

# Memo



**To:** Mayor and Council, Woodstock  
**From:** Jennifer Brown, Planner, Dillon Consulting  
**Date:** November 9, 2023  
**Subject:** Municipal Plan Public Comment Period Feedback & Recommended Approach

Woodstock Council kicked off the legislative approval process of their new Municipal Plan on September 26, 2023 with a 30 day public comment period required by the Community Planning Act. The public were invited to review and provide feedback on the draft Municipal Plan and Future Land Use map between September 27 and October 27. Feedback was also sought from the Planning Advisory Committee and Town Staff. The Planning Advisory Committee was instructed to submit their feedback directly to Council. The following memo provides an overview of the public feedback received throughout the 30 day comment period and a recommended approach in response to the critical items received. Copies of the written feedback received are attached to this memo.

## ***Land Use versus Zoning Clarification***

A number of conversations were had throughout the public comment period which referenced zoning. In an effort to provide clarity, it should be noted that a municipal plan and, subsequently, a future land use map is the first step to setting zoning in place. A future land use map uses the land use designations described in the policies of a municipal plan to paint a picture of intended land use within the geography of a municipality. A land use designation directs the zoning by-law to capture land use in a more detailed and specific way, typically through zones. For example, the Residential land use designation is proposed to be administered through 6 residential zones in the proposed amendments to the Zoning By-law. The Rural land use designation is proposed to be administered through several zones including Rural Residential, Rural, Industrial, and Environmental Conservation zone. The Municipal Plan is intentionally high level in its description of land use and therefore some of the changes discussed through the public comment period will be considered through the amendments to the Zoning By-law.

## ***Summary of Feedback and Proposed Approach***

The following provides a summary of feedback provided by the public. Each feedback item is accompanied by a proposed approach and action corresponding to the Municipal Plan Amendments. If the feedback will not impact or require a change to the Municipal Plan Amendments then no action is proposed.

	<b>Summarized Feedback</b>	<b>Proposed Approach</b>
1	Under 3.2.3, the Objective for infill on 3.2.4 is a good step. Is there any appetite to reduce the minimum parking ratios in the zoning bylaw? This could help facilitate some of that infill.	There are no policies specific to parking however it does form a section of the Zoning By-law. Parking standards will be addressed in the proposed amendments to the Zoning By-law. <b>Proposed Action:</b> None.

2.	I was surprised to see that Jacksonville is not mentioned under the discussion of industrial/light industrial and business park. I think they should be included because there is a significant amount of non-retail business in that area of town.	Dillon will work with Staff to determine if the Rural designation is appropriately applied to Jacksonville. An update will be provided to Council as part of the public hearing. <b>Proposed Action:</b> Explore updates to the Future Land Use Map to designate appropriate areas in Jacksonville as Industrial.
3.	LU 27 + 28 - are they in conflict with each other? I'm not clear on whether LU-28 is only referring to provincially designated farmland. My reading of LU-27 (below) is that it would allow low-density residential, resource/timber/woodlots, passive rec.	<p>LU-27 Council shall provide for a mix of rural land uses in the Rural Land Use Designation through appropriate provisions in the Zoning By-Law.</p> <p>LU-28 Council shall discourage the encroachment into agricultural lands through limiting the re-designation of lands from Rural to any other land use designation. When reviewing an application to re-designate Rural lands, Council shall:</p> <p>a) Require the applicant to seek declassification of the farmland from the Provincial Government and provide proof of its release; and</p> <p>b) Require the applicant provide a rationale that any development proposed on the site fulfils a need of the community and will contribute positively to the Town's tax base over the long-term.</p> <p>LU-27 directs the uses in the Zoning By-law where LU-28 ensures that agricultural lands are not redesignated without more thorough review. LU-27 directs all uses in the rural areas. LU-28 addresses the flipping of agricultural lands to another use. These policies do not conflict.</p> <p><b>Proposed Action:</b> None.</p>
4.	The other item that is missing in the municipal plan is the Manganese mines. These are going to have major impacts. I'm not sure what the	Pits, quarries, and mines are addressed through the Zoning By-law. The upcoming

