

**Virtual Public Meeting using Microsoft Teams**  
**68 Queen's Road**  
**Tuesday, November 17, 2020 1:00 pm**  
**Wednesday, November 18, 2020 7:00 pm**

**Present:**     **Facilitator**  
Marie Ryan

**City of St. John's**  
Ken O'Brien, Chief Municipal Planner  
Ann Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage  
Maureen Harvey, Legislative Assistant - Session 1  
Shanna Fitzgerald, Legislative Assistant - Session 2

**Proponents**  
Rick Pardy, Parish Lane Development  
Phillip Pratt, Architect  
Paul Chafe, Architect  
representing the proponent, Parish Lane Development Inc.

The number of people at each session was approximately as follows:

- November 17, 2020  45
- November 18, 2020  39

Prior to each session, Ann Marie Cashin conducted a short session for those who required support for the online platform being used for the meeting to explain some of the features of MS Teams.

**CALL TO ORDER AND BACKGROUND PRESENTATIONS**

Marie Ryan, Chairperson and Facilitator for the meeting, referenced the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, necessitating this as the City's first virtual public meeting. To that end she requested patience and understanding as the City works through this new technological approach.

Facilitator Ryan outlined the rules for decorum to ensure everyone who wishes to speak has equal opportunity to do so and that such should be done in a respectful manner.

The process for the virtual meeting was outlined with the following points highlighted:

- The video recording is for the purpose of minute-taking until such point as minutes have been finalized. The recording will not be posted to the City's website.
- Media was in attendance. The City provided guidelines for media participation which included: identifying themselves as a member of the media and requesting

them to refrain from quoting members of the public without their explicit permission.

- For those participants who wish to speak, it was requested to use the “raise your hand” feature of MS teams.

Ms. Ryan indicated that the agenda for the meeting will allow City staff to provide an overview of the proposed development following which time the proponent will present additional information. Following the presentation questions and comments will be considered from participants.

Participants were advised that this report will highlight the points made by members of the public without identifying each speaker. In addition, written comments will be accepted by the Office of the City Clerk and appended to this report.

All written submissions received in response to the application be included with the minutes of this meeting and referred to Council. Submissions will be redacted to protect private information of the submitter as per ATIPP legislation.

## **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

Ann Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage for the City, outlined the purpose of the meeting which is to consider an application to rezone land located at 66-68 Queen’s Road (Cathedral Parish Hall). She provided the following background and current status of the application as follows:

### **Background and Current Status**

Following a public meeting on November 27, 2019 to discuss rezoning and development for 66-68 Queen’s Road, the applicant changed the proposed design. The applicant now proposes four (4) townhouses (instead of a large residential building) along Queen’s Road and has re-oriented the proposed 36-unit residential building on Harvey Road. The revised Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR) is available on the City’s website for public review.

The Minister of Environment, Climate Change and Municipalities has requested public consultation in relation to the proposed St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan Amendment No. 1, 2020 to re-designate land at 66-68 Queen’s Road from Public Open Space to Urban Development. A copy of the amendment is available upon request.

This proposed Regional Plan amendment would enable Council to amend the St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations to accommodate the proposed development. With the change in proposed building types, Council is considering different zones than previously advertised. Council is considering rezoning the land on Queen’s Road from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Residential Mixed (RM) Zone for the

townhouses, and from the Open Space (O) Zone to a new site-specific Apartment zone on Harvey Road to accommodate the Apartment Building and ensure that its size and height remains as shown. A Municipal Plan amendment is required.

The existing building, Cathedral Parish Hall, is designated by Council as a Heritage Building and the applicant's design proposes demolition of this building to allow for the new buildings.

The subject property is currently zoned Institutional (INST) at the front of the property along Queen's Road and Open Space (O) at the rear of the property along Harvey Road, which do not permit this type of residential development.

