



**Virtual Public Information Meeting
Case 22980**

The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.

**Thursday, December 10, 2020
6 p.m.
Virtual**

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Jamy-Ellen, Planner, Planner II, HRM Planning
Carl Purvis, Program Manager
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Stephanie Mah – Presenter for Applicant, Clayton Developments
Kevin Neatt - Presenter for Applicant, Clayton Developments
Deputy Mayor Tim Outhit

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE: Approximately: 5

1. Call to order and Introductions – Jamy-Ellen Klenavic, Planner

Case 22980: Application by West Bedford Holdings Limited requesting substantive and non-substantive amendments to an existing development agreement for lands off of Amesbury Gate to allow townhouse development.

Ms. Klenavic introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator guiding Clayton Developments application through the planning process. They also introduced other staff members, and the presenter from West Bedford Holdings. The area Deputy Mayor for District 16, Tim Outhit, was also in attendance online.

2. Presentations

2a) Presentation by HRM Staff – Jamy-Ellen Klenavic

Ms. Klenavic's presentation included information on the following:

- (a) the purpose of the meeting including to share information and collect public feedback about the proposal - no decisions were made at this meeting;
- (b) the role of HRM staff through the planning process;
- (c) a brief description of the application including site context, explanation of what a development agreement is, proposed site plan, proposed changes, policy and By-law overview, policy consideration;
- (d) and status of the application.

2b) Presentation by Stephanie Mah – Applicant

Ms. Mah presented details about Clayton Developments proposal including site plan view, and concept plan.

3. Questions and Comments

Ms. Klenavic welcomed attendees to ask questions to staff and the presenters and provide their feedback, including what they liked and disliked about the proposal. Attendees that were connected via Teams webcast were called upon to provide their comments and questions.

(1) Questions from people connected via MS Teams

Mr. Purvis invited the speakers from the public, one at a time, to unmute themselves and provide their comments:

- (i) Dominic Clamp, Amesbury Gate, Bedford:
Has 3 concerns they would like to discuss;
- 1 – Tree clearance, the trees are significant and are a sound buffer for the highway. Page 14 and 19 of the application has a significant difference in the number of trees that are cut back. I would just like to know which is a better representation of the clearance that is going to take place. My concern is more with page 14.
Mr. Neatt stated there was a drafting error. There is no reason to take out the trees above block A11. The ones in the slide show tonight are what is called dead reckoning and we are much closer that.
- 2 – Parking – it is a private laneway, so I anticipate with a private laneway that there will be no parking allowed on the laneway. Is that correct? My concern would be with overflow parking on Amesbury Gate. Amesbury Gate is a young community with a lot of children playing and with increased traffic activity there comes concerns around safety and quality of life for the residents. Would there be any way to mitigate that? Post development if the need arises, is there no room to expand the parking?
Ms. Mah stated the parking that is provided by the townhouse driveways and the visitor parking is the only permitted parking onsite. It is something that is important to us and we have done our best to design that maximizes the visitor parking to provide for people. We have built it out right to the edge of the watercourse buffer and we do feel that it should be sufficient for the site.
Mr. Neatt stated there is a slight amount of room on the northwest side of the units without garages if needed. There is the ability to expand if absolutely needed. We have the parking dialed into this type of product and we are pretty confident that we are not going to see overflow onto Amesbury Gate. It would also be inconvenient for people to park on Amesbury Gate because of its setback a fairway from it.
- 3 – the third is minor, the artist renderings refer to the townhomes in the vicinity, do you know if they will fit into the aesthetic character of the neighbourhood? Is this something the city can weigh in on in the planning stage?
Ms. Klenavic stated it isn't something the Planning Department would get into detail about in this process.
Ms. Mah stated they review each application for architectural detail to make sure it fits into the community.
- 4 – Can we consider as residents that there will be no further development on this plot of land?
Ms. Klenavic advised if it was to be considered it would have to follow this process again and would require public input.
Ms Mah stated once this block is completed, they have no plans to expand this block.
- (ii) Genadi Chaikin, Amesbury Gate, Bedford:
Question about tree removal. Trees have already been removed from this area, but you say final approval hasn't been given yet for what is going to be built there. How does that work if they have already started cleanup of that area?
Ms. Klenavic stated a property owner can clear trees on their property up to the watercourse buffer regardless of whether they have a development permit issued or not. Because there is already an approved development on this site so in both cases tree removal isn't surprising.

If this is not approved would more trees be removed? My concern right now is that after the removal of the trees I can see the highway very well and I can hear and see the cars. It hurts the sound barrier and it affects the visual aspect of things from my backyard. My concern if there is a chance that more trees might be removed, that might be a bigger problem for the tenants and cost our homes to depreciate. What is the limit on the tree cutting? Could there be some consideration of putting up a sound barrier, like a wall or something that would help with the noise?

Ms. Klenavic stated the tree removal isn't something that is regulated through this process.

Ms. Mah can't really say if anymore trees are going to be removed at this time one way or the other. If the townhouses are approved a smaller amount of tree cover will have to be cut, then if the multi residential building goes forward. The townhouses development would be favorable for you. A sound barrier isn't something that is being considered at this time.

(iii) Deputy Mayor Outhit spoke to some of the concerns of the residents.

4. **Closing Comments**

Ms. Klenavic thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting.

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:42 p.m.