



From: lorna khan  
Date: November 3, 2016 at 8:54:03 PM ADT  
To: "Mancini, Tony" <mancint@halifax.ca>  
Subject: Re: Nov. 3 Public Meeting re: Port Wallace Development

the meeting didn't really start until 730 pm then the presentation took over an hour and I left because I was tired. The question and answer was at the end of the meeting and too late. Yes you could ask stuff before the meeting started but the presentation should have been done earlier. Just my opinion.

Lorna Khan

---

From: Tim Maher  
Sent: November-04-16 8:02 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Port Wallis plan

Dear Mr. Morgan,

Thank you for chairing the meeting last night. I couldn't stay for the Conrad's portion or the Q & A but otherwise found it to be insightful. I have numerous relatives and neighbors (many of whom are quite elderly) in the area who couldn't attend but are interested (and worried) about what is happening with this proposal. I will be endeavoring to explain this to them to some degree sometime soon. To that end, it would be far easier to explain if any or all of the development proposal plans on display last night were available on-line. Any assistance you can provide would be appreciated.

Regards,

Tim

Timothy R. Maher  
Paralegal  
Burchells LLP  
1801 Hollis Street, Suite 1800  
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3N4  
Dir: 902-442-8318  
Tel: 902-423-6361  
Fax: 902-420-9326  
Web: [www.burchells.ca](http://www.burchells.ca)

---

From: Roberto Salgueiro  
Sent: November-04-16 8:48 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Mancini, Tony; [info@andrewyounger.ca](mailto:info@andrewyounger.ca)  
Subject: Port Wallace New Proposed Developments

Hi Mr. Morgan,

I was at yesterday's presentation for the new proposed developments for the Port Wallace area, first of all I'd like to thank all of the presenters and staff for having the presentation and answering some of the questions that people had at the meeting. By the sounds of it yesterday I may be one of the few that is not opposed to the development, of course it would be nice to have the area stay the way it is (its a beautiful area to live in), but change is inevitable and we just have to learn to adapt to it. That being said, I do want to ensure that any change that will take place happens in a respectful manner and is completed in a manner that would have as minimal an impact on the community as possible.

One of the questions that I still have from yesterday's presentation has to do with lot size. One of the speakers from Clayton Developments spoke

briefly about how Clayton in partnership with Cresco has condensed some of the single unit dwelling lots they currently have in other developments (West Bedford I believe is one of the areas). I believe from reading an news article in the past that Clayton/Cresco had successfully applied to council to have R1 designated lots in West Bedford reduced in size to a minimum lot size of 3,400 sq ft with a minimum width of 34 ft wide. I believe as it stands now an R1 lot in the Port Wallace area must be a minimum of 5,000 square feet. Is it the intention of the developers to have this land use by law amended to reduce the minimum R1 lot size? I have no opposition to maintaining the current minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, but I do oppose any further reduction in size.

The only other concern I have at this time is traffic flow, it was brought up yesterday by a concerned citizen in the audience that having a connection to the Forrest Hills Parkway delayed for 6-8 years is not acceptable, I'm in complete agreement with that statement. As I'm sure you are well aware there is a lot of concern with increased traffic on the Waverley Road as it is already at capacity, any additional increase to the population in the area would make this scenario worse. While I can respect that the developers want and need to proceed with the development in the most cost effective way as possible, the traffic concern must be dealt with first, not later.

Again, I am in favor of new development, the proposals outlined yesterday are welcomed by me, as long as the issues I mentioned above are respected.

Thank you,

Roberto Salgueiro

---

From: Mike Curry

Sent: November-04-16 9:08 AM

To: Mancini, Tony

Subject: RE: Nov. 3 Public Meeting re: Port Wallace Development

Hi Tony,

It was good seeing you again last night.

Clayton Developments are a reputable company & the right choice for this project. I'm confident they'll do a good job.

However, I'm concerned about the potential traffic increase on the Waverley Road. I moved to the area 27 years ago & traffic seems just seems to be increasing ever year. I think it naive to believe there would be NO traffic increase during or after this project. Last night, Clayton's planners acknowledge traffic issues on the Waverley Road, but want us to believe any increase, as a result of their development, would be pushed to the Forrest Hill Parkway. This despite the fact that HRM hasn't yet completed a traffic study.

Also, If I understand correctly, the NEW connector to the Forest Hills Parkway will not be completed until the end of this project (10 years +). This would mean only the Waverley Road would be expected to handle increased construction & increased residents traffic during the different development phases.

Tony, I think Clayton needs to prove the Waverley Road won't become a parking lot before getting my support.

