COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

With respect to
February 26. 2026 Public Hearing Concerning:

City of Mount Pearl Municipal Plan: Amendment #29, 2024 & Mount Pearl Development Regulations: Amendment #77, 2024. Proposal to redesignate land at Civics #173 and #177A Park Avenue from the Open Space (OS) Designation to Residential (RES) Designation; and to rezone land at Civic #2 Stapleton Road (former municipal pool site) and Civics #173, #175-177A Park Avenue from the Open Space (OS) Zone and Residential-Medium Density (RMD) Zone to the Residential High Density (RHD) Zone.

General

The Commissioner was appointed by the City of Mount Pearl by letter dated February 3, 2026 pursuant to Section 19 of ***The Urban and Rural Planning Act 2000*** (the Act) to hold a Public Hearing and to report to Council on the proposed Mount Pearl Municipal Plan 2010: Amendment #29, 2024 & Mount Pearl Development Regulations 2010: Amendment #77, 2024.

The Hearing was held on February 26, 2024 at Mount Pearl City Hall. Your Commissioner was assisted by Kieran Miller, MCIP (Manager of Development and Planning) and Paul Boundridge, MCIP, City of Mount Pearl Consultant.

Introduction

The Hearing commenced at the advertised time of 7:00 P.M. Ms.Kieran Miller, MCIP, Manager of Development and Planning outlined the purpose of the hearing and introduced the Commissioner.

The Hearing was attended by 18 persons which included 7 citizens from local area addresses and 11 persons recorded as "City of Mount Pearl".

The Commissioner affirmed that the "Notice of Meeting" was duly advertised In accordance with the requirements of Section 17 of the Act and that there were no objections raised with respect to "Notice".

Four written submissions were received by the Commissioner; two via e-mail and two via letter drop-off at City Hall. (Attached).

Public Hearing Notes were recorded in writing by Kieran Miller, Manager of Development & Planning. A copy of her notes as well as the "Attendance Sheets" were provided to and reviewed by the Commissioner. The Notes were found to be consistent with the Commissioners personal notes and hence are attached hereto and form part of this Report. (Attached).

The following materials were reviewed by the Commissioner prior to the commencement date of the Hearing:

(1) Background Report of City of Mount Pearl "Briefing Session" of November 18, 2024 Chaired by Councilor Antle;
(2) Other written documentation/actions by Council, Staff and Consultant on the matter to date;
(3) Previous Citizen Submissions and Letters submitted at the Council Briefing Session of November 18, 2024;
(4) Urban & Rural Planning Act, 2000 (as Amended); and
(5) Form of Published Notices.

Purpose of the Hearing

The purpose of the Public Hearing was:

(1) to receive public input and evaluate public response to the proposed Mount Pearl Municipal Plan 2010, Amendment #29, 2024 & Mount Pearl Development Regulations 2010: Amendment #77, 2024;

(2) to report to Council on the nature of the public input with respect to the proposals; and

(3) to provide recommendations to Council.

The Proposed Amendments

Concurrently with the proposed Amendment to the Municipal Plan, the proposed **Mount Pearl Development Regulations 2010, Amendment #8, 2012** is a resolution to amend the Land Use Zoning Map. The Amendment proposes that **Mount Pearl Municipal Plan 2010 Amendment #29, 2024;** and **Mount Pearl Development Regulations 2010: Amendment #77, 2024 redesignate** land at Civic #173 and 177A Park Avenue from Open Space (OS) Designation to Residential (RES) Designation; and **to rezone** certain land at Park Avenue **from** their respective Open Space (OS) zone and Residential- Medium Density (RMD) zone **to** a new designation of Residential High Density (RHD) zone.

The Hearing

On behalf of the City, Mr. Paul Boundridge presented to the Attendees an up-to-date review of the history with respect to the proposed Amendments which included an overview/outline of the consultation process, the proposed Rezoning Amendments and the stated rationale for the changes to date.

At the conclusion of Mr. Boundridge's update the Commissioner resumed the Chair. As previously noted above four written e-mails/letters had been received by the Commissioner prior to the Hearing. These letters were

officially received by and admitted as a part of the official record by the Commissioner. The Commissioner then stated that the Citizens who had submitted written correspondence would, if present, be offered the first opportunity to speak to the matter and, after that, the floor would then be opened to all who wished to speak.

