

REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY NOVEMBER 18, 2024
AGENDA

1. Minutes of November 4, 2024
2. Business Arising
3. Application to operate a microbrewery at 11 Cribbies Road (A2024-77)
4. Drainage issue 9 Long Run Road
5. 2025 Budget and Tax Schedule
6. Quotes to repair plumbing at community centre
7. PCA Amendment – Change Order Motion Bay Road Ext. Phase 2
8. Daily Foreperson's Log
9. Expense Claims
10. Bills
11. New Business
12. Adjourn

BILLS

November 18, 2024

City of St. John's (Garbage Expense)	\$3,101.65
Canoe (Office Expense)	\$75.88
Dicks & Company (Office Expense)	\$74.74
Bennett's Home Hardware (R & M Building)	\$32.14
Formac 2002 Ltd (Road Maintenance)	\$2,024.00
Irving Oil Ltd. (Gas Expense)	\$1,675.39
Rogers (Office Expense)	\$114.98
Stewart McKelvey (Professional Fees)	\$499.10
T & D Enterprises (Snow Clearing Expense)	\$26,583.33
JD Excavating (Road Maintenance)	\$460.00
TRIO (Pension Plan)	\$1,276.58
Dynamic Engineering (CWP Motion Bay Road Ext.)	\$15,009.80
All North Consultants Ltd. (CWP PRV Upgrades)	\$1,031.26
NF Power (Hydro Expense)	<u>\$2,495.93</u>
TOTAL	\$54,454.78

TOWN OF PETTY HARBOUR/MADDOX COVE

REGULAR MEETING

MONDAY NOVEMBER 18, 2024

PRESENT: Rick Raymond, Ed Dyke, Irene Stack, Agatha Stack Balsom, David Balsom, Kayla Parsons and Stephanie Stack

ABSENT: Ron Doyle

		ITEM
1		Deputy Mayor Raymond brought the meeting to order at 6:37pm.
2		Minutes of November 4, 2024, were tabled. Motion #380 Agatha Stack Balsom/Irene Stack Proposed to accept minutes of November 4, 2024. All in favor. Motion carried.
	BUSINESS ARISING	
3		
4		#10 The new business owner of Enviromasters Lawn Care has honored the previous pricing quote to the town and will be looking after the lawn care for the town.
5		#12 CWP Motion Bay Road Extension Phase 1 - Weir's Construction should be back on-site next week to complete the project and address some deficiencies.
6		#18 CWP Motion Bay Road Extension Phase 2 – Once council approves the change order for the relocation of the drain, the engineering firm will complete the design work.
7		#19 Councillor Stack wanted to send along a congratulations to the Museum Committee and the War Memorial Committee for a wonderful Remembrance Day Service.
	TONIGHT'S AGENDA	
8		<p>Application (A2024-77) for a micro-brewery at 11 Cribbies Road Councillor Dyke spoke on behalf on the Inspections and Development Committee and stated that the committee has inspected the area several times and at the last inspection the committee noted that the decking was very close to the property owner's boundary line. The Committee recommends that the deck should be at least 2 ft from the boundary line.</p> <p>Councillor Stack stated that "this has been one of the hardest decisions that has come before Council, and I will be making a motion taking all aspects of the town and application in mind. I stand firm in my opinion that the town plan needed to be changed, and I wanted to take the application into consideration on its merits. Maybe, if it was a smaller restaurant aspect, and more focused on the brewing portion, then my opinion may be different. But we have to look at the specific application we have been provided. Once you approve something, it's done – and with uncertainties, I don't believe Council should take that risk. Granted any new business may have a similar increased impact for an initial opening, before leveling out; but a smaller seating for example, or professional assurance of increased parking, should equate to less traffic impact once established – but we are considering an impact of 75 people plus – long term.</p> <p>As I have stated before, I am in favor of a business at the applicable property, and this motion is not intended for a precedent or stipulation that no business, similar to the current application or otherwise, should be approved there – Just not this specific application. While I understand that some may see that as a cycle – why not review the concerns beforehand, why consider a similar application, if this one does not work, why deny if we will have to go through it again if so decided – we have to keep in mind that sometimes slight changes can make all the difference in daily operations, and impact on surrounding area. I wanted to attempt to come to a decision on the details of this application that has been put forward, after questions back and forth previously from both sides."</p> <p>Councillor Dyke stated "I'm here to speak and cast a vote on the present application put before this council and the town, application # A2044-77, an application to propose a Micro-Brewery/Restaurant for the old church property located on 11</p>

Cribbies Rd.

