



**Virtual Public Information Meeting
Case 23374**

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

**Wednesday, June 2, 2021
6 p.m.
Virtual**

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE:

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

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE:

Connor Wallace – Applicant, ZZap Consulting Inc.
Greg Zwicker – Applicant, ZZap Consulting Inc.
Tony Chedrawy – Property Owner.
Tony Mancini (District 6) - Councillor for Harbourview – Burnside – Dartmouth East

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE:

Approximately: 15

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

Case 23374: Application by ZZAP Architecture and Planning for a new mixed-use building containing ground floor commercial spaces and 43 residential units within a 5-storey building at the corner of Waverley Rd and Montebello Dr Dartmouth.

Ms. Eavis introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator guiding ZZap'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 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 Connor Wallace – Applicant

Mr. Wallace presented details about ZZap's proposal including background, community feedback, design changes to address community and staff feedback, renderings, transition, traffic & benefits of the development.

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) **Donna Perry:**

Really interested in learning about the design of inside the building. Thinks the outside looks wonderful. The sq footage of the single units is quite small. How many townhouse units are there going to be, and how hard will they be to get if you want one? DO the units all have their own washer and dryer? Will these units be condominiums or rentals?

Melissa Eavis – 7 townhouse units

Connor Wallace – Yes, 7 townhouse units proposed. Spoke to size (decided by current market demand), style, amenities in each unit, as well as amity space for all to use. The intent is to be rentals.

(ii) **Phil Power - Waverley Rd.:**

Traffic is the number one concern. They are giving up 14 feet of their own space to make the right-hand turning lane, and a number of other things, which is great. The design that you see now is entirely different from what was proposed back in 2017 which is a huge improvement and matches our community. No rental units in this area and this will give people options. A big fan of having this development in the area as both a resident and business owner and fully support it. Concern about the number of units that have parking spots – where can the people park going to the commercial section of this development?

Connor Wallace – 46 units proposed and 39 parking spots. Spoke to parking in general for this development (residential & commercial).

(iii) **Morgan Shauerte:**

Looked at C-41 and has a number of issues, the view plain, the assessment of traffic, parking, and the adherence to C-41 in general. First issue - There have only been 2 views provided to residents and they are the side view and front view. On slide 21 the amenity floor isn't even shown on the views given to residents for comment. Just the amenity floor could block view for houses all the way up to Rossi. Right now, residents have no idea that would happen and on slide 29 that isn't even shown. Suggests residents, to truly understand, it needs to be more than 2 preferential views and you need to have views from all sides to truly understand what it is going to do. The second issue was the traffic study – it is done using 2013 data and in 2013 the structure and form of these neighbourhoods was much different; the residents are much different, and the volume has increased drastically. More concerning than that you can tell this was a desktop study and not done by somebody that didn't do site recognisance. It completely misses the MicMac Bonita cut thru. They would say between 30-70 percent of all traffic in Waverley and Montebello takes that cut thru on two streets with no sidewalks filled with children. To truly understand the impact residents, need to have up-to-date traffic data, and even better, the number of trips was estimated from a book value that is not localized to the area. The public transportation infrastructure here is not great and to make the assumption that 20 percent of all people are taking public transit is ludicrous for this area. Old data, the main throughfare not counted in the study and, a very generous assessment declared conservative as part of the traffic study. The parking – everyone in this area has a car. They estimated, using more realistic values, in the commercial space there will be between 8-22 cars parked permanently on MicMac and Bonita. That combined with sidewalks is a significant load on the area.

Tony Mancini – asked for more clarification

Connor Wallace – stated there will be things investigated in more detail after Morgan's

comments.

Melissa Eavis – Believes there was some confusion around the difference between view plains and perspective renderings. Ms. Eavis explained what the difference was in more detail. Also spoke to the Traffic Study (TIS) – HRM's engineers review the TIS and provide comments and we can request another look at the TIS.

Connor Wallace – Explained the most up-to-date drawings were provided to HRM and are online and include the amenity penthouse.

Carl Purvis – Elevation plans (2 dimensional) and renderings (3 dimensional). Also spoke to the TIS and how they are done. The TIS is worthy of a second look.

