

## Engagement Summary

As a part of the planning process, public participation was conducted for this proposal. This included a survey, a public information meeting, emails, meetings, and phone calls with community members, signage posted on the subject site, and an application website. The following is a summary of those efforts.

### Signage and Website

The application was initially received in November 2020. An application website was published in February 2021 outlining the proposed development and providing staff contact information. A sign providing a general description of the proposal was installed on the subject site in May 2020.

### Virtual Public Meeting

A virtual public meeting was held on October 20, 2021. A mailout notification with details on the application and an invitation to attend the meeting was mailed to 615 surrounding households. A total of 48 community members attended the meeting and approximately 14 attendees provided comments on the application. A summary of the meeting can be found in Appendix A.

### Online Survey

An online survey was conducted as a part of the public engagement for this application. Households within the surrounding area were informed of the survey through a mailout and those who attended the public information meeting received a link to the survey by email. The survey contained 12 questions and there were 128 respondents in total. Questions were on topics such as park size and location, park use, park connections, active transportation, connectivity to surrounding residential areas, location of density within the site, balance of commercial and residential land uses, the appropriateness of the townhouse portion of the development/ and a general question on what areas of the plan need improvement if any. Overall, responses to all survey questions were generally positive with a few notable exceptions summarized below. Survey results can be found in Appendix B.

### Parks (Question 1 to 5)

There were five questions on the proposed parkland and how appropriate/adequate it is for this application. The first and second question considered the size and location of the proposed public parks and 65.3% of participants responded positively to the proposal. Concerns raised include:

- the overuse of existing park facilities especially Brownlow Park,
- that proposed parkland is inadequate to accommodate the density being proposed and the parkland should be increased,
- Brownlow Park needs upgrades to accommodate future residents;
- Increase density to free up more space for parkland;
- A new playground facility is needed to accommodate future residents;
- An area for walking dogs is needed;

- The location of the central park (Blocks C, D, F and G) is not appropriate as it surrounded by parking and buildings;
- More seating and more field space are needed.

The remaining questions on parkland asked participants how adequately the provision of active, passive, and connecting uses were addressed by the proposal and responses were generally positive (64.2%, 68.2% and 76.4% respectively).

### **Transportation Network and Connectivity (Question 6 to 8)**

There were three questions on the adequacy of the transportation network. Question 6 focused on the active transportation component of the proposal and 68.3% of responses were positive. The remaining questions were on the Portland Street Transit Terminal and how well the proposal connects this important infrastructure to the proposed development and the surrounding community. Responses were generally positive (73.3%), but the following concerns were raised:

- The terminal would be better located within the development;
- Connections to the terminal are unsafe due to the layout of surrounding parking lots;
- Concerns about retaining the existing pedestrian connections through Brownlow Park and Berkley Brae;
- Existing pedestrian/cycling infrastructure outside of the proposed development area is inadequate and unsafe (poor infrastructure on Portland Street, disrepair of the Circumferential Highway pedestrian over pass, lack of sidewalks in Manor Park etc.);
- Active transportation connections through the site should be provided as a part of Phase 1;
- A multi use path should be provided from Peddars Way to the development site;
- Existing fencing around Brownlow needs to be removed;
- Connections between Manor Park and Sobeys should be maintained/formalized;
- Public transportation should be included within the development area;
- Accessibility is important including for the visually impaired; and
- Street network should be extended though to other neighbourhoods.

### **Density (Question 9)**

Policy regarding the allowable density for the site was approved as a part of the Regional Centre Municipal Planning Strategy. The plan also provides guidance on how density is to be allocated within the site. Question 9 of the survey asked how well the proposal adheres to this policy requirement. The results were generally positive with 71.5% of respondents indicating that the plan “somewhat” or “definitely” achieved the policy goal.

### **Land Uses (Question 10 and 11)**

The survey included a question on the balance of land uses proposed within the site. Respondents generally feel that the mix of commercial and residential uses proposed is well balanced (75.6%).