This is the hardest decision and the most time-consuming application that was before this council and probably all other previous councils. We have had several meetings/consultations and sleepless nights on this topic.

I personally think having a micro-brewery in our community is a great idea and I would probably be one of the first in line to use its services.

I was and still am in total support of the changes we made to the town's amendment to have a look at this application and to see what is best suited for 11 Cribbies Rd. I thought long and hard on this, reading over a lot of reports, drawings and taking into considerations concerns against the application and letters in support of the application.

Our decision must be made on the facts and supported by the Town Plan, Town policies and taking into consideration all other information available to us, then we consider emotions that support or is against the application.

This decision that this council makes on this application will have possibly an everlasting impact on this community. We must weigh all options and try to make the best decision that applies to this application.

There are several options that council could have approached on this,

1. Approve it in principle and attach a list of requirements that must be met.
2. Denied it and give reasons why, then the applicant can reply with all requirements.
3. Refer it to request more information.

The first 2 can be appealed.

I do have some concerns about this application. See below sections of the Town Plan and Regulations, once tabled, this letter will be available for public reading. First, from the town's regulations.

3.4.

Permit Not to be Issued in Certain Cases Approval shall not be issued for a proposed development where, in the opinion of Council, it is premature by reason of the site lacking adequate road access, power, drainage, sanitary facilities, or domestic water supply, or being beyond the natural development of the area at the time of application unless the applicant contracts to pay the full cost of construction of the services deemed necessary by Council.

3.5.

Discretionary Powers

In considering an application for a permit or for approval in principle to carry out development, Council shall take into account the policies expressed in the Municipal Plan and any further scheme, plan or regulations pursuant thereto, and shall assess the general appearance of the development of the area, the amenity of the surroundings, availability of utilities, public safety and convenience, and any other considerations which are, in its opinion, material, and notwithstanding the conformity of the application with the requirements of these Regulations, Council may, in its discretion, and as a result of its consideration of the matters set out in this Regulation, conditionally approve or refuse the application.

4.5. Alterations to the Natural Environment Development proposals shall include plans for grading, ditching, and landscaping. Significant alterations to the natural environment as part of a development (such as changing the drainage pattern or removing vegetation) will be considered during the evaluation of development proposals. Alterations which will adversely affect watercourses or adjacent property as a result of alterations to watercourses, drainage or grading shall not be permitted. Topsoil or sods shall not be removed except with the approval of Council.

4.15. Landscaping and Screening

2. Council may, in the case of existing unsightly development, order the owner or occupier to provide adequate and suitable landscaping or screening; and for this purpose may require the submission of an application giving details of the landscaping or screening, and these Regulations shall then apply to that application. The provision of adequate and suitable landscaping or screening may be made a condition of any development permit where, in the opinion of Council, the landscaping or screening is desirable to preserve amenity or to protect the environment.

4.26. Soil Removal, Deposit and Site Grading

1. Removal or placement of soil or other material, or alteration to the natural grade or drainage of a property which adversely affects a watercourse or adjacent property shall not be permitted
3. Where not part of an approved development, any land disturbance involving the removal, deposition or grading on a property affecting more than 25 square meters in area shall require application, review and approval by the Town and show the full extent of disturbance that is intended. Council may require a developer to assess geotechnical aspects, visual and environmental impacts, as well as impacts on

adjoining properties;

5.1.

Parking Required For every building, structure or use to be erected, enlarged or established, there shall be provided and maintained a quantity of off-street parking spaces sufficient to ensure that the flow of traffic on adjacent streets is not impeded by the parking of vehicles associated with that building, structure or use.