	<p>discussion has been at council, it's a huge topic and I'm wondering if there are even precedents for having mining within municipal boundaries.</p> <p>However, it would be a major oversight to leave it out of the municipal plan, in my opinion. Especially where the plan says that "heavy industrial" is not really a priority or being contemplated.</p>	<p>approach requires new pit, quarries, or mines to go through a rezoning process.</p> <p>A review of the Municipal Plan policy to direct Council how and when to consider heavy industrial uses would be beneficial to ensure future applications would not require additional processes.</p> <p><b>Proposed Action:</b> Draft policy statement to consider resource extraction uses and to clarify how heavy industry would be considered.</p>
5.	<p>Staff Comment: Property at PAN 04853154 should be designated residential to accommodate proposed development.</p>	<p>There is a developer considering a residential development project at the subject property. The area can support residential development and a residential proposal is in keeping with the general development pattern of the area.</p> <p><b>Proposed Action:</b> Update the Future Land Use map to designate the area Residential. Introduce the proposed development concept to Council and residents at the Public Hearing.</p>

**Additional Map Changes**

The following list of changes were identified by Staff as being required to reflect the existing land use conditions. It is recommended that this list inform an update to the Future Land Use map and the updated map be provided to Council as part of the Public Hearing.

PID	Existing Designation	Proposed Designation
10244663	Rural and Agriculture	Residential
10286938	Residential	General Commercial
10110526 10159564 10118479 10159572	Institutional	Residential
10078798	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	General Commercial
10124394	Agricultural and Resource Lands, Environmental Protection	Industrial (only the portion that is currently designated Agricultural and Resource Lands will be redesignated)



Brown, Jennifer <jbrown@dillon.ca>

**FW: also**

1 message

**Andrew Garnett** <andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca>

To: Jennifer Brown <jbrown@dillon.ca>

Mon, Oct 30, 2023 at 3:57 PM

Second email from Amy

Andrew Garnett

Director of Development & Planning

Town of Woodstock

824 Main Street,

Woodstock, NB E7M 2E8

Phone: 506-325-4507

Andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.town.woodstock.nb.ca&d=DwlGaQ&c=JnLCALisrkxQZnQdpANaBZUceEGEGD7WjEji\\_\\_0JcDA&r=a8YTBiSttI6\\_qwnk1xvg1Zp-okubkCY9aA2iXq7NKs&m=KAQWGzi0M5ui96QqGqBiWya0Anr9RAY9H-TTjNaC8TWYdqOUUyjkQigfmXkvTFU&s=hRI\\_Uz3nKlp-vWJ60SFZJxRIX-ZX6uZ4WDuRP\\_EX2es&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.town.woodstock.nb.ca&d=DwlGaQ&c=JnLCALisrkxQZnQdpANaBZUceEGEGD7WjEji__0JcDA&r=a8YTBiSttI6_qwnk1xvg1Zp-okubkCY9aA2iXq7NKs&m=KAQWGzi0M5ui96QqGqBiWya0Anr9RAY9H-TTjNaC8TWYdqOUUyjkQigfmXkvTFU&s=hRI_Uz3nKlp-vWJ60SFZJxRIX-ZX6uZ4WDuRP_EX2es&e=)

-----Original Message-----

From: Amy Anderson <amy.anderson.nb@gmail.com>

Sent: October 25, 2023 10:37 AM

To: Andrew Garnett <andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca>

Subject: also

Hi Andrew,

Also, I meant to include this with my previous email and forgot:

The other item that is missing in the municipal plan is the Manganese mines. These are going to have major impacts. I'm not sure what the discussion has been at council, it's a huge topic and I'm wondering if there are even precedents for having mining within municipal boundaries.