The proposal includes a townhouse development at the back of the site. Respondents were asked as to whether the size, location and landscaping were adequate for this part of the proposal. The following feedback was provided:

- Townhouse development is appropriate throughout the site, not tall buildings;
- The proposal responds to the previous consultation outcomes which suggested lower density adjacent to existing low rise residential neighbourhoods;
- The vegetative buffer between the proposed townhouses and the existing residential community is important and necessary
- Higher density is needed throughout the site, no need for lower density townhouse development
- The development does not fit well with the existing community
- Townhouses are too close to existing development
- Parking space and garages should be in front of the townhouses
- More commercial and less residential land uses;
- Parking in the rear is supported;
- Parking in the rear should be open space for use by residents (i.e., backyards);
- Materials like brick and stone should be required;
- Townhouses should be located along Portland Street;
- There are too many units and too much height;
- Bungalow style should be considered;
- The architectural style of the townhouses is unattractive;
- More townhouse units should be included; and
- Rear parking should be more alley like with backyards, less like a parking lot.

### **General Feedback (Question 12)**

The final question of the survey asked respondents for any other feedback they'd like to provide. The responses included the following:

- Apartment buildings are too high and height should be limited to 9 storeys;
- The potential increase in traffic is a concern;
- The development should be of high-quality construction;
- The development should provide affordable housing opportunities;
- Trails and paths should be well lit;
- More park space should be provided;
- Increase the height to 20 to 22 storeys;
- Environmental impacts to Penhorn Lake during and after construction are a concern;
- Servicing plan is inadequate;
- School capacity should be considered;

- Green building practices should be incorporated into the development;
- Light pollution should be mitigated; and
- Increase in parking for Brownlow

### Next Steps

The above summary concludes the formal portion of public engagement. Updates to the proposal will continue to be posted on the website. Members of the public will be given another opportunity to provide feedback directly to the Harbour East – Marine Drive Community Council at a public hearing which will be advertised on the application website, in the Chronical Herald newspaper, and through a mailout notification to surrounding households. In the meantime, direct any questions to the staff planner:

**Melissa Eavis, Planner III**

**Phone: 902.237.1216**

**Email: [eavism@halifax.ca](mailto:eavism@halifax.ca)**

# Appendix A: Virtual Public Information Meeting Notes



## Virtual Public Information Meeting Case 23224

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

---

Tuesday, October 20, 2021  
6 p.m.  
Virtual

### STAFF IN

#### ATTENDANCE:

Melissa Eavis, Planner, Planner II, HRM Planning  
Carl Purvis, Planning Applications Program Manager  
Maggie Holm, Principal Planner  
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning

### ALSO IN

#### ATTENDANCE:

Stephanie Mah – Applicant, Clayton Developments Limited  
Andrew Bone – Applicant, Clayton Developments Limited  
Kevin Neatt – Applicant, Clayton Developments Limited  
Sam Austin (District 5) - Councillor

### PUBLIC IN

#### ATTENDANCE:

Approximately: 48

---

## 1. Call to order and Introductions – Melissa Eavis, Planner

Case 23224: Application by Clayton Developments to redevelop the former Penhorn Mall property with a mixed-use community containing a mix of low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise residential buildings in addition to retail uses on the lands at 535-569 Portland Street, Dartmouth.

Ms. Eavis introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator guiding Clayton Developments application through the planning process. They also introduced other staff members, and the presenter for this application. The area Councillor for District 5, Sam Austin, was also in attendance online.

## 2. Presentations

### 2a) Presentation by HRM Staff – Melissa Eavis

Ms. Eavis'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 application history, application proposal, site context, proposal, planning policies & what a development agreement is;
- (d) and status of the application.

### 2b) Presentation by Kevin Neatt, Andrew Bone & Stephanie Mah – Applicant

Mr. Neatt talked about Clayton Developments Limited and the Shaw Group. Andrew Bone presented details about Clayton Developments Limited proposal including background, design, their vision for the sight, the proposal, what the surrounding area is like, access to the site, concept plan, active transportation network, greenway and central park, traffic

calming plan, Stephanie Mah presented details on the type of building forms and uses – townhouses, midrise buildings, high-rise buildings, conceptual renderings, site details & stormwater management plan, aligning the plan with HalifACT 2050.

### 3. Questions and Comments

Ms. Eavis 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) **Neil Stover:**

Will you save trees around block E1 when the development takes place, will there be natural gas service to the development?

**Andrew Bone:** They are working with the natural gas utility right now to attempt to bring it into the area. The number of trees that can be protected or saved will be determined at detailed design. They will try to maintain as many trees as possible.

(i) **Kip Pegley:**

Has concerns around the trees on the north side of the property. It is concerning to hear that there is no clear plan for protecting those trees. Would like more clarity around what is happening to those trees and will there be a retaining wall there? What steps are being taken to protect the Manor Park residents?

