

Date: May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Town Council**

Town of Saint Andrews

212 Water Street

Saint Andrews, NB E5B 1B4

**Re: Opposition to the Market Wharf Approach Trestle Replacement and Expansion Project**

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed Market Wharf Approach Trestle Replacement and Expansion Project with increased concern based on recent plans submitted to the Transport Canada Navigation Protection Program.

As a waterfront property owner—my title extending to the ordinary low water mark—directly adjacent to the site of this proposed development, I have significant and well-founded concerns regarding the detrimental environmental, visual, and property-related impacts this project will have, both on my land and the broader community.

### **1. Environmental and Shoreline Impacts**

The proposed infill will fundamentally alter the natural tidal dynamics of this section of the Saint Andrews waterfront. Historically, the cribbing beneath the former Cottage Craft property allowed tidal waters to flow freely, a critical process that maintained shoreline stability and ecosystem balance. The infill that has already taken place at that site has had clear and measurable negative consequences. The area has become a catch basin for seaweed and debris, and neighbouring properties, including mine, have suffered from increased erosion and flood damage.

The current plan for further infill under the Market Wharf approach—replacing open pilings with solid mass—will exacerbate these problems. By blocking the free flow of tidal water, the project will artificially redirect energy toward the shorelines of my property and my neighbours, increasing erosion, degrading land stability, altering sediment patterns, and raising the risk of flooding.

### **2. Aesthetic and Economic Concerns**

Saint Andrews is a nationally recognized tourist destination, one that heavily relies on its waterfront aesthetic, historical charm, and pristine marine environment. Replacing the current structure with a large, stone-filled infill project not only scars the visual landscape but introduces an industrial feel entirely out of character with our heritage district and tourism-driven economy.

### **3. Scope Creep and Lack of Long-Term Planning**

This project has evolved far beyond what was originally envisioned—a necessary repair of the wharf approach. What we now face is a significant expansion with no clear long-term plan for the rest of the wharf or Market Square. There is no evidence that a 10- to 15-year vision exists for the wharf infrastructure, let alone a transparent financial plan for ongoing maintenance and improvement. Proceeding without such a plan is fiscally and environmentally irresponsible.

#### **4. Urgency Misrepresented**

The Town appears to have been pressured into fast-tracking this project due to the possibility of losing a climate change mitigation grant. This is not a justifiable reason to rush into a project that could cause irreversible harm to our local ecosystem and community. The wharf is not at risk of imminent collapse—it simply needs repair. The fear of losing the grant has blinded stakeholders to the broader, long-term consequences.

#### **5. Expertise and Consultation**

Relying solely on CBCL Engineering's recommendations is insufficient. They are not marine or wharf specialists, nor are they experts in coastal ecosystems, tidal flow dynamics, or sedimentology. Saint Andrews is fortunate to be home to world-class scientists in these fields—many of whom are based at the Huntsman Marine Science Centre, the St. Andrews Biological Station, and in nearby academic institutions. Their input should be mandatory before such a permanent alteration to our shoreline is made.

#### **6. Legal Considerations**

This issue is of such importance to myself and my fellow affected property owners that we are prepared to pursue legal counsel. Should this project proceed in its current form, a class action lawsuit may be initiated to address the environmental, financial, and property damages caused by the Town's actions.

#### **7. Flawed Environmental Trade-offs**

Justifying the destruction of our local marine environment by stating that remediation efforts will occur elsewhere—such as on Campobello Island—is not a valid or ethical rationale. Environmental responsibility cannot be transferred or exchanged like a commodity. You cannot kill one ecosystem to restore another and claim a net benefit.

#### **8. Unfriendly and Unsafe Design**

The proposed use of armour stone and rock fill not only harms the environment but poses direct physical hazards, such as falling risks or entrapment. Additionally, the plan includes the creation of a temporary infill staging area in the water—yet another layer of disruption with further environmental cost.

In summary, this project risks permanently damaging the unique natural and historical character of Saint Andrews, and it does so without sufficient scientific input, long-term vision, or public transparency on the changes made to the original proposal. I urge you to halt this current project, reconsider its scope, and consult with appropriate experts—both environmental and legal—before taking any further steps.

Respectfully,

Cindy Kohler  
Waterfront Property Owner  
233 Water Street, St. Andrews NB E5B 1B3  
mail@cindykohler.com | 506-467-2263

*Attachments: Photos showing the impact of infill on the waterfront along with the increased flood damage on neighbouring properties as a result.*

Storm Surge: <https://photos.app.goo.gl/p8wwziqm9dAqT8D87>  
Wharf Images: <https://photos.app.goo.gl/TqAKdNhAJwa4YHdq7>  
Shoreline: <https://photos.app.goo.gl/8j5Xw6wAFRXViEyj6>  
High Tide: <https://photos.app.goo.gl/PxmPvG84vYxBcZZE7>







