

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
Public Information Meeting  
Case 21296**

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

---

**Tuesday, May 30, 2018  
7:00 p.m.**

**Christ Church Hall - Lower level - 61 Dundas St, Dartmouth, NS**

**STAFF IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Carl Purvis, Planner, HRM Planning  
Melissa Eavis, HRM Planning  
Holy Kent, Planning Technician, HRM Planning  
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning  
Councillor, Sam Austin, District 5

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** David Quilichini – Applicant, Fares & Co. Developments Inc.  
Sean Day – Applicant, Fares & Co. Developments Inc.

**PUBLIC IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Approximately: 158

---

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:00 p.m.

**Call to order, purpose of meeting – Carl Purvis**

Mr. Purvis introduced himself as the Planner and Facilitator for the application. They also introduced; Councillor Sam Austin, Tara Couvrette – Planning Controller, Holly Kent - Planning Technician, and the Applicant – David Quilichini & Sean Day.

Case 21296 - Application by Fares & Co. Development Inc. to enter into a new Stage 1 Development Agreement to allow a mixed use development inclusive of up to 1500 residential units, commercial space, hotel, marina, parks and open space, and new streets on the lands commonly known as King's Wharf, Dartmouth.

Mr. Purvis explained; the purpose of the Public Information Meeting (PIM) is: a) to identify that HRM has received a proposal for the site; b) to provide information on the project; c) to explain the Planning Policies and the stages of the Planning Process; d) an opportunity for Staff to receive public feedback regarding the proposal. No decisions are made at this PIM.

**1a) Presentation of Proposal – Mr. Purvis**

Mr. Purvis provided a brief introduction to the application and then made a presentation to the public outlining the purpose of the meeting, status of the application and the applicants request. Mr. Purvis outlined the context of the subject lands and the relevant planning policies.

**1b) Presentation by David Quilichini & Sean Day - Applicant**

**Mr. Quilichini and Mr. Day** explained why this project is the right density, the right scale, its walkability, the park spaces and amenities, its connection to the water, views, and why it's a wonderful place. Mr. Quilichini also explained the phasing plan through renderings and reference images.

## 2. Questions and Comments

**Concerns brought up during the meeting;** The tall buildings are too tall; where will everyone park (grocery store / visitors / residents); sea level rise and storm surges as it pertains to the height above sea level of these buildings, the proposed emergency ramp – not obstructing the walkability; where are the people coming from; who will be the grocery store tenant; too much infilling of the harbor; if the grocery store doesn't work/happen then what, Height of all buildings is a concern, traffic onto Alderney Dr., will the buildings be sold after construction, will they be condos or rentals, affordability – accessible housing, visitor parking, traffic being held up by the train, would like a second access point to the development, the trail along the tracks.

**Jan Schlosberg – Tulip St.,** feels the tall buildings are too tall and wanted to know if there was going to be parking for the grocery store. **Mr. Quilichini** explained that there will be between 100 and 115 spots available for the grocery store.

**Don Gordon – Prince St.,** stated climate change is for real and sea levels are rising, which will result in storm surges, and would like to know if this has all been taken into consideration. Also, the proposal for the emergency access ramp seems to interfere and block the sidewalk and pedestrian trail that are currently there. They feel it is imperative that this is kept in its entirety because it is a very important part of downtown and the walkability. **Mr. Purvis** stated in terms of sea level rise there is a policy in the Regional Plan that talks about sea level rise and residential buildings be a certain minimum height above sea level and all the residential buildings proposed would be meeting this policy. With regards to the revised second access (emergency ramp) it is completely on land that the applicant owns.