**Melissa Eavis:** Has been hearing from the community that they want to maintain a buffer between Manor Park and the development, and this is defiantly something that can be considered when drafting the development agreement as well as protecting the existing trees. Through fencing and the landscape buffer is how they will be protecting the residents of Manor Park.

**Andrew Bone:** Right now, they are working on grading on the site and trying to figure out what will need to be graded and where they will have to alter grade. They are in the process of trying to figure out if they are going to need any retaining walls. For landscaping and fencing – they are trying to work on figuring out what the need is. There will be an attempt to provide buffering between the development and the existing community.

(ii) **Andria Davidge:**

Are the buildings and townhouses going to be rentals or, condos? Any low-income housing and if so, how much? Will new schools be opened to accommodate influx of children?

**Andrew Bone:** The dwelling units have yet to be determined. It ultimately depends on who is building the buildings. The types of buildings have been determined as shown. Affordable housing – this mix of units will be market righted. As part of that, the density housings requirements, by the city require a significant contribution that goes into the affordable housing fund.

**Kevin Neatt:** The piece on renal vs condo, regardless of the rental or condos the quality that Clayton imposes on our builders is the same. It is always high-level fit, finish, and quality.

**Melissa Eavis:** HRM circulates our applications to the school boards so they are aware of all our planning applications. Their mandate is to accommodate this kind of growth and if required will build schools if needed.

(iii) **Ron Noseworthy:**

The development is already a done deal in relationship to the Central Plan – is that correct Councillor Austin? If that is a given, they think that there is a need for further public consultation because the last time this was done, over 10 years ago and not virtually, there was over 100 people in attendance. Will this be it after the survey is completed in November? The sign has 13

storey's as the max height of the buildings and the proposal has 15 so there is some misinformation from a public point of view.

**Councillor Austin:** The Centre Plan being a done deal question – this piece of it, the broad vision for the site, was approved as part of package A when that come through council. Now we are talking about the specific details in terms of what goes in the development agreement.

**Melissa Eavis:** As far as consultation, we struggled with the virtual when planning this meeting because we knew there was a lot of interest on the site. This way allows us to answer any questions and then we can have a better dialog individually about your specific concerns and comments. That being said, if there is a need for further conciliation, we wouldn't be apposed to that either. As for the sign and the misinformation, the sign would have been put up when the application was first opened back in the spring and the application has changed and evolved with revisions that have come in sense the application was first received so that sign doesn't reflect that. The website would be the most up-to-date information on the request.

**(iv) Tony McGrath:**

How many cars are anticipated on the site, what are you designing for? How many parking spaces will there be? Portland St. is a disaster, particularly by the overpass, what is the city's plan for the interface for this new load of vehicles?

**Andrew Bone:** As far as traffic goes, and because this is so close to transit, we expect a high number of these residents to choose to be here because they don't need a car. Secondly, we have done the traffic analysis, it was submitted to the municipality, and they have accepted the results. They are aware that the municipality is doing a functional plan for the Portland St. corridor where they are looking at transit and transit upgrades as well as improvements to Portland St., but they don't think anything has come out of that yet. For each building there will be a 1:1 parking space underground (905 total spaces). There will also be some above ground parking and some on street parking.

**Carl Purvis:** Spoke to the Traffic Impact Study.

**(v) Jim and Alexa Kennedy:**

Your storm water plan discusses the new surface features but says nothing about the storm sewers themselves. Where are they and where will they empty to? Will there be any measures to reduce, particularly, winter road salt from going to Penhorn and, possibly, Oathill Lake? Has any consideration been given to having at least some single level (possibly with basement) town houses around the perimeter rather than all two-story ones? There is a deficit of such units in HRM, which are particularly of interest to seniors. Regarding the question of community involvement, we know that many neighbours didn't get the invitation to this meeting.

**Andrew Bone:** Road salt, the municipality determines weather road salting happens. The stormwater controls are used measures to control the amount of grit and contaminates. Stormwater throughout of the site mostly flows to the low point on the site which is immediately adjacent Penhorn Lake.

**Kevin Neatt:** Stormwater – through regulations and working with Department of Environment we balance our stormwater through quality and quantity. Lake monitoring programs are also put in place to make those determinations and we will be working with HRM staff to set-up a monitoring program.

**Stephanie Mah:** We design our units based on market feedback. Before these get constructed there will be some analysis of what people in the community are looking for.

