

Minutes of a Town of Pictou Public Hearing meeting convened at the CN Station – Council Chambers on the above date. Mayor James Ryan presiding.

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Shawn McNamara; Councillors Dan Currie, Nadine LeBlanc and Melinda MacKenzie

ALSO PRESENT: Kyle Slaunwhite, CAO
Roland Burek, Planning/Development Officer (DO)
Nicole MacDonald, Deputy Clerk/Minute Recorder

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Ryan called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It was acknowledged that Town Council was meeting on the ancestral lands of the Mi'kmaq and in the unceded territory of Mi'kma'ki.

3. APPEAL OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL (SPA) – 88 PATTERSON ST, FORMER PICTOU ACADEMY BUILDING

The Mayor called on the DO to review the history of the SPA.

The application is on behalf of the Town of Pictou. Town Council has reached a tentative agreement with a potential purchaser to convert the former institutional space into a multi-unit residential use, with a small office component. The residential space would be used as accommodations for workers during their stay in Pictou, where they would be employed by the shipyard. This type of SPA is permitted in the existing institutional zone, but it is not automatic. Appeals can be made, which would trigger an Appeal Hearing.

The DO advised that notices were sent to people within 200 ft of property, informing them of their opportunity to appeal the SPA. Five written appeals were received which triggered this Appeal Hearing.

He also advised that Council can make a decision to proceed with or reject the SPA at the Special Meeting of Council immediately following this hearing or defer a decision pending the collection of additional information.

The Mayor called on the property owner, the Town of Pictou, to provide further information. The CAO spoke on behalf of the Town and reported that only one proposal has been received to repurpose the building; the offer is for \$150,000 with a \$2 million planned investment that supports housing for a major town employer.

- Question on costs incurred by the Town to date – \$80,000 in heat in the first year in addition to annual insurance; the building was winterized and heat was reduced the next year, some damage still occurred because of this; some vandalism has taken place as well

- Question on who received the secondary information piece in response to written submissions – any resident, including those outside the 200 ft limit, that contacted DO about the appeal
- Question on tear down cost – \$600,000 to \$800,000

At this point, the public was invited to comment. Some highlights from written submissions include:

- Paul and Pam Bridgeo – concern that this development might create negative effect on residential values, questioned security, parking, background checks of residents, requested public meetings on development
- Paul and Alison McCallum – interest in repurposing will help with vandalism and add a revenue stream for the Town; concern expressed about the proximity to school, how will it look, whether there is a plan that can be viewed, who can appeal the Plan, do not want commercial in residential zone; what does temporary residential use mean, how will parking be handled, timeframe, was school board notified, traffic and noise concerns, concern for walking traffic safety
- Terry Steeves – biggest concern is lack of information shared in the letters
- Gordon and Lorraine Chapman (2 submissions) – Question on usage and number of units; is exterior to remain the same; will it house temporary workers and office space; if purpose not adhered to does the town have recourse; would they initially renovate a portion or do it in stages; concern with not knowing the neighbours as they would be coming and going; will there be stipulations that developer must keep the purpose for extended period of time; if developer flips the building what happens

Other public comments made:

- Clarification asked on Development Agreement process
- Question on who is paying the rent
- Question on whether the Town completed a needs assessment of the area
- Question on what temporary housing means
- Question on basketball courts and who owns them – CCRSB has ‘care and control’
- Question on whether the Department of Education has been advised – No, but they will be informed
- Question on sewer infrastructure and how this would be impacted – no issues
- Question on parking
- Comment on no comparison of 300 students vs 58 full-time people
- Question on whether this could close hotels
- Comment for the need of a sidewalk
- Question on details of SPA and whether public will be privy to the info
- Question on whether it is foreign workers that will be housed here
- Comment that parents whose children attend the nearby school should be notified
- Question on next steps after this public hearing
- Question on how the property was marketed for sale over the last 5 years
- Question on development timelines
- Comment that there are too many unknown questions and that the developer should be in attendance to respond
- Question on timelines of Purchase and Sale Agreement

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.

APPROVED

James J. Ryan
Mayor

Kyle Slaunwhite
CAO