5.2.

Parking Spaces,

The number of parking spaces to be provided for any building, structure, use or occupancy shall conform to the standards set out in table below. Parking requirements for uses not specifically listed below shall be determined by Council.

5.3.

Parking Area Design Standards Parking areas or parking lots associated with a development requiring more than four parking spaces will meet the following standards: a) no part of any off-street parking area shall be closer than 1.5 metres to the front lot line in any zone; b) parking standards to accommodate persons with disabilities shall meet the requirement of the Buildings Accessibility Act and Regulations; and c) parking areas shall, except in the case of single or attached residential dwellings, be arranged so that it is not necessary for any vehicle to reverse onto or from a street.

5.4.

Off-Street Loading Requirements 1. For every building, structure or use to be erected, enlarged or established requiring the shipping, loading or unloading of goods, wares or merchandise, there shall be provided and maintained for the premises, loading facilities on land that is not part of a street comprised of one or more loading spaces, 15 metres long, 4 metres wide and having a vertical clearance of at least 4 metres with direct access to a street or with access by a driveway of a minimum width of 6 metres to a street. 2. The number of loading spaces to be provided shall be determined by Council. 3. The loading facilities required by this Regulation shall be arranged so that vehicles can move clear of any street and so that it is not necessary for any vehicle to reverse onto or from a street.

8.6.13.

Parking Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 5 of these Regulations, parking requirements in the Heritage Area Use Zone for uses that require parking for visitors or customers may be reduced provided the applicant can demonstrate how parking can be accommodated, either on-site or off-site, in a manner acceptable to Council.

7.1. Administration of the Municipal Plan

In order for consideration of any proposals for an amendment to the Development Regulations (i.e., a rezoning), Council shall require a clear proposal to be submitted. Such a proposal must clearly show: The location of the subject property, to scale, showing lot dimensions, area, street frontages; The means by which the site is/will be serviced; The proposed location of all driveways and parking areas; Areas which are to be landscaped and/or buffered; and The proposed location of all buildings on the site. (ENGIRNEER DRAWING)

7.5.

Professional Advice Council may obtain its own professional advice in regard to any proposed amendment to the Municipal Plan or Development Regulations. Council may also seek professional advice in regards to the evaluation of development proposals where additional expertise is necessary.

8.6.10. New Developments

c) On-site parking requirements may be waived for development not located on the main road, provided that the development can be assured of off-street parking adequate to permit snow-clearing and customer parking

Policy HA-7

Parking Narrow roads and smaller lots contribute to the character of the area but prevent conventional parking arrangements and vehicle access.

1. In the Heritage Area, Town road standards, lot standards, siting standards, and parking and loading requirements will aim to maintain the landscape and look of the area, while providing a reasonable level of traffic safety and convenience.

2. Uses which require parking for attendance, visitors, customers or guests, will be required to demonstrate how necessary parking spaces can be accommodated in a manner which is safe, convenient and acceptable to adjacent uses.

3. Off premises parking will be permitted but must be identified at the time of application.

7.2.

Development Regulations To implement the goals, objectives and policies of the Municipal Plan, Council will prepare and adopt Development Regulations pursuant

to Section 35 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

All land within the municipal planning area will be covered by land use zones which provide detailed requirements such as lot size, frontage, building setbacks, and parking standards.

In order for consideration of any proposals for an amendment to the Development Regulations (i.e., a rezoning), Council shall require a clear proposal to be submitted. Such a proposal must clearly show: The location of the subject property, to scale, showing lot dimensions, area, street frontages; The means by which the site is/will be serviced; The proposed location of all driveways and parking areas; Areas which are to be landscaped and/or buffered; and the proposed location of all buildings on the site.

Traffic studied commission by the applicant.

According to section 2.4.1

Main Road traffic would increase by 44 percent on the main road from May to July for weekdays, 2 way traffic.

Traffic would increase by 62 percent on the main road from May to July for weekends, 2 way traffic.

Cribbies Rd.

