

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
Public Information Meeting  
Case 21880**

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

---

**Thursday, February 21, 2019  
7:00 p.m.**

**South End Baptist Church Hall - 60 Hastings Drive, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia**

**STAFF IN**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Jamy-Ellen Klenavic, Planner, Planner II, HRM Planning  
Cameron Robertson, Planner, Planner II, HRM Planning  
Holly Kent, Planning Technician, HRM Planning  
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor, Sam Austin, District 5  
Troy Scott – Applicant  
Chandler Haliburton - Developer

**PUBLIC IN**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Approximately: 76

---

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

**Call to order, purpose of meeting – Jamy-Ellen Klenavic**

Ms. Klenavic introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator for the application. They also introduced; Councillor Sam Austin, Cameron Robertson – Planner, Tara Couvrette – Planning Controller, Holly Kent - Planning Technician, Troy Scott – Applicant, and Chandler Haliburton - Developer.

Case 21880 - Application by T.A. Scott Architecture and Design Limited requesting to enter into a development agreement for two six-storey mixed-use buildings at 358-364 Portland Street, Dartmouth, and to rezone lands and enter into a development agreement for one four-storey residential building at PID (00221952), Dartmouth.

Ms. Klenavic 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 – Ms. Klenavic**

Ms. Klenavic 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. Ms. Klenavic outlined the context of the subject lands and the relevant planning policies.

**1b) Presentation by Chandler Haliburton, Developer & Troy Scott, Applicant**

Mr. Haliburton and Mr. Scott explained what they were looking to do on the site and why.

**2. Questions and Comments**

**Heather Yule, Rodney Rd** – stated most of the applicants presentation was around the Centre Plan and that isn't in affect at this moment and in the Dartmouth Municipal Planning Strategy it is very clear that lot C is in the R-2 zone and it is not included in the commercial zones along Portland St. currently it does not fit. If you look ahead at the Centre Plan it also does not fit because lot C is clearly excluded from the corridor area, it is part of the residential area. Strongly supports maintaining it as a residential area because there has been a lot of consolation and effort put into keeping that R-2 as most of the neighbourhood is built R-2. Is concerned about creep of commercial into the Southdale neighbourhood.

Thinks it is great to see vibrancy happening and proposed along Portland St. Thinks a three storey would be better suited for the area. Lot C provides the transition space between the commercial zone and the residential zone. With regards to drainage and soil, with the switch from a lot of green space to impermeable surfaces such as pavement and concrete, would like to know how this will impact he drainage and runoff from that space. Is it required to have a water impact statement? **Ms. Klenavic** explained when a stormwater management plan/sediment erosion and control plan would be required. **Mr. Haliburton** also spoke to the 50-foot easement that is there, which belongs to Halifax Water. **Ms. Yule** was also wondering what the capacity of the aging infrastructure. Feels that the drawing does not give a clear indication of the height of the buildings from Rodney Rd. Would like to better understand what that looks like. It seems like they will be much more imposing than they appear to be in the drawings.

**Rowen Wells** - showed up tonight to show support for this project. Feels this is a good-looking set of buildings that is being proposed and would really contribute to the community. Likes the walkability, having the commercial up front and the potential use for it.

**Rita Grentz, Rodney Rd.** – concerned about the wooded area currently zoned R-2, those trees provide the residents of Rodney Rd. with a buffer zone from the hussle and bussle of Portland St. and also a degree of privacy for the residents. Also, one of the main reason bird populations decline is because of loss of habitat. Ms. Grentz went through a list of birds she has observed in that wooded area behind Rodney Rd. it takes a long time for trees to grow to such heights and they have watched these trees grow for over 50 years. Trees are important for so many reasons, they absorb pollutants, they hold back water and soil and make neighbourhoods more pleasant places to live.