Regards

Mike Curry  
44 Capistrano Drive  
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia  
Canada, B2X 3N7

---

From: Wynne Anne Meaney  
Sent: November-04-16 11:32 AM  
To: Joe Doiron  
Cc: Mancini, Tony  
Subject: Re: Public Meeting Notice - Port Wallace Development Proposals

Very informative meeting last night Tony. Some thoughtful observations/questions by attendees hit the mark.

My personal observations: seemingly too much density for the area. Do we really need that much to service airport and burnside?

It sounded like there were very few 50 ft lots or larger in the plan. We had to deal with that in our neighbourhood- you will recall that we moved from 50 ft to 75 ft to air out the Craighburn neighbourhood.

While transportation was highlighted in opening remarks as biggest issue to be addressed, I thought it kinda bold that the first proposed phases did not address the traffic concerns- in fact the new highway entrance got pushed out to year 6. Waverley road as is cannot withstand that amount of traffic in my mind, ever. I know you'll be on top of this - you'll be greatly affected by the planned exit/entrance near your house.

On the positive side, the general plan looks thoughtful, with parks and schools and trail ways, protection of waterways. And mixed residential with rentals, condos etc. Commercial space design could make or break this. Can't have more Baker drives. Need walkable classic Main Street scrapes.

I am concerned about the impact on lake Charles. I would not want to own property on the lake near the construction area. We see what happened to MicMac from DC development. It will be very hard to prevent.

Pleased to chat further

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: SUZANNE Roy  
Date: November 4, 2016 at 12:23:28 PM ADT  
To: Andrew Younger MLA , "Mancini, Tony"  
Cc: "Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCan)"

Subject: Port Wallace Development

Hello gentlemen

Interesting session last night. I hope they are sincere, but it sounds like the developers are indeed taking great care. Glad that the issue of Lake protection seems to be in the plans.

Not sure what time you left the meeting, but it did become apparent towards the end of the meeting that unless the Province acts quickly with the 107 connector of Ave du Portage to allow developer to reverse the development phases and start at the upper areas, the implementation of the first phase closer to Waverley Rd. will cause tremendous disruption to traffic and community for up to 8 years....

Claudia and I chatted with a developer representative after the meeting, who indicated that starting at the top is their preference as well, but that it will be a Provincial & HRM council decision.

If both or either of you can take this cause on with TIR to make this happen, you will definitely shine as community champions for years to come. Other than sending concerns to the HRM planners, how can citizens make this a priority? Claudia was suggesting a petition?

Thanks as always

Suzanne

---

From: V Bradshaw  
Sent: November-04-16 10:03 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Port Wallace Nov 3/16 session

Yesterday as first we heard of this proposed development but we were concerned so made it to the information session. Was not i pressed by the proponents' men who 'defended' concerns I raised about dust creation and dust clouds during construction wafting over to other neighbourhoods (

'well, IKEA is worse than we'll be' was the reply), and about the scimpy lot sizes and cramped appearance of the proposed streets ( everyone else is doing it this way).

Another concern would be the water chemistry of that wetland which drains from the former goldmines area ( Hg, As, uranium) then runs through the proposed development. No one mention water chemistry...

Dartmouth/Waverley traffic will be impacted during construction phase for at least 6 years before an alternate route to the 107 comes in.

We are not Toronto, nor Halifax West nor Bedford...do not want hillsides to be denuded so homes can be crammed in like sardines for the sake of enriching developers, construction suppliers, and city coffers through property-based taxation.

Dartmouth Crossing and Kings Wharf are two examples of environmental and aesthetic mistakes inflicted upon this side of the Harbour. Please do not inflict more. Also, Lakes Banook and MicMac are going eutrophic because of development decisions , inadequate environmental controls on construction, and climate change. The chain of lakes need maximum green space protection to survive . Don't let lake Charles be next.

All that said....at least the Conrad lands proposal was more to scale, and more attractive sounding if the neighbourhood can safely be developed from those cliff drop-offs that were mentioned

---

From: Bobbie Sears  
Sent: November-04-16 9:01 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Waverley Rd.Development

An excellent presentation last night! Since you hope to connect to Hwy 107 has anyone ever considered getting rid of the lights at Forest Hills and 107 and putting in a roundabout to speed traffic flow. Right now that is a very

long light and causes significant block up from 4pm and on. It appears there is empty land there at that intersection. Just a thought.

We also hope that there will be Bungalow style condos or townhouses for seniors who wish to avoid apartment living.

Bobbie Sears  
715 Waverley Road.