**Janet McCarthy – Prince St. - Admiralty Place,** would like to know what studies were done to determine where all the people are coming from, who don't have cars, to live in these buildings. Most people have cars and there aren't enough parking spaces. Why the changes to the proposal? Too much infilling in the harbor. Likes the new ramp. Would like to know if there is already a tenant in mind for the grocery store. **Mr. Purvis** in terms of where are the people without cars coming from – in the early drafts of the Centre Plan proposal it is suggesting in certain strategic areas, like in Downtown Dartmouth there may be a minimum parking requirement. However, what the development community is saying is that don't think they can sell units without parking spaces because we are not there yet. In this case there would be a requirement for some vehicle parking and there is parking being proposed for residential uses in each of the buildings that are being proposed. **Mr. Quilichini** stated at this point they think there will be 1 parking spot for each unit built. They changed the agreement from the original simply to make it better. They are not getting anything additional out of this. They still will end up with the same number of units that were in the original proposal. They have been in talks with a grocery store but it is not guaranteed at this point so we can't say.

**Peter Hendrickson – Prince St. – Admiralty Place,** would like to know, at the road level, what height above sea level the existing buildings are. The reason for the question is because their unit is exposed to that view. What they are seeing is 6 storeys high on the lower part and 24 storeys on the higher part so at what level, if they are going down, will the lower level be equated. They only can relate it to the existing buildings now. 1500 units are going to be built regardless of the size and shape. What they are trying to figure out is from where they live, and what views they will gain or lose, and what they will be looking at in the next 10-15 years. **Mr. Quilichini** stated the existing buildings are 8 meters above sea level. They also offered to have Mr. Hendrickson come to their office, on site, and they would walk it through with Mr. Hendrickson. **Mr. Purvis** explained that the final agreement would have exact numbers of meters and explain how that number is calculated. We have not got to that level of detail yet.

**Clive Mason – Prince St. Admiralty Place,** has two questions/comments – first - the grocery store is being proposed as noncommercial space or commercial space that will be in addition to the approved commercial space. What happens if/when the grocery store fails, what would that space become. At a very minimum we have to know what would happen if it was built and there was no grocery store because they feel it would end up as more commercial space and it should be included in the commercial space that is allotted for that site. The second comment is that when the original proposal was approved it was said that there would be no further requests for infill once that project was approved and going ahead. Particularly the area where the finger jetty comes out and swings around. We are now seeing a proposal that breaches that original understanding, that there would be no further infill, that essentially infills the entire site and includes blockage of views to a much more extensive degree at the outer edge of the development than was the

case before. Mr. Mason would like to see the original agreement, as far as infilling goes, adhered to. **Mr. Purvis** stated that as far as the commercial space that space is, right now, proposed to be in the very next phase. If the grocery store were to happen and not happen later, 1-2 years later, it would be in advance of when the rest of the development would happen. If it was to end up being just more retail that space would no longer be deducted, you couldn't have the commercial space otherwise. As HRM we can't say you must have a certain type of business in this location. **Mr. Day** – spoke to infill stating they retained as much water on the site as they could. **Mr. Quilichini** stated they are doing more infill to provide a bit more space on the site to lower the height of the buildings.

**Sharon MacDonald – Prince St.**, Very concerned about the infill and is parking going to be underground/below the buildings. **Mr. Purvis** stated yes, parking would be below the buildings. **Ms. MacDonald**, then this means this will not be a 6 storey buildings if you are talking about parking underneath. You would need a lot of infill to get up to be well above sea level. We would be talking about much higher than 6 floors. We are concerned because it knocks out our wonderful views of the harbor. There is not a lot of affordable housing going up, we have a lot of high end housing that is going up for the senior market. There is a lot of empty/unsold units in the downtown area now. Who will inhabit all this space? **Mr. Purvis**, stated the 6 storeys is measured from the new ground. In terms of affordable housing, that is not a component of the proposal, there would be some requirements for unit variety.

**Carolyn Davis – Prince St. Admiralty Place**, is concerned about their views and sea level rise. Also has concerns about parking for the grocery store. **Mr. Purvis** stated they don't want to get it wrong with regards to sea level rise. With regards to walking to the grocery store, they do have parking available for people driving to the store.

