

## Public Open House Meeting Notes

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**  
**Public Open House**  
**21951**

---

**Wednesday, November 27th, 2019**  
**7:00 pm- 9:00 pm**  
**Alderney Gate Public Library - Helen Creighton Room**

### **STAFF IN**

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

Dean MacDougall, Planner, HRM Planning and Development  
Meaghan Maund, Planner, HRM Planning and Development  
Jared Cavers, Planning Technician, HRM Planning and Development

### **ALSO IN**

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Sam Austin, District 5  
Blaise Morrison, Armour Group Ltd. (Applicant)

### **PUBLIC IN**

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

Approximately 19

### **Questions asked on the Comment form:**

*Are there any parts of this proposal that you like?*

*Are there any parts of this proposal that concern you?*

*How do you feel the proposed building design fits on its site? How do you feel it fits in the neighbourhood?*

*Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposal?*

### **General Observation about the Comments:**

Of the 19 attendees, 6 completed the comment form. 4 individuals commented via email.

### **Methodology:**

A count of attendees and their response rate is included.

The format was Open House allowing for a mix of citizens, staff, and the applicant's representatives.

A selection of articulate comments directly from respondents has been transcribed and included in this analysis for context and tone.

The numbers in the rightmost column are either a direct count or a keyword/phrase occurrence count. Emphases are from the respondents.

**Data:**

<b>Attendance &amp; Reponses</b>	
Total Public Attendee Count	~19
Comment Forms Received	6
Emails Received	4
Percent	~47% response rate of meeting attendees
Percent	~4% response rate of total properties notified

<b>Proposal</b>	
Pro	3
Con	7

**Comments:**

- Traffic was a reoccurring concern, for both Micmac Blvd. and Crichton Ave.
- Comments on the proposed building were mixed with some believing it's too large, too tall, and doesn't fit with the nearby low-density residential neighbourhood. Others thought it was compatible with the existing adjacent multi-unit buildings and provided enough separation distance between it and the adjacent low-density dwellings.
- Potential loss of the existing vegetation was a concern raised by many residents.
- Concerns were raised on safe winter travel for children walking to school and the potential impact this development could have on attendance at the local school (Crichton Park Elementary).
- Proposed development is well situated within existing transportation network – in close proximity to both the highway and transit terminal.

**Quotes:**

*“Feel it may be better with townhouse or loft style ground floor units.”*

*“Too tall! Too many units – too much traffic – not compatible with neighbourhood”*

*“I would prefer to see more affordable housing in the area given its location being close to a major public transport hub, I feel the low-income population would benefit more from this location.”*

*“I believe this development is too high given that it borders an established residential area. Traffic and light pollution are a concern too.*

*“We currently have wildlife that line in these woods, deer, cardinals, pheasants and other birds that you don't see elsewhere in the HRM that will no doubt be negatively impacted by construction.*