Traffic would increase by 87 percent on the main road from May to July for weekdays, 2 way traffic.

Traffic would increase by 17.7 percent on the main road from May to July for weekends, 2 way traffic.

According to section 3.2

The study suggests 31 parking spaces compared to other facilities of this style.

Section 4

It is noted: **“This type of trip forms part of an existing trip but is not exclusive to the brewery and is not a new trip. As such, the above noted trip generation and parking generation rates likely represent the “worst-case scenario.”**

Section 5.

The estimated parking demand **can not be accommodated** by the proposed on-site parking supply of **21 parking spaces** on the subject site and off-site parking will be required to accommodate the proposed microbrewery.

The 21 on-site parking spaces combined with available public parking within walking distance are **anticipated** to provide a reasonable supply to the facility.

Conclusion:

The size of the parking lot, with my estimation there will be only 2 handicap parking lots, each handicap parking space must have 5 ft between them.

The 3 closes parking spaces to the road will not be adequate for the even flow of traffic in and out of the premises. The frontage of the lot entrance is maximum 42 ft, the first 2 parking spots are 18 ft in length, which would leave 6 ft for the entrance to accommodate traffic entering and exiting the lot.

The traffic study recommended a 1.5 metre buffer zone on the property to accommodate foot traffic, this would take away another 5 ft from the front property line.

This will eliminate a minimum of 5 parking spaces from the propose 21. This will reduce the parking plan down to a maximum of 16 spots. The whole parking study was done with a minimum recommendation of 21 parking spaces, it is recommended the applicant get a stamp engineer drawing showing the number of parking spaces and locations.

The applicant must hire a commissionaire officer to instruct traffic as outlined in the application, not a staff member. The town could hire the officer and the owner reimburse the town for that amount.

Traffic study shows an increase in foot traffic and vehicle traffic, in my opinion as laid out, Cribbie’s Rd and Skinners Hill cannot accommodate this, at its present state.

The seating capacity with the deck, I have some concerns about, the total over capacity, the estimated inside seating is sitting at 75 based on a minimum 21 parking spaces and overflow if available, add on the staff present, could be around 100 persons.

I’m sure there will be many more concerns and requirements if the project moves ahead.

This does not say that the proposal will not work in this area, but for me, it will not work with the present application and the information provided. The owner can

resubmit a new proposal with all the information requested or downsize a new proposal, and then we will consider that application.”

Councillor Stack asked her fellow councillors to allow her to finish her motion and statement before discussion, as there are multiple points I believe should be referenced.

Motion #381 Irene Stack/Ed Dyke

I make the motion to deny application A2024-77, based on what I feel are the following outstanding items; Supported from the town policies and regulations; Following Regulation 3.3. Regarding Permit's to be Issued; and 3.5 for the Discretionary Powers for Council.

Parking and traffic requirements not currently being met for 75 customers, and possible 15/20 staff at once;

From our Town Regulations;

5.1. Parking Required - For every building, structure or use to be erected, enlarged or established, there shall be provided and maintained a quantity of off-street parking spaces sufficient to ensure that the flow of traffic on adjacent streets is not impeded by the parking of vehicles associated with that building, structure or use

5.2 - The number of parking spaces required for commercial, industrial, general and public uses shall be determined at the discretion of Council ;

5.3. Parking Area Design Standards - Parking areas or parking lots associated with a development requiring more than four parking spaces will meet the following standards:

a) no part of any off-street parking area shall be closer than 1.5 meters to the front lot line in any zone;

b) parking standards to accommodate persons with disabilities shall meet the requirement of the Buildings Accessibility Act and Regulations

8.6.13. Parking

Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 5 of these Regulations, parking requirements in the Heritage Area Use Zone for uses that require parking for visitors or customers may be reduced provided the applicant can demonstrate how parking can be accommodated, either on-site or off-site, in a manner acceptable to Council.

From our Municipal Plan

Policy HA-7 Parking - Narrow roads and smaller lots contribute to the character of the area but prevent conventional parking arrangements and vehicle access.