**Kourash Rad – Halifax**, wanted to congratulate the developer on the design, they think the street scape experience of this development is great and a lot of thought has gone into making sure the variety of buildings forms exist to make sure that the street scape experience is pleasant. The park locations are fantastic and you have addressed accessibility very well. The emergency exit is a necessity but you have done it the best you can to accommodate that. Overall as a resident of this municipality they are really excited that there is going to be a place like this.

**Trever Parsons – Tulip St.**, wants to clarify that when it comes to infilling, that is not technically our water, where they are infilling is on their deed. It is not owned by the province, the feds or anybody else. They hope staff will take a very close look at the access on the level crossing because they can see the potential for some serious traffic issues coming onto Alderney Dr. with the amount of residential/commercial and hotel uses on this site. They would also like to know if there are any plans to know how many of these units will be condo and how many will be rentals. Will the developer be selling more of these buildings once they are completed as they have already sold one? **Mr. Purvis** stated there were studies done regarding traffic but they will be looking to get those studies updated. **Mr. Quilichini** stated the decision on condo's vs rentals will all depend on the market. The next building is intended to be apartment and there is a possibility it might be sold at the end but that is far as we can look ahead.

**Marry-Ann Koosh– Price St. Admiralty Place**, the Admiralty Place garage opens on a curve already and they are seeing a lot of traffic coming from there and have a tough time getting out of the garage as it is. Is HRM considering putting some sort of a light or something there to mitigate that traffic. The traffic will be increased going in and out of King Street because of people going to the grocery store and hotel. **Mr. Purvis** doesn't know of any plans to signalize that area.

**Warren Weston - King St.**, Wishes them all the success with getting this done. Is concerned about affordability. Stated there is a scheme in the Centre Plan for accessible housing. Will that formula be considered for this development. **Mr. Purvis** stated the Centre Plan is in the draft form and they have received more feedback on affordable housing than any other component of the plan. More specifically, gentrification and how the density bonusing program is going to work. There is some work to do, is the clear message that they received. What we must use on this site is the existing policy that is currently in place which does not address affordable housing. **Mr. Weston** wanted to know, when this development gets approved the Centre Plan should be in place so are you saying this development is exempt from that. **Mr. Purvis** stated our job is to access it against the rules that we have now. That is what council has told us to do.

**Neil Lovett – Park Lane**, the waterfront of Dartmouth has a lot to like about it but it is a very disjointed place. They think the vision of this plan is wonderful compared to the existing rights that are already approved in terms of the type of pedestrian friendly district, really intimate and urban friendly spaces that we don't have too many of to enjoy right now in the city anywhere. As a resident and somebody with a family, the compromises we had to make to come to that, is worth it to me. What will make this work is all the detail that will come down the road in those phase two agreements. The devil is in the details and so the pressure is on to make that work. There should be some consideration given around what HRM is going to do around the site to support it and make sure that this project is something that feeds into a broader benefit for the entire downtown.

**Mark Smith – Kings Wharf**, the more they build out the less the build up and vis versa as far as infilling goes. As a resident I would prefer to see it go out to the extremity of the property line rather than going up in the air. If you have property why wouldn't you use it. They would like to see the second exit/entrance be used by everybody not just emergency vehicles. With an additional 1500 apartments there is the potential for an additional 1500 cars so they are interested in seeing a second entrance/exit to the development. Overall it is a good improvement.