---

From: Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCan)  
Sent: November-04-16 3:48 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Suzanne Roy; Andrew Younger MLA  
Glenn Bowie  
Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

Hi Paul:

It was made clear last night that developing Phase 1&2, possibly 3&4 with no definitive plan (i.e. guarantee on 107 access, to push the traffic east away from the Waverly Road) is going to become a serious problem.

Andrew's comments below are not comforting; meaning that the Province could, in fact, not put an exit off the 107 to Port Wallace at all. That phase 1-6 could go through and there might never be an exit up there. The traffic statistics for the 107 show that it is beyond capacity, (sorry I forget who said that last night), but it doesn't sound like Clayton developments can say with 100% certainty that there will be an east exit. That puts 7,400 plus another 1,000 (Conrad's) all emptying on to the Waverly Road.

That would be total destruction to the community that uses that road now. It won't be my problem in that case, because I will move!

Our committee needs to address this issue immediately and get assurances that:



A. There is a guarantee from the province that there will be an exit (in and out)

B. That the phases should be reversed (they said last night engineering can solve this problem)

When the exit to the 107 is discussed it means an exit IN and Out of the proposed subdivision- Andrew quote: My personal view (subject to seeing more information) is the partial connection with only a way into the subdivision and not out, doesn't solve the overall issues. I think a full connection is required, whatever that ultimately looks like.

C. Perhaps, it would be more prudent to put the Conrad's land development ahead of the Port Wallace as proof of concept, provided the traffic safety issues can be addressed. This could be the canary in the coal mine, to judge the effects of escalated traffic on the Waverly Road, the 107 load, and the stability of the lake's ecosystem to adapt to the changes.

I came on this committee to watch over the lake and its sustainability; I didn't think I would get stuck down this traffic rabbit hole ☐

As you know, we have just recently formed the Lake Charles Residents (property owners) Association. Glenn Bowie, (copied on this) is temporary chair. Our first general meeting was in late September, we will meet again, after I can report more real information (not hearsay) back to them on this very real issue.

Looking forward to more dialogue, and hopefully a better plan to deal with traffic, so I can please go back to water sampling- smile ☐

Regards,

Claudia

---

From: Morgan, Paul

Sent: November-04-16 4:14 PM

To: Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCan)

Cc: Suzanne Roy; Andrew Younger MLA ; Glenn Bowie

Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

Hi Claudia: I'm getting lots of comments about the traffic issues already. One of the mandates of the public participation committee is to make recommendations to Regional Council about how these lands are to be developed (through municipal policies and regulations). These can include phasing and required infrastructure. I think that it would be appropriate to raise these matters at our next meeting (actually, I would be quite surprised if they weren't raised given the discussion last night and the messages that I'm getting).

The messages that I am receiving will be bundled and forwarded to committee members in advance of our next meeting. Do you want your message and my response to be part of the record?

---

From: Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCAN) [mailto:claudia.currie@canada.ca]  
Sent: November-04-16 4:35 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

Yes, you can include it.

---

From: Andrew Younger MLA  
Sent: November-04-16 3:51 PM  
To: Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCAN); Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Suzanne Roy; Glenn Bowie  
Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

I would add to this that an exit on the portion of the 107 between the current interchange and Main Street (#7) might be permitted by the province (I can't speak for the department) but usually it is at the full cost of the developer. So it's really about asking permission to build it.

Andrew

---

From: Glenn Bowie [mailto:gbowie@newcastlehotels.com]  
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2016 4:17 PM  
To: Andrew Younger MLA ; Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCan) ;  
morganp@halifax.ca  
Cc: Suzanne Roy  
Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

Sounds like I missed some excitement last night – I apologize as I had business out of country.

Andrew, first, thanks very much for the insight and support!

Second, Any idea on timelines for decisions and final approvals? In my opinion, this could well adversely affect property values, safety and lifestyle; therefore in if we do have to make some regional noise we have an idea of immediacy?

THX

---

From: Andrew Younger MLA  
Sent: November-04-16 5:04 PM  
To: Glenn Bowie; Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCan); Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Suzanne Roy  
Subject: RE: Port Wallace Development

I bet Claudia has the best idea of timelines being on the committee. The fact is however it has more public meetings to come, and then it requires a public hearing at regional council where anyone can appear. Keep in mind, as Paul said, the committee can make these recommendations to council. And there is substantial precedent. So, theoretically, council could decide that Clayton or others could have all their approvals but can't be issued permits to begin construction until the connection is built (or whatever

people decide they want). Or maybe they could begin putting in roads and so forth, but could not build houses until the connection is there. Many possibilities.