1. In the Heritage Area, Town road standards, lot standards, siting standards, and parking and loading requirements will aim to maintain the landscape and look of the area, while providing a reasonable level of traffic safety and convenience.

2. Uses which require parking for attendance, visitors, customers or guests, will be required to demonstrate how necessary parking spaces can be accommodated in a manner which is safe, convenient and acceptable to adjacent uses.

3. Off premises parking will be permitted but must be identified at the time of application

Without having a certified engineered drawing plotted on a survey, the current application does not demonstrate an accurate description of available onsite parking. Regulation 5.3 states parking shall not be closer than 1.5 meters, eliminating possibly more than 1 space. While older businesses may have been grandfathered in with parking that goes against this, new business should have to abide by it. The parking standards to accommodate persons with disabilities may reduce the proposed accessible spaces down to 2 spaces, vs the depicted 3 with inspection measurements. Additional measurements with the conformity of the property boundary further reduce spaces to possibly less than 15, once the parking lot is plotted on a survey map.

Given that the other offsite parking (aprox. 35 cars) is at capacity for the majority of the peak season, this would not be an applicable off-site option. While the proposed traffic study stated that a portion of the parking demand may not consist of additional vehicle's requiring parking; it is with the statement that it would be highly likely that a portion of the trips to the proposed business would be paired with trips to other businesses', but that does not take into account the similarity of the other established business already in the area, already using the parking; Which would mean new patrons to the new business would need new parking,

In terms of off-site parking outside peak seasons, this would not be a feasible option based on location/walking accessibility (for the main larger lot) for guest's & over 20 staff at any time – without the support of the onsite parking lot being confirmed

to provide the noted 21 spaces.

Additionally, with the requested number of restaurant seats, the influx of traffic in the area may not be sustainable, even for a seasonal duration. The traffic study advised that the proposed application would generate 41 cars per hour during weekday afternoon/evenings, and 50 trips per hour on the weekend, which may impede the flow of traffic on the narrow adjacent streets. A general parking attendant would be able to manage the flow of this traffic, as they would have to work from the parking lot, and not the street.

Deck/Patio placement not conforming to the Heritage Area;

From the Town's Regulations;

8.6.3; Minimum Side Yard has a requirement of 1.5 meters

8.6.11. Additions, Renovations and Alterations

1. An existing structure that conforms to the architectural style of the Heritage Area Use Zone may be expanded provided the changes are consistent with the style of the original building.

5. Contemporary design for changes to existing properties may be permitted when:

b) Such design is compatible with the size, scale, colour, material, texture and character of the property, neighbourhood, or environment.

Permitting the patio on south side as is, would possibly overlap the property boundary, and impede the 1.5 meters for an extended boundary length, outside any current non-conformities. Two large patio portions would not conform with the heritage area, this should be a higher priority than it possibly has been in the past to keep our town's unique character. Additionally, the patio would have a potential safety concern for the town's parking lot for the Community Centre (items falling over).

Concerns on the potential retaining wall/ culvert and water flow under the parking lot.

From the municipal plan;

Policy G-7 Development in Hazardous Area

1. Council shall prevent inappropriate development in areas of known hazard that may be susceptible to erosion, flooding or any other hazards.

2. In areas of potential hazard, Council may require detailed engineering studies to evaluate the suitability of the land for a development where backfilling is proposed, or where there may be potential for flooding, erosion or other hazard to occur.

3. In approving a development in an area with potential hazard, Council may require additional engineering design or other measures to mitigate identified hazards as a condition of development.

4. In any event, no private development in an area of known or potential hazard risk shall result in public liability or public cost.

Given the drastic change to the parking lot of the proposed building, before being able to approve an application, I would want to ensure that the changes being made are sufficient for the area. The boundary runs alongside Skinners Hill, and with the water/river flow in the area, I feel I could not approve an application without a sign off from an engineer. There are discrepancies in the business plan, and contractor submitted information for the retaining wall (difference in height, length), and the town cannot afford to have the adjacent roadway undermined, or water flow impacted, without the proper security and reassurances beforehand. It's one thing to make a decision when you have an informed professional opinion, but we know issues can rise even when there is engineer involvement; so not having the information beforehand feels like a risk I am not willing to take.