**Barry Lampier – Summit St.**, As the new development has been occurring it has been taking away from my view and that's fine because what is important is bringing more of these buildings to Downtown Dartmouth and more people to make it much more of a viable community. Mr. Lampier has three questions; 1. Would like the difference in the second access point described as it appears from Alderney Dr. Will it be more of a bank of grass going up to a slop, what will it look like to people walking by and how is it going to impede on the view of the water. 2. Could you explain more about the park that has the steps going down into the water with a bridge going over it. How will it be available to the community, will it be accessible. 3. The trail along the tracks, could somebody explain what the limitations and possibilities for that to still happen in the new scheme. **Mr. Purvis**, The second access from Alderney – We know that it can be located there and fire trucks can get over it, we know it is possible to make the turns and the truck to get over the peak of it, what we don't know is definitively what it is going to look like in terms of construction material and landscaping. When that design is available we will post it on our website. The ferry Terminal park connection – that is on us at HRM because that is HRM owned land. There would be a need for infilling in order to create a pathway because there is not enough space between the tracks to meet the rules and safety standards now. In talking to the Parks and Rec people they acknowledge the need and desire, how that would be a good thing and a benefit. It is something that they are looking at intently but it isn't holding up the Kings Wharf application because it is not on their property. **Mr. Quilichini** what is already approved for this lot right now is an 8 storey building and what they are going to build is less so it will block the views less. **Mr. Day** spoke about the park (showing it on a slide). There is a small bridge that allows the water from the marina to turn the corner and go up into the interior of the site. It will be a calm space that boats will be able to come into. There will also be a large communal space for the people who live around there to be able to occupy for various events. There is no anticipation that this will ever be cut off to the public apart from a special event happening. **Mr. Lampier** thinks the redesign is a positive thing because they are bringing a more livable space.

**Elizabeth Phillips - Admiralty Place**, stated when they take a walk up there at night (around 7pm) they see cars parked right down from there the railroad tracks are all the way up the hill and a lot of cars are also parked at the restaurant, as when coming back down, in the parking lot by the service center, there are a lot of people there, is there a problem in the four buildings with parking now? Have you asked the people in the four buildings if they have enough spots for people to park? **Mr. Quilichini** stated they currently provide 1 space per unit and isn't sure about visitor parking for the first two buildings as he wasn't part of that but no visitor parking in the last two.

**Alex Handyside – Kings Wharf**, has concerns about traffic, one afternoon last year the train stopped for 22 minutes and they counted 27 vehicles, stationary, waiting to cross and some were idling. With 4 towers being 1/5<sup>th</sup> full, you don't have enough street to occupy the number of vehicles that will be idling waiting to get past the train. We need a second exit that is open to the public not an emergency only exit.

**Don Gordon – Prince St.**, concerns have been raised about the infilling, this will be destroying fish habitat which is a violation of the federal fisheries act and it is their understanding that they would be a requirement for the developer to consult with the DFO to get advice on how the infilling can be done in the best manner. How it is done can have an impact on how successful it is with the type of material used and the size of the material. A porous material with large holes is much better new fish habitat than a concrete wall. They feel

a nice amenity would be to add some fishing platforms around their boardwalk, it would be a nice feature. **Mr. Quilichini** said they will be consulting with DFO before they do they infill.

**Colin May, Dahlia St**, At the end of King St is an empty property which is now WDC, that property was expropriated by the city of Dartmouth on March 31, 1978 and still sits empty today. Mr. May would like to know what it would look like when you look down Prince St., what will it look like from the Peace Pavilion, what will it look like as you look down Alderney Dr.? This idea of corridor view, you don't climb up a mountain to see a corridor view. Only in the planning world do people walk around to observe scenery down 60 feet wide streets. What they think should happen is WDC should give the developer the 40-year-old empty lot and let them build on it. Mr. May has followed the 4 buildings that have gone up and feels the developer has had a very hard time financially on that development. Mr. May feels that everything west of Price St. should be thrown out the door because otherwise what will you see from the Peace Pavilion when you look down the harbor. Mr. May also stated that due to climate change 3.5 meters is far too low. The storm surges (tropical storms) will be tragic for this development. The water levels are going to rise and you will have to double, at least, that 3.5 meters.

**Keith Thomas - Admiralty Place**, thinks the new design is a lot better than the first one. Mr. Thomas thinks focusing on the pedestrian, spreading it out is an innovative idea. Mr. Thomas likes the new second access ramp, it is not on public land and the tax payers don't have to pay for it. The problem, from what they have heard tonight is the traffic and the number of cars with limited access on one route. That is still 20 years out and there are many think tanks saying private car ownership is going to drop dramatically over the next 20 years with electric vehicles, autonomous vehicles and just the general cost of energy and wanted to know if any thought was given to that. **Mr. Quilichini** thinks autonomous vehicles are coming along and they will affect requirements for vehicle ownership and use but we aren't there yet and it is hard to predict. We have had to plan for what we have now. Mr. Purvis said it is something that the planning world is trying to keep its finger on the pulse. We don't want to over build but we want to build for what the necessity is in the here and now and not neglect that fact.