At the April 29, 2019 Council Meeting, Council decided that they would consider the amendment, set a Term for Reference for a Land Use Assessment Report so that more information about the proposed development could be presented to the public prior to Council making a decision on this application. The Land Use Assessment Report was initially presented in December 2019. Based on the feedback from that meeting, the applicant has revised the application and drafted a new Land Use Assessment Report. This report is available on the City's website.

The applicant is now proposing a 36-unit apartment building along Harvey Road and 3 townhouses along Queen's Road. The townhouses would attach to the existing resident house which is designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

Given the change in the type of dwelling proposed, the City is now considering rezoning the land to Residential Mixed along Queen's Road and a site-specific zone along Harvey Road. The Commercial Central Mixed Zone is no longer considered appropriate for townhousing here. The Residential Mixed Zone would allow the potential for conversion of the townhouse units to commercial or office space at some point in the future, similar to the buildings along Church Hill. This idea was raised during the last round of public consultation.

Staff is considering a site-specific zone along Harvey Road. If this is approved by Council, the purpose of this zone would be to ensure that the size of the development proposed is what is built. Zones normally have minimum setbacks and maximum height, in addition to other standards. Re-zoning this site to one of the existing zones could allow for a larger building to be built than what is proposed. Therefore, a site-specific zone would set the minimum setbacks to near the edge of the proposed building.

The applicant is proposing a building height of 18m along Harvey Road. Given the slope of the site, this is about 5 stories along Harvey Road and about 10 storeys at the rear of the building. The applicant also proposes underground and above ground parking, a green roof and protection of the existing trees at the perimeter of the property.

In addition to the St. John's amendments, a Regional Plan amendment is required for this development. In order for the municipal amendment to proceed, a Regional Plan

amendment is needed to re-designate the land from the Public Open Space designation to the Urban Development designation. This was not known at the time of the last public meeting. The Minister has given permission to consider this amendment. Similar to the City's process, this permission is allowing the amendment to go to public consultation. The Regional Plan amendment will require the Minister's approval in order to be approved at the municipal level.

The Minister's draft amendment explains why the land along Harvey Road is designated Public Open Space in the Regional Plan. It states a project undertaken by the Department in 2014 to legally update the St. John's Urban Region Regional Plan paper map to a digital map changed the regional designation for many parcels of land throughout the region to directly reflect municipal designations. The new digital map was intended to ensure compliance between regional land use designations and municipal land use designations; however, in some areas of the region, the new map introduced a level of detail that reflected the municipal plans but did not correspond to the regional plan policies.

In the original Regional Plan, much of St. John's was historically designated 'Urban Development'. The subject property was captured in this designation; however, this was changed in 2014 to the 'Public Open Space' designation to reflect the City's Open Space land use designations. As a result, the Regional Plan designates a portion of the proposed development area as 'Public Open Space'. The Regional Plan policies for 'Public Open Space' is limited to specific public provincial and national parks in the Region, including Signal Hill, Cape Spear, CA Pippy Park, Butterpot Park, and Cochrane Pond Park. It is not the intent of the Regional Plan to capture privately held or municipally zoned open space lands within the Regional 'Public Open Space' designation as these are accommodated in the 'Urban Development' designation.

With respect to heritage, Cathedral Parish Hall is designated as a Heritage Building by Council and the designation is confined to the footprint of the building. Further, the site is located in Heritage Area 1 and the St. John's Ecclesiastical District.

If this proposal proceeds, the applicant is requesting to demolish Cathedral Parish Hall, but will maintain the residential building at the left gable end of the building and will incorporate the original arch into the new development.

A draft version of the revised Land Use Assessment Report was reviewed by the Built Heritage Experts Panel. The Panel made four recommendations which include:

- consideration of the retention of trees along Queen's Road where possible a stronger commitment to preserve, retain and use the existing arch in the new design. The Panel is not agreeable to demolition of the arch simply for the purpose of reducing cost.
- The original materials of the archway should be incorporated into the new design as in the original arrangement. Otherwise the arch to remain at its current location.