Mr. Kevin Rumsey, a 37 year resident of the area, was then recognized to address the Commissioner. He had previously submitted written correspondence in opposition to the proposal and spoke passionately against the proposal to change the zoning designation. Mr. Rumsey's *viva voce* submission was consistent with his written submission. He strongly opposed the proposed loss of the "OS" designation. He is concerned that the proposed high density uses of the land will put in jeopardy the future of the current ballfield and playground that would, should high density housing become the future use of the land, then be adjacent to the new residential uses. He appeared to be skeptical of the assurances that, notwithstanding any new zoning designation, the ballfield and the playground/park would remain within their current uses.

Next to address the Commissioner was **Mr. Daniel Oakley**. Mr. Oakley had previously addressed the matter at the Council Briefing Session in 2024. At this Hearing he reiterated his concern that he was skeptical of the future of the ballfield and playground/park if rezoned. He queried why the ballfield and playground/park would not be left out of the rezoning if it was intended that they would retain their current uses notwithstanding the rezoning changes.

The Commissioner next recognized **Mr. Winston Brown**. Mr. Brown had also previously addressed the stated Briefing Session of November, 2024. He stated to the Commissioner that he had concerns regarding the rezoning of the whole area as "High Density". He stated that he was of the opinion that once the whole area was designated as high density the ballfield and playground would be gone within "a few short years down the

road". He expressed concern that no detailed information has been provided by Council as to which land the new housing project would be going on first - would it be the old pool area or the parking area. Mr. Brown did not accept the previous explanation, earlier reiterated by Mr. Boundridge, that there is currently no proponent with respect to this land.

Note: Mr. Boundridge asked to be permitted to respond. He said that there is as yet no RFP approved by Council with respect to this land. He further stated that the current process is, at this juncture, a preparation for the future development of the land as a residential use and positioning the Council with maximum flexibility to deal with the property in whatever way Council envisages is in the best interest of the City of Mount Pearl.

The Commissioner then referred to a letter containing comments received from a **Mr. Greg Browne.** Mr. Browne did not appear at this Hearing. He presented to the Commissioner a four page type written letter setting out his objections to high density rezoning and development with respect to the proposed rezoning in this area. Mr. Browne raises many issues such as: character and compatibility; traffic and parking matters, privacy and shadow impact issues for adjacent area homes; noise levels; strain on local infrastructure; and loss of alternative uses. Many, if not all, of these concerns are legitimate but can also be said to be standard issues normally addressed by Councils and the professional City Staff in the normal processes of community governance with respect to all real estate development. Mr. Browne also states his concerns about "insufficient information and engagement on project specifics". However; his comments in this regard appear to be premature based on the repeated comments throughout the process to date that there is no recognized Proponent and there has been no approved RFP on the part of the Council. Mr. Browne raises many valid opinions. He concludes his written opinions with a final paragraph worthy of consideration by Council regarding the advancement of any future actions on the part of Council with respect to the development of this site. Mr. Brown states: "We appreciate Council's responsibility to

address housing needs in Mount Pearl. However, this should not be accomplished by imposing an over-sized, high-density project on a small, established residential pocket without adequate protections for the families already living beside it. We urge you to take a cautious balanced approach that respects both current and future residents".

After the completion of the presentations of Messrs. Rumsey, Oakley and Brown the Commissioner then opened up the floor to the general public and invited anyone present who wished to address the matter to come forward. Four persons present availed of the opportunity: Messrs. Martin Best, Steven Walsh. David Rumsey and Darrell Traverse.

The Commissioner next recognized **Mr. Martin Best.** Mr. Best expressed an opinion that Apartment buildings are not necessarily "a fit" for this specific area and that any residential use must be within a blended nature vis-a-vis the current community. He raised concerns regarding increased traffic, increased crime and winter season snow issues. He stated that once mistakes are made, such as large developments, they cannot be reversed and urged Council not to bend to pressure due to federal money being available.

The Commissioner next recognized **Mr. Steven Walsh**. Mr. Walsh stated that he has small children and was against the rezoning due to increased traffic issues. He further stated that parking is currently an issue during the Summer months due to ballpark use and questioned where the parking would be located if an apartment building is built on the site.

Next recognized by the Commissioner was **Mr. David Rumsey**. Mr. Rumsey stated that since "row housing is medium density then high density can only mean one thing - apartment building". He then stated further "...with that comes no privacy for adjacent property owners".