Public opinion;

From the town regulations;

7.3. Public Consultation

Council is committed to consultation with citizens and will seek input from the public on planning and development matters that:

Require an exercise of Council discretion in arriving at a decision on a development application;

Involve significant development proposals that are of interest to the community at large;

From the Municipal plan;

Policy G-23 Community Health & Wellbeing

It shall be the policy of Council to consider the impacts of development proposals on the health of the community to enhance safety, and the health and well-being of all residents.

I understand we cannot please everyone, but – overall we do have to look at the opinions of our residents, and what may benefit the town as a whole; and while all may not like it, we have to take it into consideration. We have had meetings, and received letters. We know the amount of vocal disagreement we have had, and while some may say it is a small percentage – given the fact we usually have very little comment on proposed development – I think it is something we have to take into consideration when making decisions that could have impact on the town overall.

Finally, with effort to be transparent as possible, given my initial thought on the proposed business was positive for the town, I also looked to see if an approval in principle may be possible, with limitations/adjustments for the application for the outstanding areas & questions noted. But as per our Regulation under 3.9 (2). Council may issue an Approval in Principle if it determines the application conforms to the Municipal Plan and these Regulations - which I believe this application does not, and the changes needed would be considered as a new application, which I would welcome before council.

Councillor Balsom, Councillor Parsons, and Councillor Stack Balsom not in favor. Deputy Mayor Raymond, Councillor Stack and Councillor Dyke in favor. Motion defeated.

Motion #382 Kayla Parsons/Agatha Stack Balsom

I make a motion to approve the proposed business A2024-77 in principle with the following stipulations:

- All government permits including the environmental impact assessment must be completed prior to municipal approval being granted.
- Business must be on a water meter.
- Engineered drawings (stamped) of the parking lot, and all parking spaces must be submitted.
- If the number of parking spaces changes the seating capacity is subject to change at council's discretion.
- Parking lot must be completed prior to any work being completed on interior.
- The exterior deck must be moved in 2 ft on the side.
- The business owner would be responsible for hiring a commissioner for parking and directing traffic during peak seasons (June-September)
- This business would be subject to any bi-laws developed by the town post approval.
- Would like to note as per section 3 of the development regulations amendment that microbrewery was added to the list of discretionary uses in a heritage zone.
- And per section 8.6.8 of the development regulations, council may consider any range of commercial uses for 11 Cribbies Road.

Councillor Stack noted that she had concerns over an approval in principle as she did not want to give the applicant false hope. She stated an approval in principle should be for applications that conform to the regulations and this applicant does not. With all the changes required for the application it would be like a new application.

Councillor Dyke stated if the applicant forwarded a new application with the changes and requirements attached, he would consider looking at it.

Councillor Stack Balsom asked about deferring the application until the application had more information. It was noted that there is currently a motion on the floor.

Deputy Mayor Raymond, Councillor Dyke and Councillor Stack not in favor. Councillor Balsom, Councillor Parsons and Councillor Stack Balsom in favor. Motion defeated.

Application was not approved.

9

Drainage issues on Long Run Road

The Inspections and Development Committee inspected the area and noted that there was no evidence that this is town infrastructure. The area the culvert is on is private property. They noted that it may have been installed by a property owner.