**(vi) Ron Noseworthy:**

When Penhorn Mall was originally constructed there was a huge amount of stormwater that came off and went into the soccer pitch and drainage around it to a point where the small drains could not hold and handle it. There was also an issue of it going directly into Penhorn Lake into the winter before the berms were put up on the site. It is great to see that there is a stormwater management plan in the documents. That is positive.

**Melissa Eavis:** The quality of Penhorn Lake is very much a concern for the planning department. Very aware of the impacts this development would have on this lake and we will make sure that is managed properly.

**(vii) Xiaojie Yang:**

Is it possible to increase the proportion of commercial units in the re-development? We hope this community to become more convenient but with less new residents.

**Melissa Eavis:** Spoke to the Regional Centre Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy policy consideration and where they want mixed-use on the property.

**Andrew Bone:** Stated this community is an ideal live work community and they are hoping in negotiations with HRM that this will allow for home-based business. Once the front is redeveloped there may be additional commercial opportunities that may radiate back into these lands.

**Xiaojie Yang:** There are 2 phases of this development and phase 2 would happen in 30 years after the rental of the existing commercial units. It means for a long time the community would use the same existing commercial units here and that worries them regarding the capacity of these units. The community is currently a quite relaxing community with many mature residents, if there are many new apartments – this means many young residents coming into the community and changing the existence of the community. If hoping the commercial units would be constructed earlier.

**(viii) Ren:**

For people living in those units (townhouse/building) in the future, if they have small business like a small massage studio, can they do their business in the place they live in their units? Would there be any possibility that we can see this community integrating solar power to the community?

**Andrew Bone:** Home based business seems very reasonable to propose that home-based business be enabled. That would be a term of the development agreement and subject to the municipality's terms and conditions. They anticipate the infrastructure to be build within 3 years and the buildings will take longer, each on taking about 24 months to build, with the intent to get this online as quick as possible.

**Melissa Eavis:** Phasing – explained the phasing plan and that provisions will be put in the DA to allow it to proceed in 3 phases.

**(ix) Ron Noseworthy:**

By next spring you are planning to break ground in phase one with a 12 & 13 storey high-rise – correct. 2000 people living in those 2 high-rises?

**Melissa Eavis –** Yes that is phase one, but 2000 people is for the entire site, not just that phase, 4000 people for the entire development.

**Stephanie Mah:** Unit count is 905 total and about 200 in phase one and the density would be that \* 2.25 = 450 possible people.

**(x) Andria Davidge:**

What are the benefits of the development for the existing residents of Manor Park?

**Andrew Bone:** Spoke to benefits to the community. Provides an opportunity for pedestrian connections, parks, multi-use trails, transit, modernization of stormwater, etc.

**(xi) Ron Noseworthy:**

What will this do to property values?

**Carl Purvis:** This is not something that is taken into consideration.

**(xii) Krista:**

What will the views look like from Manor Park?

**Melissa Eavis:** Views from that aspect haven't been requested from the applicant but once we get more of the building forms sorted out it is something, we can ask the applicant to provide.

**(xiii) Steve Chipman:**

Are there plans to improve the bridge over the Circumferential connecting to this area especially for cyclists?



**Melissa Eavis:** The Portland St. functional Plan is underway but with this application nothing is proposed to change with any of that infrastructure. There is plans to update the paths within the site which will allow easier access for pedestrian and cyclists.

**Councillor Austin** – the overpass is provincial infrastructure, so things need to be worked out with the province and the active transportation group is looking at this.

**(xiv) Ron Noseworthy:**

Have the actual building floors been approved by HRM planners i.e., 13 vs 15?

**Carl Purvis:** No

**(xv) Sarah Sobanski**

It was break ground in spring for the first phase.

**Kevin Neatt:** Should council approve this project spring is a reasonable start date.

**(xvi) George Warburton:**

Does the plan include new playgrounds?

**Melissa Eavis:** Established where the parkland will be but would like to see from the community the prevised need would be.

**(xvii) Jim and Alexa Kennedy:**

Didn't see anything about wind, but what will the impact of the Phase 1 be on the Brownlow Park soccer field?

**Melissa Eavis:** Haven't asked for wind studies yet because final building design isn't in yet. They will be required.

**(xviii) Ren:**

Would there be any possibility that we can see this community integrating solar power to the community? Rooftop solar.

**Carl Purvis:** The Centre Plan is trying to be accommodating for those types of things.

**Stephanie Mah:** That is something that we are going to be considering.

**4. Closing Comments**

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

**5. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:40 p.m.