The final person recognized by the Commissioner was **Mr. Darrell Traverse**. Mr. Traverse stated a concern about "misinformation". He stated that misinformation put out causes unnecessary stress and chaos. He then stated that no one is against development if it is the right development for the area. He then further stated that a high density development is not the right development.

There then being no other attendees indicating a desire to speak; the Commissioner noted that he had observed from the records of the public meeting previously held by Council on November 18, 2024 that Council had been fully apprised at that time of most of the issues now being raised by citizens at this meeting. He further stated that he was confident that the issues raised in this Public Hearing and noted in this Commissioner's Report, would be fully evaluated in future Council deliberations on the matter.

Of particular note to the Commissioner was that the general consensus of the written submissions as well as that of the viva voce comments of all the speakers was not that they were against a future housing construction development on the site *per se.* Rather the general consensus of both the written submissions and the Speakers indicate that they were strongly opposed to the erection of a "high rise" development being the eventual choice of housing construction on the site.

Of note to the Commissioner was that no definition of what constituted a "high rise" was provided by any submission, written or oral, nor that referenced any of the many new residential construction sites of recent years in the City of Mount Pearl as being an example of "an objectionable high rise".

In addition to the objection to a high rise complex, all speakers appeared to hold very strong and genuine concerns about the future fate of the Ballpark and the Playground should they lose their OS Zoning designation. A

general mistrust was evident in their speech tones whenever this topic was brought up notwithstanding statements by City staff at both this Hearing and the November 2024 Briefing Session that the Ballpark and the Playground would both remain in their current uses.

Although the concerns raised were diverse the citizens were adamant that their concerns, particularly with respect to the future fate of the Ballpark area and the possible construction of a high rise apartment complex, be heard and addressed by Council and that Council protect their interests to the fullest reasonable extent before any final decision is made to proceed further with the development of the property.

In view of the fact that all of the speakers either recognized, or at least did not object to, the need for more housing in the City of Mount Pearl, coupled with the further fact that, with the exception of the Ballpark and Playground, no person objected to the proposed rezoning designations and the sites being used as a "housing site". The aerial view map clearly shows that the location of the land to be rezoned is in the midst of a residential center. Although there is no indication otherwise; anything other than a future residential development would not be an appropriate fit for this area.

With respect to a residential fit; the residents have clearly indicated that, although they recognize the need for affordable housing, they disfavor the construction of a "high rise apartment" if it is to be the intended future use. City representatives consistently stated throughout the Hearing that there is at present no commitment to any form of future use except that, as is evident from the rezoning actions, it will be residential in nature. It was noted that, in most situations where a development proposal has been made to Council, there would be a "Proponent" present to answer questions with respect to the proposal. However; there was no "Proponent" at this Hearing because Council has not yet reached the stage where it has authorized any RFPs or other positive actions regarding this land except, as stated, this rezoning application designed to strengthen its own position

with respect to future dealings regarding this land. It was repeatedly stated by Council representatives that the rezoning application's nomenclature is to provide Council with total flexibility to consider all future residential options that may arise for use of all the land. They will then be in the strongest position to weigh what use they determine will be in the best interests of the Citizens of Mount Pearl.

The record to date clearly indicates Council's willingness and determination to consider and evaluate all citizen's concerns before proceeding with the Application. The Commissioner urges Council to maintain its positive attitude and approach with respect to the future development of these lands and that the issues raised publicly at this Hearing, as well as previous and subsequent matters ancillary thereto, continue to remain issues of concern to Council in future matters affecting the future use of the subject lands.

The difficulty these days in residential areas of low density housing appears to be that where vacant land is being considered for development of any kind it appears to immediately raises concerns in the local area property owners about the construction of "High Rise Apartment" complexes. These legitimately held concerns of the property owners in the local area usually involve what the affect of the new development will have on their quality of life as well as the future value of their properties. These concerns appear to be evident here with respect to the local citizens in the area. However; on the other side of the equation, whenever making decisions within its mandate, the City Council incumbents have overriding fiduciary responsibilities to the Citizens of the City to act in what they have collectively determined will be in the best interests of the City. In this regard Council carries the delicate responsibility of trying to balance the interests and concerns of the local citizens with the interests and concerns of the City "writ large". In this case, the local area citizens appear to be skeptical of the Council's provided reasons for the decision to re-zone the area as set out herein. Although truly held; in many cases the objections appear to be based mostly on skepticism and inferences as to possible future