Motion #383 Ed Dyke/Dave Balsom

Proposed to send a letter to the property owner informing them that this is private

		property and not the town's infrastructure. All in favor, motion carried.
10		<p>2025 Budget and Tax Schedule</p> <p>The Finance Committee is presenting to Council tonight, a balanced budget for 2025 in the amount of \$1,293,873.78. This is up from last year's budget of \$1,171,105.08.</p> <p>There are ongoing challenges the town faces in an effort to achieve a balanced budget. Although balancing the budget remains a top priority, it has proven to be a difficult goal, requiring the town to make challenging decisions and sacrifices along the way.</p> <p>Like every small town, limited revenue restricts the ability to invest in new projects and forces the town to operate within tight constraints.</p> <p>A significant challenge in balancing the budget is the steady increase in costs. Municipalities are not immune from these increases in goods and services. Inflation, and higher prices for essential goods and services put constant pressure on the town's budget. Each year, we see a gradual increase in operational costs such as gas, hydro, professional fees, insurance expense, snow clearing etc., making it challenging to stay within our financial means without having to increase the mil rate. The town has done its best over the years in balancing the budget and has kept the Residential mil rate at 6.5 for the last 8 years but rising costs have made it impossible to continue the mil rate at 6.5 in 2025. The Town has no other choice but to increase tax rates for the 2025 budget, but rest assured the town has only implemented a minimal increase of .7 mils in order to balance the budget.</p> <p>Balancing a budget involves difficult prioritization. We must carefully evaluate each expense, balancing short-term needs with long-term goals. This often means making hard decisions to cut or postpone projects that are valuable but not essential, which we recognize can be disappointing for residents and community committees.</p> <p>Despite these challenges, the town wants to assure you that they are fully committed to maintaining financial stability. We continue to explore ways to increase revenue, reduce costs, and manage unforeseen expenses more effectively.</p> <p>The Finance Committee is proposing the following increases and new fees:</p> <p>Residential Property Tax from 6.5 mils to 7.2 mils Commercial Property Tax from 9 mils to 10 mils Minimum Property Tax from \$700.00 to \$750.00 per year Vacant Land Tax from 6.5 mils to 7 mils Minimum Vacant land Tax from 600.00 to 630.00 per year Commercial Business Tax from 10.5 mils to 11.5 mils Minimum Commercial Business Tax from \$300.00 to \$325.00 per year Mobile Vending Permit from \$300.00 to \$400.00 per year Crown Land Application from \$50.00 to \$100.00 Late Write off Request Fee \$25.00 Permit Late Fee \$50.00</p> <p>Here are some of the spending highlights of the budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is \$10,436.00 allocated for municipal enforcement (summer season). This covers 4 days a week (4 hrs. per day) for 12 weeks. - Funds have been allocated for Chrome Books for councillors in the amount of \$4,000.00. - Funds have been allocated for 1 summer student for the summer program for Recreation in the amount of \$6,000.00. The Finance Committee is recommending the town look at Recreation's Financial Statement and Bank Statement before issuing any grants. It was recommended that no funds be issued until Recreation's audit is completed. - The committee has allocated \$4,700.00 for tools (Winch and sub pump). - The committee has allocated \$6,000.00 for eves trough (\$2000.00) and a mini split (\$4000.00) for the town office. - Professional Fees which include lawyers' fees have been increased by \$20,000.00