**Larry Graham** – Never realized the path was private property. Asked to clarify where the 50-foot easement was. Stated the river (50-foot easement) that flows underground between Fenwick St. and Hastings Dr. under Southdale school parking lot. Will it be looked after? It is referred to as storm runoff but it never stops flowing from the berm that they put in behind the houses on Plymouth St. (59:55). **Ms. Klenavic** – stated that would have to be addressed in the stormwater management plan. **Mr. Graham** also wanted to know how many cars this would put on Portland St. **Ms. Klenavic** stated it would add 200 vehicles a day.

**Helen Zeboda, Clement St.** - active member of the community and total supports this development.

**Connie Mack, Rodney Rd.** – is concerned about emergency vehicles, enough to deal with an emergency, being able to get in and out of this development. **Mr. Troy** explained that they made sure there was enough space for the biggest of emergency vehicles to get in and out of the space. **Ms. Mac** in concerned that if there was a large fire there would not be enough space for more than one emergency vehicle to get in there. **Ms. Klenavic** stated one of the review agency's that this was circulated to was the fire department and they had the opportunity to review this proposal and make comments on it. It was determined that this development was ok and could accommodate the emergency vehicles. **Mr. Troy** stated fire was also addressed in the design of the building and the materials that would be used. **Ms. Mack** has concerns about pedestrian crossings. There used to be one on Rodney Rd. but it was removed and would like to see another pedestrian crossing on Rodney Rd.

**Genevieve Orton, Rodney Rd.** – would like to know how the people from building C would get to Portland St. **Ms. Klenavic** explained that there is a walk-way/sidewalk beside each of the two front buildings (building A/B) going up the internal driveway and in front of the underground parking up to Portland St. **Mr. Scott** also explained the walkway/sidewalk as well.

**Mike, Southdale** – said nobody is holding onto property to sell later. Thinks this is a beautiful project and will be nothing but great for business on Portland St. but has concern with the flow of traffic coming out onto Portland St. and is concerned for public safety. Especially for the children in the area because of the schools and the fact that there is a park right there. Will there be traffic lights put out front and crosswalks installed? **Ms. Klenavic** stated part of the review process is that the traffic management professionals have gone through the traffic impact study that the applicant provided and they have determined that what is there is sufficient to handle the additional traffic.

**Ruth Partridge, Portland St.** – feels that it is unusual that there was not an independent traffic study done and that the applicant is the one that does the traffic study. Would like to know if there will be an independent 3 party traffic study done? **Ms. Klenavic** explained how the traffic studies are completed.

**Ruth** stated there are 4/5 developable lots in the immediate area and once those are developed there are really going to be some traffic issues to discuss. Stated that although they learned that the path is people trespassing on private property, it has been used as a pathway for over 35 years and didn't want it misunderstood that this is just a casual path, it is a well used path. The natural buffer doesn't seem adequate for building, building C. Stated they have observed Osprey nesting in that area and they are protected. Would like to know if an environmental assessment has been or will be done. **Ms. Klenavic** stated an environmental assessment would be done at the provincial level not municipal and is triggered by a site that is larger than this site. **Ruth** stated that if this is going through private financing, and a conventional lender, one of the requirements, and to do due diligence, would be to require a phase one assessment at a minimum. Can we have the developer's assurance that there will be an environmental assessment done prior to moving ahead with any plans for proposal C. Lot C is smack in an R-2 zone and isn't considering any of the things that created the R-2 zone. The original subdivision plan created a buffer between the commercial and the busy activity on Portland St. and the R-2 zone and the single-family zones that exist in the rest of the subdivision. They would urge staff to remember that the existing bylaws and zoning reflects the community's desire and was planned that way for a reason. Doesn't want a multiunit building built in there back yard. The height of the building is not congruent with the grade of the land. Also, would like planning staff to consider the dangerous precedent that this would be setting. Is 100% behind this project if it is done without the third building (building C) respect the existing zoning.

**June Trenholm, Johnstone** – Would like to know what the GFAR is for both building A and B. **Troy Scott** – wasn't sure off the top of his head. Stated everything they have done with this would hit every mark of the Centre Plan. **Ms. Trenholm and Mr. Scott** discussed heights.