outcomes that amount, at this stage, to essentially "second-guessing" as to what Council's future intentions would or might be. However; with respect to this rezoning application there is no plain evidence, other than an indication that whatever the future use it will be residential in nature, of what Council will in fact or might do in the future by changing the Zoning allocations as indicated therein. Certainly the proposed designations will allow for any and all kinds of residential uses. In this regard the concerns raised by the citizens may or may not prove to be true in the future. However; as of today, with respect to the ballpark and playground areas, the Council's intentions have been made known - they will remain within their current uses. Whether the stated intentions are accepted or not is a personal decision. However; there has been no valid evidence presented here to discredit or impugn what Council has publicly stated about the future uses of the ballpark and the playgrounds. Council has been apprised of the local citizens concerns and is very aware of its obligation to weigh those concerns in its deliberations. However; after due consideration of the views and concerns of the local residents at this Hearing, I am not convinced that there are sufficient grounds raised that would warrant any impediment of Council's proposed rezoning actions at this time.

Recommendations

There being no legal objections noted by the Commissioner nor raised at the Hearing, and after due consideration of all of the presentations, both oral and written, raised and addressed at the Public Hearing held on the 26th day of February, 2026, It is hereby recommended to Council that:

City of Mount Pearl Municipal Plan: Amendment #29, 2024 & Mount Pearl Development Regulations: Amendment #77, 2024. Proposal to redesignate land at Civics #173 and #177A Park Avenue from the Open Space (OS) Designation to Residential (RES) Designation; and

to rezone land at Civic #2 Stapleton Road (former municipal pool site) and Civics #173, #175-177A Park Avenue from the Open Space (OS) Zone and Residential-Medium Density (RMD) Zone to the Residential High Density (RHD) Zone **be approved without Amendment.**

Respectfully submitted this 11th day of March, 2026.

Ernest Boone

Ernest Boone, C.D.,K.C.
Commissioner

Written comments of Local Residents

11:000am 85

City of Mount Pearl
FEB 24 2026
RECEIVED

Stapleton Road Property

[redacted]

Date Tuesday 2026-02-24

Development Regulations Amendment No. 77, 2024

The City of Mount Pearl is seeking to rezone land at civic #2 Stapleton Road (former municipal pool site)

And civic #173, 175-177A Park Ave from Open Space and the Residential-Medium Density (RMD) Zone to the Residential-High Density (RHD) Zone, as shown on Land Use Zone Map 1.

This amendment would provide council with the authority to develop on this property Double Dwellings, Row Dwellings, or dwelling units in an Apartment Building.

As a resident of Davis Place for the past 37 years, I am strongly opposed to the rezoning of this property from Open Space Zone to Residential High Density (RHD) Zone.

Neighborhoods Need Open Spaces for all of their residents, young and old. At present, this space accommodates a highly used softball/baseball field and a popular playground.

Council's decision to go for a Residential-High Density (RHD) Zone puts these facilities in great jeopardy. They will no longer have the protection of the Open Space designation. Council says that the soft-ball/baseball field, playground, and a paved parking lot are to remain in us. But for how long? Future Residential-High Density development for these facilities is inevitable.

As far as the old pool site is concerned, why not re-invest in this property by making it an outdoor recreational multi-purpose facility where leisure-time activities can easily, safely, and spontaneously take place.

Why not re-invest in this " Whole Property " by keeping its Open Space (OS) designation and by working together as a community with our council to make it a " Neighborhood Area " to be used and enjoyed by all our residents and visitors.

As residents, we take great pride in our neighborhood while contributing to the good name of our City.

I will be attending the Public Hearing at 7 PM on Thursday, February 26, 2026.

Kevin D. Rumsey

Kevin D. Rumsey

Miller, Kieran

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 3:46 PM
To: Miller, Kieran
Subject: Stapleton Road

Hi Kieran,

Just to advise that I will be attending the briefing session on Feb 26th.

The notice is a little confusing regarding cancellation if no written feedback (2 copies). I am confident that many will be attending to understand what exactly the development will be and provide feedback at that time.

I do plan on stopping by City Hall to view the amendments.

Thanks

Dan Oakley
[redacted]

February 4, 2026

Mount Pearl City Council

I have been notified that there will be a public meeting on February 26th, to give notice of rezoning of the Stapleton Road property.