- the proposed inclusion of a small interpretive sculptural arch to the right of the townhouse could be more appropriately repositioned to mitigate potential damage. The repurposed brick in the feeding area may be a better location for something interpretive. The current location could be prone to destruction by vehicles or plows.
- the look of the development from Harvey Road could be improved. The Harvey Road façade could incorporate some of the elements from the townhouse building, such as the window style.

These comments were incorporated into the final version of the Land Use Assessment Report.

## **PRESENTATION BY THE DEVELOPER**

Rick Pardy introduced himself, Philip Pratt and Paul Chafe to speak on behalf of the developer, Parish Lane Development. A presentation was displayed which included architectural renderings of the proposed development. A copy of the presentation is appended to these minutes.

The following points were noted:

- There has been substantial public engagement with the community including the following:
  - The Rooms
  - Partnered with Heritage NL and Happy Cities
  - Conducted an online survey
  - Engagement with a focus group
  - Design charette was moderated by a third-party architectural firm, ERA Architects
- Proposed redesign includes:
  - Queen's Road grade-related housing
    - Four residences
    - Brick façade
    - Incorporation of design elements from existing building
  - Multi-family building has been rotated 90 degrees
    - Increases minimum distance from Garrison Hill boundaries
    - Same distance from Kirk boundary
    - 4 stories above Harvey Road (18m)
    - Provides more natural landscape
  - Minimizes visible parking
  - Density remains low (<1.8 FAR)

- Advanced Development
  - Redeveloped former residence
  - Engaged professional arborist
  - Installed core municipal infrastructure
  - Hazardous material abatement
  
- Summary
  - Increases residential in downtown
  - Utilizes existing city infrastructure
  - Very responsible in terms of density and size
  - Embraces green space
  - Respects heritage buildings
  - Protects views and streetscapes
  - Thoughtful design balancing objectives and key issues

**COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS – SESSION 1**

Facilitator Marie Ryan invited comments from the general public. The following is a summary of comments that represent the people who spoke at the meeting.

<b>COMMENTS – SESSION 1 – NOVEMBER 17, 2020</b>	
Speaker #	Commentary
1.	Appreciates the effort of the developer in maintaining the green space. Is in favor of rezoning but prefers the green space to be preserved. There is a mental health benefit to preserving wild green spaces. In this area it is important to recognize that not everyone has a back yard, therefore maintaining the green space is more important. Has always expected some sort of development on this site but chose to live in this area because of the green space available. Recognizes improvement from previous design and is pleased to see that the Queen’s Road space will be developed first. Somewhat concerned that Council may not be able to enforce details of the building as proposed. Endorses the Queen’s Road portion of zoning but feels that the open space component conflicts with Section 3.1 of the Municipal Plan. In summary, feels there is an opportunity for compromise with respect to this development.
2.	Representing NL Historic Trust – comments to be submitted in writing. Believes many of the earlier concerns expressed have been addressed. Incorporation of original masonry elements is welcomed but is concerned that some historic elements may not be incorporated. Recommends a reduced pavement area.

