

Summary of Public Engagement



HRM Planning Application Website



Signage Posted on the Site



Mailout to residents and property owners



Public Information Meeting

Information Sharing

Information on Case 23805 was shared through the HRM planning applications webpage, signage posted on the subject site, notices mailed to property owners within approximately 150 metres (500 feet) surrounding the proposed development, and a public information meeting held on March 29, 2022.

Public feedback was collected from the onset of the application and for several weeks after the information meeting. The following table outlines the various ways in which the public received information about the proposal and how popular each tool was:

Public Engagement Statistics:

Halifax.ca Planning Applications Website	
Number of unique website views up to May 4, 2022	1,436
Average time spent on the website (minutes: seconds)	4:59
Notices Mailed to Area Residents	
Number of notices mailed within notification area	121
Public Information Meeting	
Approximate number of Public Attendees	41
Direct Communication with the HRM Planner	
Number of calls received (unique callers)	3
Number of emails received from the public (unique email addresses)	19

Public Information Meeting

A public information meeting was held at the Woodlawn Public Library on March 29, 2022. Staff gave a presentation on the scope of the proposal including the planning process, what staff analysis in their evaluation, how the public can participate in the planning process, and various ways in which they can provide feedback on the proposal. Fathom Studios presented the details of their proposal and the technical studies submitted in support of the application. Members of the public were given the opportunity to offer their feedback and ask questions about the proposal after the presentations. The PowerPoint presentations were posted to the application webpage for anyone who was unable to attend the in-person event. A summary of the minutes of the meeting is provided below:



**Public Information Meeting
Case 23805**

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

**Tuesday, March 29, 2022
6:00 p.m.**

Woodlawn Public Library (31 Eisener Blvd, Dartmouth NS)

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Dean MacDougall, Planner, Planner III, HRM Planning
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning
Reyhan Akyol, GIS Planning Intern
Cameron Robertson, Principal Planner, HRM Planning

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Robert LeBlanc – Applicant, Fathom Studio
Roger Boychuck – Applicant, Fathom Studio
Clark Wilkins – Landowner, Developer
Tony Mancini (District 5) - Councillor for Harbourview – Burnside – Dartmouth East

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE: Approximately: 41

1. Call to order and Introductions – Dean MacDougall, Planner

Case 23805: Application by Fathom Studio for a Rezoning and Development Agreement to allow a 7 storey multi-unit residential building with a small commercial space fronting Portland Street at PID 00242016 and 16 Carver Street, Dartmouth.

Mr. MacDougall introduced himself as the Planner and Facilitator guiding Fathom Studio's application through the planning process. They also introduced other staff members, and the presenter for this application. The area Councillor for District 6, Tony Mancini, was also in attendance.

2. Presentations

2a) Presentation by HRM Staff – Dean MacDougall

Mr. MacDougall'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 Robert LeBlanc & Roger Boychuck – Applicant

Mr. LeBlanc presented details about Fathom Studio's proposal including project location, context plan, site plan, building plans, building elevations and 3D views (renderings). Roger provided information on traffic and parking on the site.

3. Questions and Comments

Mr. MacDougall welcomed attendees to ask questions to staff and the presenters and provide their feedback, including what they liked and disliked about the proposal.

(1) Questions from attendees

(i) **Chrystal Young:**

Concerns with the TIS (Traffic Impact Statement) shows no significant impact on their St. and appreciates the divider that stops cut-through traffic from the commercial area, however the 76 parking spaces that are proposed for the underground parking will be directed solely in and out of Carver St. and adding 76 units will have a great impact on the already busy street. How will this not impact Carver St and the surrounding streets? Where will guests park – on the side streets. Concerned traffic is being downplayed for this area. Says turning left onto Carver St. from their house is near impossible because of people cutting through and the traffic they cause. Most people leaving that development will turn right and cause more impact on traffic on other side streets in the neighbourhood.

Roger Boychuck – Spoke to the traffic and the TIS (Traffic Impact Statement). Also stated the right in, right out to the commercial area that fronts on Portland St is to solve some of those issues.

(ii) **Barry Osmun:**

Stated Rob's team does great work which is second to none. Thinks this is a great location and fully supports this development. Believes this may help solve some of the housing issues within HRM. This would give seniors a place to live that is close to many amenities.

(iii) **Ryley Norman:**

Has concerns about losing greenspace, as there are very few greenspaces in the community, however on this space there is a great deal of littler. Doesn't feel this is a greenspace that has any animal habitat because of the state of it. It is an ideal location for development but is concerned about the size, 6-storyes, it is too big and is encroaching on properties close by this development. What is being done to preserve people's privacy other than the step backs on the building? Feels people may lose the ability to garden on their property because of this buildings, size, mass. Traffic – to say that this development will have a minimal impact on people's enjoyment of their properties is an understatement. What amenities are being provided in this development? Will these amenities be only for the residents of the development or could they also be shared with people in the neighbourhood? Will you be providing additional greenspace, potentially on the rooftop, to replace or replicate the landscape that is being destroyed? Will there be noise restrictions put in place?