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The committee has allocated \$30,000.00 for general paving and some drains/swales on Cribbies Road. - The committee has allocated \$2,000.00 for upgrades to the Ron Weir Memorial Plaque and area - The committee has allocated \$10,000.00 for playground upgrades – This money is budgeted but before it will be airmarked for the playground the town would like to see Recreation’s finances before it is airmarked for this project. - The committee has allocated \$4,000.00 for a Volunteer Night <p>The Finance Committee is recommending the town approve the 2025 Budget in the amount of \$1,293,873.78.</p> <p>Councillor Dyke noted that the costs of goods and services have increased tremendously over the past number of years. Costs such as fire protection, snow clearing, tippage fees, gas, electric, etc.</p> <p>Councillor Stack noted that she was glad to see allocations in the budget for work on Cribbies Road and volunteer night. She stated she would like to thank the Finance Committee for a job well done.</p> <p>Motion #384 Agatha Stack Balsom/Irene Stack Proposed to accept the 2025 Budget in the amount of \$1,293,873.78. All in favor, motion carried.</p> <p>Motion #385 Ed Dyke/Irene Stack Proposed to approve the 2025 Tax Schedule. All in favor, motion carried.</p>
11	<p>Quotes for plumbing repairs to sink at the bar in the community centre Councillor Parsons declared a conflict of interest as her husband owns one of the companies that provided a quote.</p> <p>Motion #386 Ed Dyke/Irene Stack Proposed Councillor Parsons is in a conflict of interest when discussing/voting on this topic. All in favor, motion carried. Councillor Parsons left chambers at 7:20pm.</p> <p>The town received two quotes for the repairs. The repairs included clearing the drain, installing auto air vent and P-trap for ice machine. Keith’s Plumbing - \$325.00 plus tax BKP Plumbing - \$500.00 plus tax</p> <p>Motion #387 Ed Dyke/Agatha Stack Balsom Proposed to approve the quote for Keith’s Plumbing in the amount of \$325.00 plus tax. All in favor, motion carried. Councillor Parson’s returned to chambers at 7:22pm.</p>
12	<p>PCA Amendment – Change Order Motion Bay Road Ext. Phase 2. Due to a proposed change in the location of the drain for this project a change order is required for the engineering firm to conduct this work and provide new design drawings.</p> <p>Motion #388 Irene Stack/Kayla Parsons Be it resolved that the town approve the PCA Amendment (Change Order) for CWP Motion Bay Road Extension Phase 2 in the amount of \$3,726.00. All in favor, motion carried.</p>
13	<p>Daily Foreperson’s Log Motion #389 Dave Balsom/Ed Dyke Proposed to approve the daily Foreperson’s log. All in favor, motion carried.</p>
14	<p>Expense claim in the amount of \$20.00 for Stephanie Stack. Motion # 390 Irene Stack/Agatha Stack-Balsom Proposed to approve expense claim for Stephanie Stack in the amount of \$20.00. All in favor, motion carried.</p> <p>Expense claim in the amount of \$43.10 for Cassie Rideout. Motion # 391 Agatha Stack-Balsom/Kayla Parsons Proposed to approve expense claim for Cassie Rideout in the amount of \$43.10. All in favor, motion carried.</p>
15	<p>Bills in the amount of \$54,454.78 were presented. Motion #392 Irene Stack/Agatha Stack-Balsom Proposed to pay bills in the amount of \$54,454.78. All in favor, motion carried. Councillor Dyke noted that the town should look at starting the snow clearing</p>

		contract in December in the future.
	NEW BUSINESS	
16		Councillor Stack noted that recreation has several Christmas events coming up. She stated that council should make an effort to attend. Tree Lighting Ceremony November 24, 2024 Christmas Parade December 8, 2024 Seniors Dinner Dance December 7, 2024
17		Letter regarding debris at 10 C Main Road, Petty Harbour Councillor Dyke noted that the Inspections and Development Committee inspected the property and did not see an issue. He stated there was some wood there that looked like it was dropped off to stack to burn for the home. Councillor Dyke noted that there are some other properties in the town are in the same condition. He stated he did not see an issue that would constitute sending a letter. Staff will put something in the newsletter to remind residents to keep their properties clean.
18		Councillor Dyke noted that there is a pothole at the bottom of Motion Bay Road that is need of repair. Staff will have this work completed.
19		CWP Motion Bay Road Extension will have the final work completed next week.
20		The town received a request from Recreation to purchase clear coat to have the pine in the bar painted. Councillor Dyke noted that the last time council checked, Recreation had \$30,000 in the bank. Recreation should cover some of the costs of the community centre as the town pays for everything else such as heat and light, Wi-Fi, snow clearing etc. He recommended that Recreation pay for the cost of the clear coat. Councillor Parson agreed with Councillor Dyke on this. It was also noted by council that the clear coat is recommended to be done. Motion #393 Ed Dyke/Agatha Stack-Balsom Proposed to send a letter to Recreation recommending the pine be cleared coated and that Recreation cover the cost of supplies. All in favor, motion carried.
21		Motion #394 Ed Dyke/Agatha Stack Balsom Proposed meeting be adjourned. All in favor, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:36 pm.

Rick Raymond, Deputy Mayor _____

Stephanie Stack, Chief Administrative Officer _____