However, it would be a major oversight to leave it out of the municipal plan, in my opinion. Especially where the plan says that "heavy industrial" is not really a priority or being contemplated.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Amy



Brown, Jennifer <jbrown@dillon.ca>

---

## FW: Municipal Plan Updates

1 message

**Andrew Garnett** <andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca>  
To: Jennifer Brown <jbrown@dillon.ca>

Mon, Oct 30, 2023 at 3:56 PM

Hello Jennifer,

Comments from Amy Anderson

Andrew

Andrew Garnett  
Director of Development & Planning  
Town of Woodstock  
824 Main Street,  
Woodstock, NB E7M 2E8  
Phone: 506-325-4507

Andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca  
[https://urldelense.proofpoint.com/v2/uri?url=http-3A\\_www.town.woodstock.nb.ca&d=Dw/GaQ&c=JnLcALisrkxQZnQdPaNaBZUceEGEGD7WjEj\\_0JcDA&r=a8YTBSitH6\\_qwnk1xvg1Zp-oKubkCY9aA2Xq7Nks&m=FqpxsPxtHJcBynst6Lc4WwecMHgoZFQ7I8TH-fETIKRKLc5E0PNBebYq3A0nfQ&s=eym4sEXqfu-1qteqSc4jxMyIk9xAeJTFnG\\_EoB-u6w&e=](https://urldelense.proofpoint.com/v2/uri?url=http-3A_www.town.woodstock.nb.ca&d=Dw/GaQ&c=JnLcALisrkxQZnQdPaNaBZUceEGEGD7WjEj_0JcDA&r=a8YTBSitH6_qwnk1xvg1Zp-oKubkCY9aA2Xq7Nks&m=FqpxsPxtHJcBynst6Lc4WwecMHgoZFQ7I8TH-fETIKRKLc5E0PNBebYq3A0nfQ&s=eym4sEXqfu-1qteqSc4jxMyIk9xAeJTFnG_EoB-u6w&e=)

-----Original Message-----

From: Amy Anderson <amy.anderson.nb@gmail.com>  
Sent: October 25, 2023 8:59 AM  
To: Andrew Garnett <andrew.garnett@town.woodstock.nb.ca>  
Subject: Municipal Plan Updates

Good morning Andrew,  
I hope you are well today :)

I took a few minutes to look at the MP update, overall it's very similar and I have a few comments to add as part of public consultations. Also, could you send me the future land use map and zoning bylaw? I didn't see them on the website.

Typos - Under Section 2.3, goal #1 is missing a word:  
"Revitalize and ?? the Town's Historic Downtown"  
3.2.3 - Connell "Drive" (p.9)

Comments

1. Under 3.2.3, the Objective for infill on 3.2.4 is a good step. Is there any appetite to reduce the minimum parking ratios in the zoning bylaw? This could help

facilitate some of that infill.

2. I was surprised to see that Jacksonville is not mentioned under the discussion of industrial/light industrial and business park. I think they should be included because there is a significant amount of non-retail business in that area of town.
3. LU 27 + 28 - are they in conflict with each other? I'm not clear on whether LU-28 is only referring to provincially designated farmland. My reading of LU-27 (below) is that it would allow low-density residential, resource/timber/woodlots, passive rec (which is a question mark for me because most country people I know love ATVs and motorized vehicles).

Then in LU-28 it discourages any change from rural land to other uses, but wouldn't LU-27 just allow them to build houses on farmland?

I think more clarity here would be helpful.

That's all from me, I'm glad to see the sections on housing and downtown are being retained.

Have a great day!  
Amy

-----

LU-27 Council shall provide for a mix of rural land uses in the Rural Land Use Designation through appropriate provisions in the Zoning By-Law.

LU-28 Council shall discourage the encroachment into agricultural lands through limiting the re-designation of lands from Rural to any other land use designation. When reviewing an application to re-designate Rural lands, Council shall