Rob LeBlanc – spoke to greenspace and habitat loss, amenity space that will be offered to residents. There will be privacy fences on all boarding properties that will be at least 6 feet tall. The developer has also offered to plant trees on any neighbouring properties, if it was requested, for additional screening and reduced impacts. There will be noise restrictions put in place.

Dean MacDougall – they will also be required to meet all HRM noise restriction bylaws as well as having a construction management plan in place.

(iv) **Clarey Kempton:**

Would like to know about the excavation plan, will there be blasting? Is there a dedicated truck route for the excavation removal? What about the mitigation of dust and mud?

Dean MacDougall – explained that takes place later in the permitting stage through the construction management plan.

(v) **Steve Elliott:**

Has concerns about the shadows this development will cause. House will not get any direct sunlight from Sept. to mid March because of this development. They will not be able to garden anymore because of this. This will affect them and their neighbours negatively.

Rob LeBlanc – spoke to the shade study that was done on this development.

(vi) Genevieve Campbell (speaking on behalf of her daughter) - Edna Salame (daughter):

Has concerns about drainage on the property. This development is on the high end of elevation and their property is on the low end of the elevation. There is a streamlet that runs behind their property and this stream is not big enough to support the drainage and it overflows at times. The backyard will consistently be flooded if this is not corrected. Most of the year the yard is damp and right now it is muddy, with this development the yard will be muddy all year round because of the lack of sun due to the shade from this building. Where will the garbage be collected? There are 2 proposed connections to the trails on Landrace Park and would like to know if a high privacy fence could be installed to provide privacy to the residents on Cathy Cross Dr.

Dean MacDougall – with drainage – the developer needs to balance pre and post flow. The water that enters and leaves the property needs to be the exact same before and after development with a storm water management plan. As part of the development agreement the garbage receptacles will be placed inside the development. The developer is proposing to keep some landscaping and fences along neighbouring properties. The area of fencing that is being requested along municipal land; they will raise these concerns with the parkland planners.

(vii) Kim:

Wants to know where the compatibility is with the neighbourhood. Doesn't feel there is any compatibility. Will seniors be able to afford these apartments?

Dean MacDougall – Part of the planning process is the look at compatibility. The municipality doesn't regulate rent.

(viii) Martin:

Doesn't think the development is in the character of the neighbourhood. Feels that the address being on Portland St. is misleading. It is a Carver St. address not a Portland St address because most of the traffic will be from the residents of the building entering and existing on Carver St. which are all single-family homes and residential. Traffic is already terrible and extremely busy on the best of times. Feels the entrance and exit to the building should be on Portland St. not carver St.

(ix) Wendy Kirby:

Likes the residential feel of the area and is the reason they moved back to this area and feels this development will ruin that. Would like stop signs to be put in at the end of Carver and Day to make it a 3-waystop. Feels traffic is high already and this will make it worse. Will the lights at Portland ever allow for cars to come across onto Carver St.

Dean MacDougall – the street will remain as is.

Roger Boychuck – There will be no additional stop sign installed.

(x) Trudy Fong:

Finds it hard to see how this can go from an R-1 to something that is a throughfare that is going to turn into a 4-way intersection into a street that is already backed up. When trying to cross from Portland St. to Carver St. at the lights, while walking, people take their lives into their own hands because of the traffic. Doesn't feel this development coincides with the municipal plan. This will take us from a quite neighborhood to living in the middle of a traffic jam. Feels this will be destroying people's property values.

(xi) Audrey Farris:

Thinks this development is an excellent idea. Likes it proximity to the Superstore and other amenities.

(xii) Robert MacKenzie:

Would like to know about light pollution coming through is very large picture window. Against the project because of the residential feel and this is going to ruin that. They feel this development belongs across the street. The brook that runs all the way down to the ocean – is there any

protection of that runoff? Where is the sewer connection going to happen – on Carver or Portland St.? Carver St. will not be torn up?

Roger Boychuck – all connections will be made on Portland St. There shouldn't be any reason, as far as they can tell, to but into Carver St. other than to start the driveway. Spoke to storm water management. Also talked about elevation and lights and will look into it more in the detailed design of the development.

(xiii) Callom Thompson:

Worries about loss of privacy from balconies looking over his property. Will the property be regraded due to the difference in elevation through the property? What about storm water?

Roger Boychuck – There may be some regrading on the property but not much. As far as storm water you will not be worse off if anything you will be better off.