3.	Supports the proposal. Feels the plan is well thought out and good for the City. Would increase property tax base and promote employment. Commended the developer for making changes.
4.	Overall design goes beyond design elements. St. John's is continuing to "pluck the feathers" off the goose that laid the golden egg. There are unique features to the National Designated Ecclesiastical Historic district which have not been referenced in this proposal. The proposal does not respect heritage building and the history of this site. View planes from the Kirk and Harvey Road are not shown. This development will have a profound impact on the potential of having the site being given national historic status. Designation of Queen's Road is Pandora's box which opens the site up for commercial development. Questions Council's commitment for the retention of historic preservation. Requested view planes that show exactly the number of meters above Harvey Road and how they impact the Kirk.
5.	Voiced support of the development as it gives the site a "much-needed" facelift. It increases density and still maintains a large portion of green space. Unlike the existing site it will encourage people to come to the downtown. It will be a marketable product for the City.
6.	Reflected on the number of developments that have occurred in recent years within 1 km of the site. Did some consulting work for the developer. Level of engagement for this project has been high and the proposal has set the new standard for public engagement. Two developments referenced were the former Tobacco Factory on Bond Street and Carriage House on Bond Street. Others include 19 Church Hill, 56-64 Queen's Road (BIS property), 40 Henry Street (Star of the Sea Property), and former Standard Manufacturing Property. All these developments are indicative of a learning trend in the downtown. Suggests that residential development is much more conducive to this area than would be commercial or industrial. Fully supports this trend in development and repurposing older and vacant properties.
7.	Been working with proponent as mechanical engineer and wishes to remind participants that the development, from a green perspective will be one of the most energy efficient structures in the downtown which exceeds all international standards. It has an emission free design with no outdoor stacks. Proud to support it and feels it is a great project.
8.	Owner of Fortune Bay Trust which owns 62 Queen's Road and is the centre tower of the BIS Building. As a developer of this site there was substantial effort to retain the building with heritage character. Describes the current property as abandoned and neglected. It is not the gem as suggested by others. The City would be hard pressed to find another development that will add to the City the way this one does. There is no additional municipal infrastructure (roads/water/sewer) required. It is in stark contrast to the big box phenomena and facilitates the reduction of urban sprawl. Tenants of

	<p>these residential premises would stimulate the retail economy in the downtown, many of which are struggling today. The developer has listened to the residents. While The Rooms development was questioned by many, this structure is now one of the most recognizable features in the landscape in the downtown. Participant fully supports this proposal.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>The Terms of Reference and LUAR is absent of any reference to the church perspective. While the TOR says that “this proponent shall identify significant impacts and, where appropriate, identify measures to mitigate these issues for lands adjoining the subject property” this has not been done. Proponent has done that for The Rooms and Garrison Hill, but has not done so for the three churches. This is significant as these structures conduct daily activities including cultural and tourism events which are partnered with various community organizations. Feels that the terms of reference are designed to fully facilitate the development. A mixed commercial, high-density zone in the middle of this district is not appropriate. It was also asserted that there are thousands of human remains on this site. A written submission is also attached.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>On behalf of the Basilica Heritage Foundation the participant wished to report that this development is proposed in the midst of an Ecclesiastical District – National Historic Site. It is an incredible resource which was created at the request of the City and Heritage Foundation. This process has revealed that this area has even more potential than originally thought in making it a World Heritage District. Four churches in the area have been working as never before in promoting this initiative. This initiative will not be possible if this development proceeds. Reference was made to the Federal, Provincial, Territorial guidelines for heritage conservation with the participant noting that the City has not adopted those guidelines as it should. Requests that Council follow its own conservation guidelines and consider adopting those referenced above. Lunenburg has done this. The Foundation has also been working with Destination St. John’s in marketing this area. Any new construction has to be done in accordance with the guidelines. Acknowledged that the changes to the design have been significant but feels that more work is necessary to protect the heritage character. Asserted that tower 4 on the proposed condo building will be challenging. The development needs to sync architecturally in the interest of protecting heritage resources.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Participant is a neighbor of the site in question and the church sites. Represents the Gower Street United Church Heritage and Archives Committee and a concerned citizen. Referenced that pre-covid approximately 35K tourists have visited the area and contributed to the downtown economy. This committee is not averse to the development but feels that the proposed development is out of scale with design</p>



