

**Cronkhite, Amy**

---

**From:** Gillis, Dallas  
**Sent:** December 10, 2021 10:58 AM  
**To:** CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
**Subject:** FW: PID 01502434 AMENDMENT OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS 160 TOTAL UNITS TO 296 TOTAL UNITS

Hello,

This comment has come in for the Sarahs Lane application, but the PAC meeting was held Wed night. I wanted to send this to you so that perhaps it can still be part of the pubic hearing on Monday.

Thanks,  
Dallas

**From:** mlaurenc <[mlaurenc@nb.sympatico.ca](mailto:mlaurenc@nb.sympatico.ca)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 10, 2021 10:51 AM  
**To:** PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT <[planning@fredericton.ca](mailto:planning@fredericton.ca)>  
**Subject:** PID 01502434 AMENDMENT OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS 160 TOTAL UNITS TO 296 TOTAL UNITS

External email:

Do not follow instructions, click links, open attachments, forward or respond to the email unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing to object to the increase of total units for this development by the applicant Thrive Properties c/o Kaitlyn Lacelle.

My cerncers stem from the increase in traffic on Sarahs Lane and the lack of a second emergency exit for residents and emergency vehicles.

We bought knowing there was to be 160 units and now as seniors are no comfortable with even more units being built.

Thank you

Debbie and Mike Laurence  
28 Sarahs lane

Sent from my Galaxy

## Cronkhite, Amy

---

**From:** Peter and Noella Pike <petpike@nb.sympatico.ca>  
**Sent:** December 7, 2021 7:41 PM  
**To:** CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
**Subject:** Hearing of Objections/Support

**External email:**

**Do not follow instructions, click links, open attachments, forward or respond to the email unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Please add to the City Council Public Hearing scheduled for December 13, 2021 in regards to:

Property: 54, 56, 58, 60 & 62 Sarahs Lane  
Applicant: Thrive Properties c/o Kaitlyn Lacelle  
Proposal: Amendment of Terms and Conditions

We believe that prior to any further major development being started in this area that the topic of traffic flow must be addressed further. Studies have been done by the developer as it relates to Sarahs Lane and the developer's project but has it taken into consideration the complete area of relevance.

There have been a number of accidents on the Prospect Street and Patience Lane area in recent months. How many accidents have there been in the past year alone? This hazard will most likely increase as population density increases in the areas of Sarahs Lane, Morning Gate, and High Point Ridge with the development of more high density apartment buildings and housing. Traffic control and solutions should be in place prior to further development and not be done after the fact. It would be less problematic to do the necessary road work prior to additional traffic instead of attempting to do the work within the higher traffic flow, a hazard both to the workers and the public.

A traffic roundabout at Prospect Street West and Patience Lane should precede any further development to the areas of Sarahs Lane, Patience Lane, High Point, and Morning Gate. Let us error on the side of safety in this matter please.

This area can not support the additional 296 units with the current traffic flow/congestion from this project let alone what is being added to the strain on traffic flow by current construction and housing development with the Morning Gate and High Point Ridge projects.

Peter and Noella Pike  
Residents  
76 Sarahs Lane  
Fredericton, NB E3B0G8

## Cronkhite, Amy

---

**From:** Robert Chase <chaserobert001@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** December 13, 2021 10:53 AM  
**To:** CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
**Cc:** Henri Mallet  
**Subject:** Amendments to property located at Sarahs Lane to permit and increase to the size of the development

External email:

Do not follow instructions, click links, open attachments, forward or respond to the email unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have reviewed minutes of last weeks Planning Advisory Committee meeting, which resulted in their recommendation with respect to the above project.

Naturally I am disappointed with their decision and do not believe they fully understood and considered the concerns of area residents. Their conclusion, which was reached and based on representations received, is that the major concern residents have is the increased traffic at Patience Lane and Prospect. While this is a valid concern given this already dangerous intersection, it will not be the only negative consequence of the amendment and resultant increase in project size.

Below you will see my submission to PAC which contains other valid concerns that are shared by everyone I have spoken to in regards to the project. In my opinion PAC ignored these concerns.

I ask that you consider resident concerns and require mitigation to lessen these impacts in your expected approval of the amendment.

Thank you

Robert Chase

PAC submission

> I am a property owner located at 34 Sarah's Lane and adjacent to the proposed development. I object to the proposed amendment for the following reasons:

>

> - when I purchased my home I was aware that the adjacent land was zoned for multi unit buildings and accepted this would happen at some point. The decision to purchase was based on the then approved size of 160 units. The proposed amendment would see the size nearly double. This will significantly change the flavour of the neighbourhood which is see as a quiet, senior occupied, low density area.

>

> -Sarahs Lane in recent years has become the preferred route for all construction traffic headed in and out of the Morningate subdivision. Much of this traffic travels in excess of the speed limits. The level of traffic and speed has already created difficulties for residents and will be greatly aggravated with the addition of 296 more housing units. With only one access point to the subject property, all this traffic will land on Sarahs Lane. If the project is to proceed in any fashion, serious consideration must be given to address volume and speed. Another access from the property that would access Highpoint should be a condition of approval.

>

> Your consideration of my representation will be appreciated. While I believe the proponent, Thrive Properties, have every intention to construct a quality product and cohabitate responsibly the sheer size of the project will impact seriously on current residents who all purchased forever homes in the good faith contained in the city's previous approval

>

Sent from my iPad