

Summary of Public Engagement



HRM Planning Application Website



Signage Posted on the Site



Mailout to residents and property owners



Shape Your City Website



Responses to Public Questions and Concerns



Future Public Hearing Prior to a Decision

Information Sharing

Information on PLANAPP 2024-03126 was shared through the HRM planning applications webpage, the Shape Your City website, signage posted on the subject site, and notices mailed to property owners within approximately 80 metres (262 feet) surrounding the proposed development.

The proposal involves rezoning PIDs 40179202 & 00208280 on Craigmere Drive, Halifax from R-1 to R-3 zone to develop 10 unit condominium with 3 storey height on each lot. Therefore, the applicant submitted the following documents as part of their application: Planning rationale, Conceptual Site Plan, Conceptual Floor Plans and Traffic Impact Statement. These documents were posted online for public viewing.

Public Engagement Statistics:

Halifax.ca Planning Applications Website	
Number of unique website views up to date	66
Average time spent on the website (seconds)	58
Notices Mailed to Area Residents	
Number of notices mailed within notification area	121
Direct Communication with the HRM Planner	
Number of calls received (unique callers)	0
Number of emails received from the public (unique email addresses)	13

Responses to Public Questions and Concerns

Of the thirteen residents who contacted us, ten expressed a lack of support for the proposed rezoning. The remaining three respondents did not clearly express opposition but shared concerns and reservations about the rezoning. Of the thirteen residents who contacted us, two had questions of clarifications regarding the Land Use By-law requirements. One resident shared points for consideration, while another inquired about both the Land Use By-law requirements of the proposed R-3 zone and applicable policies, in addition to sharing recommendations and points for consideration. Among thirteen responses, four requested a Public Information Meeting.

HRM planning staff have compiled all the public comments and questions provided to date. Broadly, the concerns relate to traffic generation, parking issues, pedestrian safety, limitations of Craigmores Drive, the impact on neighborhood character, and the compatibility of development density.

Traffic Generation and Parking Concerns

- Concern that the new development will contribute to traffic congestion.
- Concern about increased traffic congestion both during construction and after project completion.
- Concern about parking availability and the proposed locations for parking provision.
- *“Turning onto Joseph Howe at 8am is difficult in either direction and more traffic will not help this.”*
- *“The existing 5-townhouse development has already contributed to increased traffic and safety concerns, and additional units would make these issues worse.”*
- *“The street is already experiencing considerable traffic congestion from large vehicles (e.g., garbage trucks, moving vans, propane delivery trucks, food delivery trucks for the IWK facility).”*
- *“While I can see some merits in their proposal, my main concern lies with the density from a parking perspective. I question if there is enough on site parking for the residents, let alone visitors to the site. Perhaps the developer is expecting to have visitors park in the Craigmores visitor parking area, which I am sure will meet with resident objections. There is minimal on street parking on Craigmores Drive in its current format, and based on the additional restrictions the developer is proposing, this will only get worse.”*
- *“The changes proposed do not fit with the character of Craigmores drive and will create traffic issues for vehicles coming down the very steep hill of Craigmores drive. There are already traffic issues with the 16 storey apartment building and have 20 unit directly across the street would only exacerbate the issues already present.”*
- *“We understand that residential developments such as the one proposed are badly needed in Halifax at the present time of population growth and a severe lack of housing, however, we also feel that common sense must in part be a consideration in the early planning of such a proposal. In this regard, if the owner can build whatever is permitted under the R-3 zoning the construction of a multi-unit building on this narrow street will significantly exacerbate already existing traffic congestion issues on Craigmores Dr.”*
- *“Currently, it can be challenging to access Joseph Howe Drive by car when traffic is backed up from the Armdale-Round-About. Add to that, the traffic that will be generated when the approved apartment building on the opposite side of Craigmores Drive (site of the*

current IWK treatment facility) is completed. It is my understanding that another application to build a nine story apartment has been approved. I believe that it is necessary to consider nearby planned construction, not just the existing structures, when making rezoning decisions.”