	<p>specs for the Ecclesiastical District. Has the potential of changing the character of the area. Parking is felt to be an issue with the proposed entrance and exit to Queen’s Road. Official submissions are forthcoming. Looks forward to meetings with Council officials as requested. Wants to ensure the design and style are appropriate. Upon question, it was confirmed that the proposed height to the top of the tower from Queen’s Road is 38m. Written submission attached.</p>
12.	<p>Participant is a resident in the Ecclesiastical District and shares the view of the Basilica Foundation i.e. the impact on surrounding churches and the Ecclesiastical District. Commended the city on this type of engagement model being used for this meeting.</p>
13.	<p>Representing St. Andrews Church (the Kirk) this participant reported there have been several meetings with the developer on this revised proposal. Acknowledged there will be some development there with the intention of 40 residential units. If there is to be site-specific zoning, requested that it be residential medium density. This church is active in the Ecclesiastical District and looks forward to world heritage designation at some point. Also expressed some concern with the impact of potential blasting in the area to create underground parking. Looks forward to a continued good working relationship with the developer.</p>
14.	<p>Participant is representing community heritage development and the real estate industry in the downtown. Expressed concern that inadequate attention is being given to heritage guidelines as governed by the City of St. John’s Act, City Regulations and Envision Municipal Plan. Recognizing significant legislation in place, finds it disappointing it does not adhere to these pieces of legislation. Not appropriate development at this site – in the midst and in the core of Heritage Area 1. If such development is permitted in the middle of a national historic district, why not on the grounds of Government House or on Signal Hill. It makes no sense to permit it in such an important part of the City that will water down all the work undertaken to create this district. References to other acceptable developments in the downtown were adaptive uses to existing structures as opposed to new buildings. Written submission attached.</p>
15.	<p>Participant objected to the platform for this meeting. Asserted that it leaves out people who need to be heard – those with no computer and/or struggle with computer literacy. Would like to see more engagement opportunities. Suggested the engagement efforts of the developer are misleading – forum was conducted by Happy City where engagement was invited and the survey results were biased. Suggested that some of the design changes were revealed at the Happy City forum inferring that it had already been approved.</p>

	<p>Refutes earlier comments that it is an unused space and asserts that people do not have to be on site to appreciate its value and beauty. In addition, there is a petition of 4-5K people who do not support this proposal. Residents of adjoining properties do not want this development. Trees will be removed, and the light fixtures proposed for the building will have negative lighting impact at night. In addition, the building height will result in less natural light for rooms in her home. The design changes do not address the concerns previously presented, it does not preserve open space and it violates the Envision Municipal Plan.</p>
Repeat Speakers	
1	<p>Upon question of whether the road and sewer work had been completed to accommodate this development it was explained that it had been. It was noted, however that the developer undertook such infrastructure extensions at its own risk with a full understanding that the completion of this work is not indicative of Council's approval of the project</p>
2	<p>Upon question of the plan as it relates to Church Hill, Ann Marie Cashin explained that while the developer has submitted an application for residential units, as with other applications, the developer is not bound by residential units, if the zoning permits other uses. Ms. Cashin read all the permitted uses in the zone and noted that Council can consider and approve discretionary uses depending on the zone.</p>
3	<p>While previous reference was made to some unsavory activity that takes place on the site, a neighboring resident stated that during his residence adjoining the site, he has not experienced such activity.</p>
4	<p>Agreed with problems with the engagement model used to consider this proposal suggesting it is not reflective of the position of some who are marginalized. It was suggested that a high-end residential development in this area may be an adversary for the more vulnerable living close by</p>
5	<p>Suggested that architectural design of the building by the church community is vital. It needs to fit into the landscape, neighboring properties and churches.</p>
6	<p>Again, asserted by another participant that this type of meeting does nothing to legitimize public consultation as it leaves out a broad spectrum of the population.</p>

Herein ended the discussion portion of Session 1. The Facilitator acknowledged the many written submissions received thus far which will be included in this report.

Participants were invited to participate in a survey on the use of this virtual method which will be sent out to all participants following the meetings.

A second public meeting to address the proposed development at 68 Queen’s Road was held at 7:00 pm on Wednesday, November 18, 2020. 39 people were in attendance. It should be noted that multiple participants who attended the first meeting also attended and spoke at the second.

**COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS – SESSION 2**

Session 2 proceeded in similar fashion to the first meeting. During the Developer’s presentation, concerns about relative heights of buildings on Harvey Road and Queens Road which were raised during the first session were addressed. Attendees were advised that the LUAR gives an accurate representation of the heights for these two locations.