I am very aware that something must be done with that property, but I thought that at our last meeting the residents in the area stated that anything but an apartment building would be the desired option.

I have a couple of concerns about the rezoning:

1. What impact will future development have on the neighborhood, especially for the residents that will be directly behind and construction. (traffic, privacy, etc.)
2. What impact will it have on property values in our neighborhood, especially those closest to any future development on Stapleton Road.

Winston Brown

Winston Brown
[redacted]

Greg Browne
[redacted]

City of Mount Pearl
FEB 24 2026
11:50 A.M
RECEIVED

MN

February 23, 2026

Mayor Dave Aker and Members of Council
City of Mount Pearl
3 Centennial Street
Mount Pearl, NL A1N 1G4

Re: Stapleton Road Redevelopment – Objection to High-Density Rezoning and Development

Dear Mayor Aker and Members of Council

We are writing as homeowners whose property directly backs onto the former swimming pool site on Stapleton Road (civic #173, 175–177A Park Avenue). We wish to formally register our opposition to the proposed high-density redevelopment and associated rezoning of this parcel of land.

We recognize that the City's Strategic Plan aims to attract more young families, immigrants, and newcomers and that the Stapleton Road site has been cleared and remediated for future housing development. We also understand that the Expressions of Interest process has contemplated a high-density development with a preference for proposals featuring over 50 residential units. While we support the goal of welcoming new residents, we strongly believe that a high-density project of this scale is inappropriate for this particular site and will have significant negative impacts on the existing neighbourhood.

Below are the key reasons for our objection:

1. Neighbourhood character and compatibility

The surrounding area is a long-established, low-density residential neighbourhood of single-family homes with generous lots and mature trees. A high-density development of 50 or more units represents a dramatic and abrupt change in built form, height, and massing compared to the existing streetscapes. Such a sudden intensification risks undermining the character and stability of the neighbourhood that current residents have invested in and relied upon for decades. A more modest, context-sensitive development with lower density and scale would be far more compatible with existing homes and the expectations of residents who back directly onto this site.

2. Traffic, safety, and parking pressures

Adding 50 or more units on a 2.58-acre parcel will generate a substantial increase in vehicle trips on Stapleton Road, Park Avenue, and nearby residential streets, all of which already experience busy

periods associated with schools, local businesses, and commuter traffic. Without a detailed traffic impact study and clear mitigation measures, this level of intensification raises serious concerns about congestion, cut-through traffic on quiet local streets, and risks to pedestrian safety—particularly for children, seniors, and people with mobility challenges. On-site parking for a high-density development is often insufficient, leading to spillover parking on adjacent streets and further eroding safety, sightlines, and emergency access.

3. Overlooking, privacy, and shadow impacts on adjacent homes

Because our property directly abuts the former pool lands, any multi-storey, high-density project will have a profound effect on our privacy and enjoyment of our homes and yards. Buildings with multiple storeys and many units mean dozens of windows and balconies overlooking existing backyards, decks, and living spaces. This represents a significant loss of privacy for current residents and will change how we can safely and comfortably use our outdoor spaces. Depending on building height and placement, there is also a risk of increased shadowing and reduced sunlight in backyards, which affects not only quality of life but also gardens, trees, and property values.

4. Noise, light pollution, and general livability

A high-density development will inevitably introduce higher and more continuous levels of noise—vehicle doors and traffic, deliveries, garbage collection, HVAC equipment, and general activity associated with many households in a compact area. Exterior lighting for parking lots, driveways, and building entrances can spill into neighbouring properties, affecting sleep and nighttime enjoyment of our yards. Without strict design controls, buffer requirements, and limits on building placement, the cumulative impact on day-to-day livability for existing residents will be substantial.

5. Strain on local infrastructure and services

While the City notes the site is "shovel-ready" and fully remediated, there has been limited public information about the capacity of existing infrastructure (water, sewer, stormwater, and roads) to support high-density development on this site. Concentrating over 50 units in one small area may strain aging infrastructure and lead to more frequent service disruptions or costly upgrades borne by taxpayers. Similarly, schools, recreation facilities, and health services are already under pressure, and further concentration of population in a built-out area must be carefully assessed and planned for rather than assumed to be manageable.