- “The concern about street parking is legitimate, especially with the limited space currently. New developments often bring additional traffic and residents, which could exacerbate the problem. As street parking is already an issue, there should be provisions in the development plans for off-street parking (e.g., parking lots or garages) to accommodate new residents and visitors.”
- “More residents, more traffic but also more mail package delivery daily, Amazon, etc., LG commercial vehicles attending the needs of large residential complex. Heavy traffic on Jos. Howe Dr. Makes access and exit a challenge. Add lights could needed ? I have witnessed blockades numerous times. Just think what circumstances will take place when they replace the IWK.”
- “Having 20 more units across the street flowing from a single lane way would only further increase vehicles hastily pulling onto the street, which would only worsen the problem. As well it would create traffic congestion on craigmore drive.”

Pedestrian Safety

- Concern that Craigmore Drive poses a safety risk for pedestrians, particularly retirees.
- Concern that the proposed rezoning will exacerbate existing pedestrian safety risks.
- Concern about potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.
- Concerns and questions regarding the timing and implementation of sidewalk installation.
- “It is already unsafe as vehicles exiting the high rise parking lot often do not yield to vehicles driving on the roadway and pull out on the street in a dangerous manner as there are no stop signs.”
- “If the existing 5 Town House units could make such a difference to our safety on this street, I cannot imagine what the increase in density, allowing R3 zoning would do.”
- “While a sidewalk will be of some assistance, the width of the street is defined by existing infrastructure.”
- “The street is already a safety risk for pedestrians. Our building is mostly occupied by retirees. I’ve seen people walk on Craigmore Dr. using canes and walkers We’ve lived here almost 10 years. After the 5 Town Houses were built on the corner of Joe Howe and Craigmore it became busier and more dangerous for pedestrians near the corner. Every townhouse owner has at least 2 vehicles. That has put at least 10 more vehicles coming and going. From my practical experience as a walker and driver, people appear to fly in and out of this street. When coming off the busy Joe Howe onto Craigmore, people do not appear to slow down in anticipation of a pedestrian on Craigmore. This raises the question of when will HRM be installing a sidewalk on Craigmore Dr, as recommended in the Traffic Impact Statement? If the existing 5 Town house units could make such a difference to our safety on this street, I cannot imagine what the increase in density, allowing R3 zoning would do. We also note that the planned re-development of the BANC IWK property for a 9 story building will only add to the issues mentioned above. “
- “As well - where will the side walk be built?”

Craigmore Drive Limitations

- Concern about Craigmore Drive being a narrow, dead-end street.
- Concern about the safety of access and egress to and from Craigmore Drive.
- Concern about fire safety due to Craigmore Drive having only a single point of access.
- Concern that the steep grade of Craigmore Drive may limit reaction time for vehicles traveling downhill, especially with additional vehicles entering the Craigmore dr.
- *"The street is barely able to provide for 2 way traffic."*
- *"The car traffic and parking issues would be significant as a dead end street."*
- *"Not feasible. The street is too narrow to accommodate increased vehicular traffic."*
- *"I feel the street Craigmore Dr. is too small for such a large project."*
- *"Presently, due to being a dead end street, the garbage trucks need to back up Craigmore, as there isn't anywhere at the end to turn around."*
- *"Craigmore is a dead end street and there is no other way out by vehicle. In case of emergency one would have to cope with the people in the 17 story apartment building on the same street."*
- *"Additionally, Craigmore Dr. is a relatively short, narrow road that already experiences considerable traffic congestion from large vehicles (e.g., garbage trucks, moving vans, propane delivery trucks, food delivery trucks for the IWK facility that is part of the 1 Craigmore Dr. complex)."*
- *"Fire safety is a concern. large forested areas invite fire seasonally. Access to fire trucks on this tiny winding Rd. Only one way out.Bad!"*
- *"Unless the street can exit from the top to St.Margaret Bay Rd or alternative. I believe it will be a disservice to the home owners at the top and there are signs people are trying sell homes or just waiting for offers. If more development continues to emerge exits from the areas must be considered. Developers earn money and need to mitigate harm."*
- *"As well, given the very steep grade of Craigmore drive cars coming down the hill would have little time to react with an additional 20 vehicles pulling out of the proposed single lane way in the same lane as the vehicles coming down the steep hill."*
- *"Craigmore Dr is a narrow residential street, originally built for single family dwellings. There is opportunity for development given the demand for housing however this street has reached its maximum capacity given current projects on the books. The car traffic and parking issues would be significant as a dead end street."*