Tony Chedrawy – Said the TIS he referenced was the old TIS and a new one was completed and is online.

(iv) **Chris Fournier:**

Feels the development is long overdue. Strongly supports this development, and this will offer a housing option that is limited and greatly needed in this area. The development is beautiful, and the rendering are beautiful, they would like to know more about what the inside and what it would look like. Would it be pet friendly? The right-hand turning lane is a great addition to the area and will make the trip home so much better.

Carl Purvis – Spoke to the right-hand turning lane and will make sure all these comments will get to the right people.

Connor Wallace – Spoke to the design of the building and interior. Pets – it is the intent to make this building pet friendly.

(v) **Deborah Cameron - Delmac Park:**

Parking is the main concern – no parking for employees of the commercial section, no visitor parking, and there are not enough parking spaces for the units proposed. Who will be paying for the sidewalk and street changes? Wondering about traffic flow onto Montebello. Will it be right turn only. Will people be able to make left turns at the lights.

Melissa Eavis – Spoke to concerns regarding traffic flow, turn moments, parking, and sidewalks.

Connor Wallace – Spoke to parking ratios, access driveway – It is a two-way full access driveway.

(vi) **Rocky Sillker – Delmac Park:**

Parking and traffic are their main concerns. The most important aspect is that there is going to be widening of Waverly Rd., a bike lane, sidewalks etc. and yet this is not going to be written into the development agreement. This is a concern because these upgrades to the intersection need to happen and it is like maybe the city will do that later when they get around to it. If that right-hand lane is going to be there that will make all the difference in the world in terms of traffic. This must be built in somehow as part of this agreement. Commercial space – and there is no provision for parking for this commercial space – there is no access to it and egress from it from Waverly Rd. Will it be residential or commercial, that kind of detail needs to be pinned down? It will make a difference if that is commercial or residential. Then you go to residential units and how many there are, some documents say 43 some say 46, that inconsistency is a concern. Traffic and parking – we say there is public transit in this area, but it is very limited – the frequency in which it runs is very infrequent. People for the most part are going to need cars and there is not enough proposed. The access to any parking from this site should be from Waverly Rd. and the egress from it should be to Montebello Dr. and it should be only right-hand turns. Likes 46 residential units as it obviates concerns around traffic. Should be right hand turns only coming and going from the site. Likes the 46 units and forget the commercial space.

Melissa Eavis – Timing of when the turning lane will be done – Who pays for the sidewalk – Commercial, if they have any, will be 43 units. If it is all residential it will be 46 units. We put 46 on the application because that is the most they would be asking for.

Connor Wallace – access to property in the original application contemplated having access off Waverley Rd. but the development engineers request to have access on Montebello. Units at this time it is the intent to have all residential units (46). Right-of-way on Montebello Dr. The design process moving forward will make accommodations for future Rd. upgrades.

Carl Purvis – The intent of HRM is certainly that the developments pays their fare share of the infrastructure.

(vii) **Ronit Evans - Montebello:**

Have concerns about traffic and the lack of sidewalks. The bus does not come frequently enough. Consideration should be given to improve traffic flow and upgrading the infrastructure. Safety concerns with increased traffic. Considerations to improving traffic flow while having active transportation safety. There might be a bit of a conflict with that right-turn lane. Will there also be a dedicated left turning lane from Waverley onto Montebello which is already a challenge there? The building would be a positive improvement to attract seniors to the area. Could there be a consideration for a pedestrian only signal? Dicey at the intersection when turning right and people are trying to cross. Will there be an improvement to public transportation network and traffic flow?

Melissa Eavis – Pedestrian upgrades to the road are prosed at a future date/development. Pedestrian signal and a left turn lane are to be discussed with traffic engineers. No sidewalk is a concern for us as well. Transportation network improvements mean.

Carl Purvis – Spoke to pedestrian safety and movement throughout the city.

Councillor Mancini – Spoke to changes being made this summer with increased time for pedestrians to move across the road. Also spoke to transit changes.

(viii) **Councillor Mancini** thanked everyone for their participation.

4. Closing Comments

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

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:31 p.m.