The following is a summary of comments that represent the people who verbally commented on the development at the meeting.

<b>COMMENTS – SESSION 2 – NOVEMBER 18, 2020</b>	
<b>Speaker #</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
1.	The speaker referenced an election pledge by Councillor Shawn Skinner stating that he would side with the members of the community who are against the development. There was expressed concern about the meetings that were held by the developer which were not public as has been stated.
2.	Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. Commenter wishes to challenge the ownership of the land to be developed. The maps up to 1967 refer to the Anglican Church owning part of the property and not the whole area zoned Open Space. The resident has been trying to get more recent maps, but the deeds office has been closed and is not accessible. The Anglican Church would have had to acquire the remaining land between 1967 and 2013 and there should be evidence to show that they acquired it. A question was raised as to the legality of the sale of land to the developer. In response, the City’s Chief Municipal Planner advised that recent surveys are understood to be genuine, however, staff will review old maps and will follow up with applicants and the Cathedral.
3.	Speaker attended the in person meeting last year and was encouraged by the opposition of the neighborhood to this development. Public

	consultation held by the developer was not public. This development is inappropriate for the neighborhood and the Heritage neighborhood should be preserved. The City has declared a climate emergency so the green space should be kept. It was suggested that the old Holloway school site would be better for this development. The City needs affordable housing and high-end condos are not appropriate for this area. This development is out of character within this designated ecclesiastical precinct and would harm the chances of being a UNESCO Heritage Site in future.
4.	Commenter attended the in person meeting last year. This property has multiple zones and is private land. Listing this as public open space is confusing because this is just the backyard of a piece of land that has been left fallow. Expressed approval of a low-density application like this.
5.	The speaker is a downtown resident who had concerns about the original design but is impressed with the revised report and feels the concerns have been addressed regarding the green space and screening with trees and the heights of the buildings as well as the accessibility from an egress and entry perspective. There should be more residents downtown so a development that brings people downtown will aid in revitalizing downtown.
6.	Participant is a resident of Garrison Hill and expressed support of the Queens Road portion of the development but is against rezoning of the open space facing Harvey Road. Rezoning will be damaging to the city and neighborhood. The developer is not a good neighbor and the new development would not be a welcoming place for the community. The building itself does not keep with the design and scale of the surrounding community. The Parish Lane development and the Rooms are not comparable as the Rooms is a public building for use and enjoyment of the people and this development is a private income generating venture. The revised proposal does not address the impacts of scale and the trees and green space, heritage, and the views. This is the last and largest naturalized green space in the City and more green space is needed downtown and what is existing should be preserved. A petition opposing the rezoning of the open space land on the back of the property has been signed online and on paper which includes 4600 signatures and echoes a clear and overwhelming rejection. This petition will be presented to City Council. This online petition is valid, and people are concerned about preserving the community. Councillor Shawn Skinner was questioned during the election and advised that he does not support the proposal because it is too intensive for the area.
7.	Commenter has no position on this proposal but feels the argument makes no sense. This land is just land and not a park. There are an adequate number of parks already. The city needs more density so it can be kept alive and there should be focus on development that

