subdivision.

Kevin Bustard: Okay. Thank you. So, so I would ask Council and maybe ask Duncan to go back to the drawing board. He had four or five drafts before. Maybe we could look at one of them that is still single dwelling and duplex.

(Audience applauds)

Maybe a bit better green space for kids and such to make it an active environment rather than, than what we see before us. Thank you.

(Audience applauds)

Kevin Kennedy: Kevin - my name is Kevin Kennedy. I live at 65 Alderwood Avenue Parkwest. Been there seven years this July. This is one of three neighbourhoods I've lived in, in Charlottetown and my wife and I chose to live there based on the previous developer of Parkwest, MacPhee Developers. That would be a single-family street. So we specifically purchased our lot on Alderwood because it was single family. We have an in-law suite so we have our parents with us. And, Duncan, that is one option for incorporating the seniors into the neighbourhoods, is to have in-law suites. And I think the present zoning accommodates that. We have a number of semi-detached throughout our neighbourhood. I think it meets the city's 25 percent that is allowed under the present zoning. The first order of business when MacPhees were no longer involved in the subdivision was they ignored what we were told in purchasing our lot and they built a semi-detached at the end of Alderwood. So you'll forgive me if I don't trust you with what you're telling me. My home will back onto that first row of duplexes and then I'll look out onto the townhouses and then finally onto the mixed-use corridor which, City Council, is a mistake. We don't need a mixed-use corridor in the middle of a residential neighbourhood. I'm sorry. Please deny this application.

(Audience applauds)

Dan Gabler: Oh, by the way, they may not get a crematorium but they could put a funeral home in the mixed-use corridor. It's one of the 43 approved uses.

Iona Breining: So one of my last few sentences. We are the people. We built Prince Edward Island. You guys sitting there, you are there because we trust you and we need your help. And we, we elect you again all over again if you will be on our side. Just let it be - I promise.

(Audience applauds)

And when I promise something, I keep my word. I'm Hungarian. So please, I begging you, just leave the original plan and don't mix that area. We want that area residential.

(Audience applauds)

And we trust you and we are begging you. And hopefully you will prove that you are our side now. I'm right or not?

(Audience applauds)

Chair: Okay. That looks like the end of our, our speakers. Oh. No. We've got one more.

Melinda Morrison: Take my time going up. Hi. My name is Melinda Morrison. I live at 2 Devonshire Street. We just moved in last December. I'm the one that sent the e-mail where I went through the entire plan for the City of Charlottetown. And I realize that Duncan also went through the official plan. I just want to point out a couple of things. One of the central themes in the City's plan is quality of life. And right now, this does not improve our quality of life. Okay?

(Audience applauds)

On page 5 - I'm going to read this, if you just excuse me for a second for reading. It says: The Charlottetown plan is seen as - and I quote - vision of the future. The City acknowledges the strong desire of the people who make up the City to protect and strengthen the neighbourhoods that have evolved over time. I don't believe that this actually meets that need. So -

(Audience applauds)

- I am in complete disagreement with this plan. And Duncan, we had a conversation on my, on my front step. I don't know if you recall.

Duncan Shaw: I do.

Melinda Morrison: And I did ask Duncan about his home and how he would like it if somebody walked up and knocked on his door and said: I'm going to put an apartment building across the road. And he flat out said to me: I wouldn't like it very much. And that's a quote. So now you know how we feel.

(Audience applauds)

Okay? Thank you.

Duncan Shaw: That's not quite what I said.

Chair: Okay. A quick note on process because I was asked to explain that. I think we know how we got to here. I tried to explain at the beginning of the meeting. But from here out, tomorrow there's a meeting of Planning Board. This is part of the process as laid out in, in our bylaw. We bring it back to Planning Board and we, we reconsider the application in light of the feedback that we've received from the public here tonight and we forward a recommendation to Council. That recommendation may also be to defer the application if we're seeking further input or, or seeking changes in the application. But so the options are to recommend approval, recommend rejection, or to defer it. That will go to Council on Monday, May 13th for a final decision. So again, thank you all for coming here tonight and for being so patient. Many of you waited through a lengthy first item on the agenda. We really appreciate your feedback and thanks for coming.

Unidentified: What time does Council (unclear) Monday?

Chair: 7 p.m.

Unidentified: (unclear)

Chair: It is. But it's a pretty small room. It's streamed on the Internet as well. It's streamed online, on the City's web site. You can find it under council meetings and it's actually streamed live online.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.