6. Loss of community-serving land and alternative uses

This parcel, as the former swimming pool site, has historically served a broad public and recreational function. Once it is converted into a high-density residential project and sold, the community loses flexibility for future public uses that might better align with neighbourhood needs—such as green space, small-scale infill, seniors' housing, or community facilities. At minimum, the City should seriously consider lower-density, mixed, or community-oriented options that maintain some public benefit and mitigate the impacts on adjoining households, rather than prioritizing maximum unit yield.

7. Precedent for future high-density infill in stable neighbourhoods

The City has indicated that it is re-creating development regulations to support innovative zoning for higher densities, infill development, and redevelopment. Approving a high-density project of this scale on the Stapleton Road site establishes a precedent that similar intensification may be imposed on other stable, low-density neighbourhoods. This creates uncertainty for long-time residents and may discourage reinvestment in existing homes if people fear that adjacent public parcels will be up-zoned for large multi-unit projects without meaningful neighbourhood consent.

8. Insufficient information and engagement on project specifics

Public information so far focuses on the site preparation and high-level goals, and notes that Expressions of Interest have been accepted for high-density housing. However, residents directly bordering the site have not been provided with clear details about proposed building heights, setbacks, parking arrangements, access points, landscaping, buffering, or construction timelines. Without this information, it is impossible for affected homeowners to fully understand and comment on the true impact of the development. Proceeding with rezoning and disposition of the land before these details are developed and shared undermines trust in the planning process.

9. Need for a scaled, phased, or conditional approach

If Council is determined to see housing on this site, we urge you to consider alternative approaches that respect existing residents, such as:

- Limiting the number of units to a lower, medium-density form more in keeping with surrounding homes.
- Strict height limits (e.g., townhouses or small-scale low-rise instead of larger apartment blocks).
- Robust green buffers, fencing, and setbacks to protect privacy and reduce noise for adjoining backyards.
- Conditions tied to traffic management, parking standards, and infrastructure upgrades before full build-out.

Such measures would better balance the City's desire for new housing with the rights and reasonable expectations of existing property owners.

Requests to Council

In light of the above, we respectfully request that Council:

1. Reject the proposed high-density rezoning and any development concept that seeks to maximize unit count at the expense of neighbourhood character and livability.

2. Direct staff to explore and publicly present lower-density, context-appropriate options for the site that

include meaningful buffers and protections for existing residents.

3. Commit to enhanced engagement with immediately adjacent homeowners, including direct notification, detailed concept plans, and opportunities to shape conditions of any future development.

We appreciate Council's responsibility to plan for growth and to address housing needs in Mount Pearl. However, this should not be accomplished by imposing an oversized, high-density project on a small, established residential pocket without adequate protections for the families already living beside it. We urge you to take a cautious, balanced approach that respects both current and future residents.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We would welcome the opportunity to speak further or to participate in any future public hearing or consultation related to the Stapleton Road redevelopment.

Sincerely



Greg Browne

[redacted]

Hearing Notes

Prepared by Kieran Miller

Manager of Development & Planning

PUBLIC HEARING NOTES
173-177A Park Avenue (Stapleton Road)
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATION AND MOUNT PEARL MUNICIPAL AMENDMENTS

CITY OF Mount Pearl

7:00 PM, THURSDAY FEBRUARY 26, 2026
CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
3 CENTENNIAL STREET, MOUNT PEARL

Welcome and Introductions: Kieran Miller, Manager of Development and Planning, read the Land Acknowledgement as well as general housekeeping items. She then introduced Commissioner Ernest Boone and Mr. Boone proceeded to Chair.

- Commissioner advised of City 'meeting protocol' and advised that these notes would form public record; he asked if anyone wished for their names not to be included in the public record to speak now. No response.

- Commissioner advised it is important to note that there is no proponent at this time, and advised that an EOI will be issued to gauge interest in potential future developments

Background Information: Paul Boundridge provided a brief background and overview of the proposed rezoning.

Commentary by Residents

1. Kevin Rumsey
    a. Opinion is that the City not piece meal the property. There was once a vibrant park in the area and was historically well used. There are 2 daycare centers in neighbourhood, and this is a good area for younger families. The cul de sac was once alive with young families. Concerned about future for kids. Would like to see the area used again as a park, for young kids to enjoy.
    Do not like the entire area being rezoned for housing, as it taking away from the open space area. It is inevitable that this will be residential, high-density housing.
    Kieran Miller clarified – the playground and ballfield will still be permitted under the new zoning. New developments would not include those areas. Mr. Rumsey voiced that all the open space within the City continues to be "squeezed". Stated we need open space to remain.