(xiv) Gregory Fong:

Doesn't feel this is a good corridor development for this area and it is impinging on a residential neighbourhood in an R-1 area. What designed modification could be done to mitigate the shading on residential properties? Traffic flow should go in and out of Portland St. not Carver St.. Stated if they are trying to encourage people to use transit there should be fewer parking spaces not a 1:1 ratio as there is now.

Dean MacDougall – They are confined to the property they own and that is what they must work within.

Roger Boychuck – explained why the driveway is where is it and traffic. Agrees with comments on parking spaces and transit but there is a balance that needs to be met.

(xv) Christine Marsh:

Traffic will increase with this development. People area always turning around in their driveway and it will only get worse with this.

Roger Boychuck – Traffic counts don't warrant updates to the road. Also spoke to shortcutting traffic.

(xvi) Hector Car:

10 years ago, there was a medical clinic proposed for this property, which would have worked better than this, and it didn't go through. Doesn't agree with this development going in here.

(xvii) Tony Young:

Where will the extra parking be, on the streets?

Dean MacDougall – there is enough parking for all units in this development.

(xviii) Cory:

Feels the park that is there is very neglected. If the land gets developed next to it and more people and residents are there the park will get more attention.

(xix) Nancy Elliott:

Stated the 2 schools in the area are over capacity now and will not be able to support additional children.

Dean MacDougall – advised that the application is provided to HRCE for review.

4. Closing Comments

Mr. MacDougall thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:05 p.m.

Summary of Public Questions and Comments

HRM planning staff compiled all the public comments and questions provided to date. Broadly, these comments fell into five categories, summarized below:

Compatibility with surrounding area

- The height and scale of the building are of great concern and will have a negative impact on the established neighbourhood.
- This proposal doesn't fit the neighbourhood, which is made up of single unit dwellings (primarily bungalows).
- Out of character for the neighbourhood.
- A four-storey building would be more appropriate given other multi-unit buildings in mixed neighbourhoods close by.
- The proposal should be of a smaller scale - townhouses or a low-rise building.

Traffic Safety

- Valleyfield/Day/Woodlawn intersection can't handle this additional traffic.
- This proposal will increase traffic on an already stressed street.
- Concerned the driveway will act as street, thereby creating what will feel like a 4 way intersection with it, Carver, and Elizabeth.
- This development is pushing multi-unit traffic to low density residential side street
- This is already an unsafe street/area and with the increase of traffic from this building safety will be further decreased.
- Portland, Carver, and Eisener Blvd. is an unsafe intersection now – this will only make it worse.
- Portland Street, this section specifically, is over capacity and development should be on hold until the problem is fixed.
- Existing street parking for existing residents will be gone
- The right in-right out off of Portland for such a small commercial space doesn't make sense and will be unsafe without proper deterrents in place
- There is too much parking for such a small commercial space.
- Active Transportation and Transit service is overexaggerated in study. Residents will drive cars.
- Concerns about the accuracy of the TIS with the on-going COVID-19 pandemic.
- Agree with subject experts that additional traffic would be insignificant and not make a noticeable impact.
- Carver is a street that is used like most - coming from one community to another - this building won't impact that.

Noise/Construction

- What mitigation efforts will be done during construction?
- Concerned about the years of nuisance with the blasting and construction
- Where will construction vehicles and their workers park during construction?
- What will be the truck routes during construction?
- Worried about the impact the construction could have on the park and its users.

Stormwater Impacts

- Concerns were raised about potential underground springs and potential impact this development could have on water flow.
- Currently there is significant overland drainage in this area due to nearby watercourse and concerns were raised on how this development will impact that water flow.
- Concerned about potential stormwater runoff onto neighbour's property due to increase of impermeable surfaces.
- Concerns were raised that shade made by the proposed building may not allow abutting lands to properly dry.

Landscaping & Buffers

- The buffer/landscaping to adjacent properties is significantly lacking and inadequate.
- Too much surface parking lot – especially for commercial space. Should be reduced and additional landscaped space provided instead.
- The back portion of the site abutting the park is an improvement and enhances the area.

Other

- This provides options to those living in the area to downsize but not leave the neighbourhood.
- Would not have bought in area if it was known a multiple unit building could go here.
- Concerns about potential loss in home value
- More housing is needed and this a good spot for that housing.
- This building will result in a loss of privacy for abutting properties
- 16 Carver should be removed from the proposal and the property/building utilize Portland Street only
- Concerned that garbage and collection bins will be located close to abutting properties.
- Shadow and shade created by this building will negatively impact abutting properties and the municipal park.
- Yes, some abutting properties will be impacted but let's not forget the families and individuals who will benefit from this new development and the new housing options.
- This is a great location for an apartment as grocery and pharmacy are minutes away and there is transit at the front door.