**Bill Zeboda, Clement St.** - the area is not drained well right now, likes Chandler's idea of approaching Halifax Water to see if they would coordinate upgrading the system. The issue with the height of the buildings on Portland St., there was a meeting held by Halifax Planning staff in which it was advised to the public that along corridors the height would be 4-6 storeys set back in a cake layer sort of system. Building C – the driveway that runs between the two places on Rodney St. (36/38) is something that they are not going to use. Feels that a bunch of the trees are dead and the rest are small trees and doesn't feel there are any trees that would be damaged for the Portland St. development. Saw no sign of the trees that are in question of an Osprey nest. 30 trees going missing in a lot this size will not damage the population of birds at all.

**Nick Grady, Rodney Rd.**- Would like planning to please respect the current zoning that is there and understand that when you step back a building at six storeys that is really eight at the back that is really going to impose on my property.

**Curtis, Portland St.** – would like to know the total count of underground parks vs surface parking and is there environmental merit for underground parking that should be considered. **Mr. Scott** stated the parking for the project has a significant amount of underground parking. There are six spaces at the back of building B and about 20 above ground spaces for building C. There are 2 levels of underground parking for building A/B and one level in building C. The amount of parking per unit is almost 1:1. **Curtis** sees value in minimizing surface parking anyway you can.

**Ruth Partridge, Portland St.** - would like to know how many units it would be as proposed. **Troy Scott** – 110. Ruth wanted to know how many spots for parking as proposed. **Mr. Scott** – believes it is about 106. **Ruth** – a spot per unit and 6 extra for visiting etc. where is the parking for the commercial space? **Mr. Scott** – stated the intent would be the surface parking around the back. **Chandler** – stated he owns where Neighbours Pub was and beside that he owns the two vacant lots. Those can never be built on so they will provide surplus parking for this development (the two vacant lots). **Ruth** – are you willing to have that added to the development agreement. **Chandler** – 100%, yes and an environmental assessment. **Ms. Klenavic** – currently those properties are not part of the application and would require an amendment to the application.

**Mark Perry, Rodney Rd.** – provided his remarks/documents to planning as well as the councillors. The apartments on Portland St. may be considered appropriate development and an improvement to the area. Building C is not in the same category, in fact it is in a category of its own. The current lot on which building C is proposed is designated as R-2, residential and it appears to have been cut out of the Rodney Rd. Lots. That building would be imbedded into and in between 5 properties with minimal transition space between the edge of their properties and the proposed building. The decision can't be

made just on the financial objectives. The decision requires the consideration of many other factors including; the desires of the neighbourhood residents, the effect on the community, weather or not the proposal and each of its parts make sense from a community planning perspective, and weather the proposal is consistent with what the city wants to develop. Parts of the proposal are good, building A/B, but other parts aren't so good, building C. Respectfully asks that the rezoning application for building C be denied on the basis that it is not an appropriate change for that particular piece of land.

**Brad Wells, Blackberry Lane** – Thinks it is awesome that the investor is part of the community and not just passing through. Would like to know what type of people they were wanting to attract to these buildings, students? **Ms. Klenavic** – stated that was not something that could be considered in this application. **Mr. Wells** wanted to know about greenspace, it is currently in pretty ruff shape.

**Bob Branton / Ryan Vessey – Rodney Rd.** – Thinks it is important that the planners and developer consider the existing path/trail way that is there now. Would like to see some plan between the developer and the city to see if there is a commitment to bring it up to something that is a healthier greenspace. Also by updating this path it was make it easier for residents to get to Portland St. **Chandler** – because it is all privately owned they aren't sure that would be possible. They stated they will be maintain their section of that path. **Bob Branton / Ryan Vessey** – Dartmouth is a wonderful place for walking trails etc. Is concerned about invasive species and the trail has invasive species like the Multiflora Rose and the Japanese knotweed. Believes the city needs to act on this.

**Kareem** – is in support of the project. Thinks it is unique that the developer is part of the community and will to come out and be that voice. The region will benefit from this type of development. Also spoke to privacy and that it is two ways. In most cases people don't really care what the other person is doing.

### **3. Closing Comments**

**Ms. Klenavic** thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments.

### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.