	would make it easy to live in the city with or without a car. This open space is a wild piece of land next door to the Kirk. There needs to be real arguments made for how the city can be made into a livable winter city with spaces that can be shared. This area could be developed into retail and shops. A livable downtown with sufficient residential development and grocery/walkable shops are needed.
8.	On behalf of the Basilica Museum and Historical Committee and the Basilica Heritage Foundation the participant wished to report that the organization is not opposed to this development but are opposed to the size and scope and appearance of this development and find it out of character for the historic district and the view plane of the City. The City must preserve and promote the heritage area and should capitalize on that area. It is recommended that they go back to the drawing board and find something more in character and the size of this development is not appropriate. This development breaks up the Ecclesiastical District and breaks up site lines in all directions. Its early days but UNESCO World Heritage Designation is worth pursuing.
9.	Participant presented images of existing buildings within the Ecclesiastical District National Historic Site of Canada. Participant expressed concern of how this development fits with scale massing and rooflines of the existing buildings. This development does not resemble anything else in the district and the new design does not fit in.
10.	Resident of Garrison Hill. Always hoped there would be a development on Queen's Road. Feels a larger residential building would be better suited to the Queen's Road location and the green space behind be preserved. The other side of the Kirk has a vacant parking lot which would be better suited to this type of development. The vacancy rate in existing new condos and buildings downtown proves that this type of development has not brought people downtown. The demographics of people who buy these kinds of condominiums are wealthy individuals. Public engagement did not include the neighbors. It was an invite only event and the public were not included. Last minute public engagement in the afternoon by the developer did not allow for people to attend. The accuracy of the drawings is questionable because there is a house missing from the design on Garrison Hill. Not much has changed about how the public feels about this development and people will be unhappy if this development goes forward.
11.	Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. On behalf of the Basilica Heritage Foundation the participant wished to report that the four churches downtown are in the process of putting together a group of people who wish to see the Ecclesiastical District further developed. They have been meeting and have put together a proposal for infrastructure and restoration of the buildings and the historical landscapes and environments. This group would like to pursue World Heritage status for this site. They have worked with Destination St.

	<p>John's to bring tourists and visitors to the downtown area. Restoration of the buildings would have economic benefit and draw visitors to the City. People around the world view the Basilica Heritage Foundation website. They have studied World Heritage designations and have talked to Parks Canada and UNESCO officials for advice. The participant raised the question if the City has studied or investigated the economic impacts of a World Heritage site for the Ecclesiastical District and what that would do for the City's economy, tourism, business, the hotel sector and the food and beverage sectors. This is an opportunity to develop a tourism and cultural sector inside an existing footprint.</p> <p>In the summer of 2019, the Mayor had promised to bring together churches to discuss issues and concerns. The churches wish to meet with the Mayor and that meeting is currently in the works.</p>
12.	<p>Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. Resident of Garrison Hill who wished to expand on neighbor's comments. There is a potential opportunity for compromise in this project around the willingness to work with higher density on the Queen's Road side of the site. More intensive development could be a better fit with retail or commercial uses under a Commercial Central Mixed (CCM) zone. It would be excellent to move more people downtown but a mixed use and more affordable development would be preferred. There could be alternative site layouts that keep the green space and keep the density.</p>
13.	<p>The proposed development contributes to healthy urban density in the downtown core which encourages a vibrant and economically diverse city. It is felt the current development does not impact negatively on the UNESCO development. This is an appropriate and quality development that is a good fit for the site.</p>
14.	<p>Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. Reference was made to page 18-19 of LUAR which is unclear in relation to height. There is merit to the economic value of World Heritage Designation. The City should consider the cost of the potential economic loss of changing the character of the heritage district. Any change here would be irreversible and there is concern that there is an impact on tangible and intangible heritage. Residents have received this area from its forebearers as a legacy in trust and any decisions that are made will impact generations to follow. It will be a lovely view for people buying the condos but not the others surrounding. The tourism value should be considered well into the future.</p>
15.	<p>Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. Participant provided information regarding the question raised about land ownership earlier in the meeting. The open space land is on an older map from provincial archaeology in the Confederation Building which shows that land was owned by the British Newfoundland School Society. There used to be a school on that site and the foundation is</p>