**Valerie Brandshaw – Dartmouth**, is concerned about the affect it would have on the appearance of the harbour. Feels the vertical scale is where it should have been all along except now it is extending too far out. If there is going to be some accommodation for this 1500-unit mistake that was approved by the city there should be compensation for regular public people who are going to lose their view of the shoreline on Alderney Dr. They could make a bridge connection to where they have it extended out now, remove some of the buildings around the outer edge and make that a public shoreline.

**Clive Mason – Price St. Admiralty Place**, wanted to make sure there are noise bylaws in place because there have been significant problems with noise downtown in the park after 10 or 11 at night. **Mr. Purvis** stated the same noise bylaw that applies elsewhere in the municipality would apply to this development as well.

**Brian MacLellan – Kings Wharf**, is trying to understand where the 24 storey building is being measured from. Is it 24 storey from the street, parking lot, water, what is that? **Mr. Quilichini** said it is 24 storeys measured from the street (pointed out on a map). **Mr. MacLellan**, stated 24 storeys from the street level and another 2-3 storeys below that for parking. **Mr. Quilichini** said it would be the exact same as the Keelson. **Mr. MacLellan** is the developers plan to build the 24 storey building for they get approval or after? **Mr. Quilichini** stated after they get approval.

**Nancy Row – Kings Wharf**, wanted to clarify what immediate build meant regarding the 24 storey building. **Mr. Quilichini** stated it just meant next, that what they will be building next.

**Jan Schlosberg – Tulip St.**, is really disturbed by the idea that there are so many well to do people that are going to buy and rent all of these units, where are these people coming from and where are the people of modest income ever going to live. **Mr. Purvis** generally the municipality has grown at 1-2% and in recent years about 40% of that growth is coming in the regional center. That is a substantial change from 10 years ago. It seems that the trend is that the type of locations and types of housing choices that people are making are different from where they were 10 years ago and the market is responding to that shift.

**Peter Hendrickson – Prince St. – Admiralty Place**, wanted to point out that they are a fan of this project. They think that the downtown expanding is a great idea, their concern is a difference from the original till now. They think what would help a lot is if they could see some real 3D models/rendering of different

viewpoints so people get a better understanding. Right now, the pictures that are appearing seem to all be in one direction. You would like to see what is being gained and lost because it will be both. They like the lower stuff better. They want to know what this is really going to look like. **Mr. Purvis** maybe there is an opportunity for the developer to provide a fly through or something like that that we can post on our website so people can get more of a visual sense of what it is going to look like.

**Janet McCarthy – Prince St. - Admiralty Place**, would like to know where the 6 storey buildings height is going to start from. If that is the case her view will be gone when this happens. **Mr. Quilichini** - 4 ½ meters above sea level. **Ms. McCarthy** wanted to know where the people are coming from to fill 1500 units. Why is there such a push to develop, is there nobody that decides we need to give it a lull for a little while. Vacancy rates are high yet you build more. **Mr. Purvis** spoke to growth. **Mr. Quilichini** stated it is really the same as any business. If you open a restaurant people might say where are the people coming from but the market does demand this. If the market is there they will build it if it is not then they won't.

**Sofie - Admiralty Place**, would like to know if a round-a-bout was considered at the junction of King St. and Alderney Dr. It may reduce the noise level and improve function as well. **Mr. Purvis** stated it hasn't been looked at in conjunction with this project. It would probably require some private land which would include some CN Rail track which will not happen.

**Public - Dahlia St.**, thinks this is a fabulous place to live but has concerns regarding affordability.

### **3. Closing Comments**

**Mr. Purvis** thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments.

### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9 p.m.