2. Daniel Oakley

a. If the playground and park will remain, why include that in the rezoned parcel of land? Why not leave it out, to ensure those open spaces remain.

3. Winston Browne
    a. Concerns regarding the whole area is being rezoned as high density. Once the area is designated as such, the ballfield and playground are gone a few years down the road. Council is only looking at swimming pool area right now.
    b. Mr. Browne addressed the Councillors regarding the fact that detailed information was not divulged to residents by Council beforehand. Are we talking about the swimming pool area that the new housing will go on, or will it be the parking lot area? Question not answered at this time, as that is not the purpose of the hearing this evening.
    c. Paul Boundrige spoke to try and further clarify the fact that we do not yet have a proponent in place, or an idea of what development will be placed there.
    d. Would like to know if there has in fact been a proposal, as Mr. Browne was told by Mayor Aker, for an apartment building.

4. Greg Brown had submitted a representation but was not in attendance this evening.

Further Representation (not previously submitted to City)

Martin Best
    a. Believes that the rezoning, as stated, he does not believe to be truthful
    b. We are a boxed in City and have to face difficult financial decisions re revenue, future revenue, etc.
    c. Development of old pool site has been an issue for residents of the area for many years.
    d. Would like to see development that reflects same social fabric as residents enjoy now. Something that continues to reflect what residents enjoy of the area now.
    e. Must be within a blended nature that fits into current development
    f. Apartment buildings are not necessarily a fit for this specific area.
    g. People in area are not to bend to pressures, simply because there is funding available for development
    h. Unfair to accept any development at costs of the resident simply to satisfy a few extra tax dollars for the City. An apartment building will not solve the City financial problems.
    i. Why should we accept something that will shake up our lifestyles, to the point where traffic will go crazy, crime will increase…
    j. CMP makes decisions randomly – too late once it is built.
    k. Too small of an area. Where is the snow going to be pushed

l. Once mistakes are made, such as large scale developments, they cannot be reversed.
m. Point of residents attending these sessions is to ensure that the residents do not have to deal with mistakes, rather than solve the issues in the first place.
n. Before any development goes there – any proposal should be brought forward to residents.
o. If council is feeling pressure due to federal money available, please do not bend to that pressure until the proper decision is made

Steven Walsh

a. Against rezoning, due to traffic. Has small kids.
b. Should not be an apartment building – should be more family friendly area
c. The whole street will be on display, should an apartment building be erected there. There will be no privacy at all.
d. Parking is currently an issue during summer and ball tournaments – where will the apartment building owners park

David Rumsey

a. Is row housing high density or medium density – medium
b. High density means one thing – apartment building
c. There will be NO privacy

Darrell Traverse

a. If there is misinformation put out, it causes unnecessary stress and chaos (re mayor and Mr. Browne convo)
b. No one is against development, if it is the right development for the area – not high density

Closing Comments by Commissioner

- This will be reviewed by the Commissioner, and a recommendation will be sent to the City within 30 days.
- Adjournment.

Attendance Record

Public Hearing of February 26, 206

PUBLIC HEARING - ATTENDANCE RECORD

173-177A Park Avenue (Stapleton Road) –
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATION AND MOUNT PEARL MUNICIPAL AMENDMENTS

7:00 PM, THURSDAY FEBRUARY 26, 2026
CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
3 CENTENNIAL STREET, MOUNT PEARL

CITY OF Mount Pearl

NAME	REPRESENTING / ADDRESS	EMAIL
Kevin Rumsey	[redacted]	
Winston Browne	[redacted]	
Dan Oakley	[redacted]	
Martin Best	[redacted]	
Steven Walsh	[redacted]	
Darrell Traverse	[redacted]	
Kevin Zhao	[redacted]	

NAME	REPRESENTING / ADDRESS	EMAIL
Alanna Felt	City of Mount Pearl	
Jim Locke	City of Mount Pearl	
Brian Power	City of Mount Pearl	
Scott Batt	City of Mount Pearl	
Cassie Rideout	City of Mount Pearl	
Paul Boundridge	Consultant – City of Mount Pearl	
Ernest Boone	Commissioner	
Kieran Miller	City of Mount Pearl	
Robin Bartlett	City of Mount Pearl	
Mark Rice	City of Mount Pearl	
Stephanie Walsh	City of Mount Pearl	