	<p>under the Parish Hall. The British Newfoundland School Society was the largest missionary school in the world and that makes the site very valuable to a World Heritage designation. The Anglican Church took over operating the school in the 1840s. There was presumably a quieting of titles and question was raised as to if the title was actually quieted. Other churches used that property. The Kirk used that property for church services before building its existing church around 1846. Provincial archaeology will have the maps.</p>
16.	<p>Speaker also spoke at the meeting on November 17. Participant is representing community heritage development and the real estate industry in the downtown and expressed concern about the importance of heritage regulations. Guiding principles for appropriate development should be used as they have been in the other areas of the City as well as other parts of the Province. Together residents and developers have enhanced heritage areas and this process should continue. The developer should reconsider this development and think about success stories from the past. It was questioned if the developer had been given copies of the City regulations before he started which include heritage standards and guidelines, the City Plan, Envision Municipal Plan and the Federal Standards and Guidelines for National Historic Sites. The developer will respond in writing.</p>
<b>Repeat Speakers</b>	
1	<p>Participant wished to raise the question as to who the stakeholders are. In the early stages the term 'stakeholders' was used to describe property owners. All who hold an interest in this property are stakeholders in this district. Stakeholders by heritage, interest, and stewards of this property. This development, as it is, inserted incongruously into the center of Heritage Area 1 and the Ecclesiastical Heritage Site is not appropriate.</p>
2	<p>Participant questioned what developers should have to contribute, as a 'price' for variances, etc. How does it enhance the Ecclesiastical District? There was comparison made to the accomplishments of Vancouver, particularly Yaletown and other preserved heritage areas. Preserving the heritage district should be the clear vision. Neighbors should have been consulted.</p>
3	<p>Participant has a long association with the area and this property and feels this open space downtown is not a particularly pleasant area and there is unsavory activity occurring. Having a development that is appropriate for the area would improve the neighborhood. This proposal is not entirely inappropriate but could be made more sympathetic to the area. The concept of this development is based on a good news story. The Anglican Church has moved out of a property that was not serving them well and has invested into the expansion of the Anglican Cathedral which is important for the downtown area.</p>

4	Question was raised on the timelines for this development. The process was outlined by Ann Marie Cashin. It was noted that it is early in the rezoning process. Currently the City is doing the initial consultation for this amendment which will be brought back to Council for consideration with the minutes of these public meetings and the submissions appended. There is also consideration for a Regional Plan amendment at this same time. Notices have been sent out to the fourteen municipalities within the St. John's urban region. The deadline for responses from surrounding municipalities is December 1. This application will be brought back to Council for adoption in principal. If adopted in principal, it will be sent to the Province for Provincial review. If there are no issues from the Province it will be sent back to the municipality to consider adoption and to hire a commissioner for a Public Hearing. If there are submissions received and the Public Hearing goes ahead a report will go back to Council with a recommendation. Council are the decision makers and are not bound by that recommendation. If Council approves it will go to the Province for registration and gazetting and the amendment will go into effect on the day it is placed in the gazette. It was advised that there will be 6 months at least for a timeline.
5	Commenter is troubled to see the City is not following and not requiring the developer to follow strategic policies in the public City Plans. Commitments made to the public should be honored. We are a capital city and the oldest city in North America and heritage matters.
6	A question was raised to the developer that if the site is rezoned and approval is given to proceed with this proposal, there is concern that anything could be done with the site. It was questioned if the intention of the developer is to build what has been outlined in the proposal. The developer responded that the proposal and intention is as it has been presented. They have identified the parameters they can work with on the site including four townhouses, including the existing one on Queen's Road, and a building up to thirty-six units at the rear of the property. The zoning suggested by the City is acceptable to the development.
7	In response to an earlier comment about the type of activity that occurs in that area it was noted that there is no nefarious activity taking place. The green space has been cleaned up by the neighbors seasonally for the last ten years.

Herein ended the discussion portion of Session 2. A survey about the platform used for the meeting and the registration process will be sent out to participants.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

It was noted that following this meeting, minutes will be prepared, combined with all written redacted submissions, and presented to Council prior to Council deciding whether



or not to proceed. As a Municipal Plan amendment is required, should Council decide to proceed with the amendment, a Public Hearing would be set later.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The first session of this meeting adjourned at 2:56 pm.  
The second session of this meeting adjourned at 8:42 pm.

Marie Ryan  
Chairperson/Facilitator