Neighborhood Character and Density Compatibility

- Concerns about the potential for high-density development.
- Concern that the new development will increase population.
- Concern that the 20 unit condominium does not fit into the character of the Craigmore dr.
- Concern about the impact on the character of the existing neighborhood.
- Some residents suggest that an R-2T zone (townhouses) would be appropriate and better in keeping with the surrounding properties, especially with the townhouse development on the south side of the street.
- *"I can see perhaps a couple of duplexes but not 20 condominium units bringing in the possibility of 40 vehicles (based on 2 per household)."*

- *"A consistent line of town houses is more harmonious and stable for this neighborhood."*
- *"Given all of the above, it seems readily apparent to us that the only type of development that would suit this site is one with a row of townhouses along the lines of the recently-constructed development located at the beginning of the street. All things considered, our quality of life, and that of virtually every resident on Craigmores Dr., will be **significantly** affected by construction of a large, multi-story building on this site. We therefore respectfully suggest that an R-2T (Townhouse zoning) of this site would be much more appropriate than a change to an R-3 zoning."*
- *"I am firmly opposed to a development of this size and suggest something significant smaller in the range of 5 units maximum."*
- *"The 20 unit condominium proposed on these relatively 2 small lots is an over expansion of the 2 R1- single family dwelling lots and does not fit the character of the street."*
- *"Rezoning the two lots at 34 Craigmores Drive from R1 to R2T would facilitate increased density, minimize traffic complications and help preserve "the stability and character of the neighbourhood".*
- *"I believe our little street has done its part to respond to the housing needs of our municipality. The 9 storey, 150 unit (I believe) BANC development on the current IWK Treatment Centre site will access Craigmores Drive. I don't believe another 40 potential units on the subject site via the R-3 zone is consistent with the Planning Strategy, in particular with the policy guidance on infrastructure adequacy."*
- *"I'm in support of a rezoning to R-2T to permit a group of townhouses similar to those recently built on the south side of the street. I believe that 40 additional units on the subject site via the R-3 zone is not consistent with the intent of the Planning Strategy."*
- *"This project identifies 20 additional units bring us to a point where the attributes and qualities of the neighbourhood will be long lost."*
- *"We have concerns about the impact on the current row homes and buildings in the area. Sidewalks can affect the appearance of a neighborhood, especially when they run right in front of existing properties. If sidewalks are added, it's important to ensure that property boundaries are respected and that the sidewalk doesn't negatively impact the curb appeal or accessibility of the row homes."*
- *"At most the 2 lots proposed on craigmores drive could accommodate two duplexes or a town house of 4 units, each with separate driveways, which would be consistent with what is built at the bottom of the roadway on the south east side of Craigmores drive."*
- *"I'm in support of a rezoning to R-2T to permit a group of townhouses similar to those recently built on the south side of the street. I believe that 40 additional units on the subject site via the R-3 zone is not consistent with the intent of the Planning Strategy."*

Other Concerns

- Concern about the impact of blasting, digging, noise and dust during and post construction on neighbors.
- Concern about the Garbage storage and collection.
- Concern that the rendering and drawings were not clear.
- Questions about applicable municipal policies and Land use by-law requirements.
- Concern about the planned 9 storey building approved under HAF amendments and how it might increase the traffic congestion.

- *“We also note that the planned re-development of the BANC IWK property for a 9 story building will only add to the issues mentioned above.”*
- *“The treed portion of the proposed site provides habitat for various species of birds and small mammals. Deer sightings are also frequent in this area and this small area of woods provides a rare space for them to find cover and grazing opportunities.”*

Matters Beyond the Scope of the Rezoning Application

Some of the concerns raised fall outside the scope of this rezoning application. While valid, certain items will be addressed during the permitting stage, where the applicant must comply with all applicable regulations and by-laws. These include:

- Questions regarding population density, angle controls, parking and compliance with the Land Use Bylaw
- Concerns about the adequacy of municipal services and detailed building drawings
- Questions related to the applicable Noise Bylaw and Blasting Bylaw