---

From: Stephen Comeau

Date: November 5, 2016 at 11:53:24 AM ADT

To: "mancint@halifax.ca" <mancint@halifax.ca>

Subject: Port Wallace Development

Dear Mr. Mancini,

After attending the public meeting regarding the 5000 acre development by Cresco and the Shaw Group for Port Wallace, my previous enthusiasm has been quite dampened. The organizers clearly recognize the negative affect this development will have on traffic for the Waverly Rd., but are pushing it forward for their own gains. As was mentioned at the meeting, the Hammonds Plains Rd., where a similar development took place, is now a disaster. It is my opinion that no development permits should be given until stage one of the development includes a full highway 107 interchange and if the 107 needs to be twinned first, then so be it. The many residents of the Waverly Rd, should not be made to suffer years of traffic woes so that these companies can grow their bottom lines. There is no need to turn the Waverly Rd. into something like the Bedford Highway.

Sincerely,

Stephen Comeau

1 Mountbatten Ave.

Dartmouth, N.S.

---

From: "Declan O'Dowd" <declanodowd@hotmail.com>

Date: November 6, 2016 at 9:43:08 AM AST

To: "tony.mancini@halifax.ca" <tony.mancini@halifax.ca>

Subject: Port Wallace Development - Waverley Road Traffic Concern

Hi Tony,

My name is Declan O'Dowd, you know my wife a and daughter Gina at 260 Waverley Rd across from Port Wallis Church.

We are concerned with the possible development for a few reasons. Traffic is the main concern. The Waverley road as you know is very busy already and not only used for local homeowners but as a recreational road for bikers and car/motorbike enthusiasts (this area is attractive for the beauty). Police are not monitoring the speed and this is an ongoing problem. How are the potential developers planning on getting the construction material to the site? This could be a traffic issue for many years of development. Now fast forward to 3 years down the "road" to 2020...with 2500 plus homes needing to get to the Circumferential highway 111 to go to work in Halifax and Burnside. Waverley Road will be too busy and was never built to withstand this much traffic. One last concern is the waste and possible pollution from this development which might effect streams and lakes.

I think this possible development will effect many families in this area and while i'm not apposed to development, I believe the scale is too large and the infrastructure surrounding it isn't sufficient for a smooth transition.

I get there are studies and this is good and I wanted to let you know as a homeowner we are concerned.

Best, Declan O'Dowd (a supporter of yours)

Declan O'Dowd, Dartmouth, N.S, Canada

---

On Nov 6, 2016, at 11:52 AM, Mancini, Tony wrote:

Hello Declan,

Thank you for your email. I truly appreciate your concerns and I will pass them onto to the community committee, HRM staff and the developers. The following link will bring you to the presentation that was shown at the public consultation: [http://www.halifax.ca/district06/documents/PortWallace-PIM\\_November\\_3\\_2016.pdf](http://www.halifax.ca/district06/documents/PortWallace-PIM_November_3_2016.pdf)

Thank you for your support and I am a big fan of your family, especially  
Gina ☐

Tony

---

From: Declan O'Dowd  
Sent: November-06-16 5:20 PM  
To: Mancini, Tony  
Subject: Re: Port Wallace Development - Waverley Road Traffic Concern

Thanks Tony,  
I took a look and think that's a huge amount of people who could be using Waverley Rd. It's already too busy and now adding approx 7500 people could be very uncomfortable for commuters and residence. I'll leave it up to the infrastructure specialists but have a feeling they should be able to see the many problems which are inevitably going to occur. There will be more tall fences being built if this plan goes through. Sadly fences aren't the solution to healthy communities.

I'll read more regarding this proposed development when I have time.

I know you have lots on your plate.

Thanks Declan

---

From: Rene Leclerc  
Sent: November-07-16 2:50 PM  
To: Mancini, Tony  
Subject: Re: Feedback re Port Wallace Dev

Thanks Tony - In no particular order I've summarized all of our feedback into one note. There are several of us who don't want to see on this side what has happened on the other side. I wish I had been around 10 years ago - I would have at least tried to affect what in my opinion today is an

ugly - poorly planned dev. What's done is done, and I can only hope that these 2 Devs are done well.

I'm all for smart, well thought out dev. Heck, I almost got into the game myself. None of us want to see our property values go down, be negatively impacted by traffic, or have our enjoyment of this lake affected. That said, we all welcome smart dev of those lands.

To Clayton Developments/Conrad Developments

Concerns and comments re the proposed Port Wallace Dev

On behalf of several home owners from Twilight, Craighburn Drive, Charles Keating, Lake Charles Drive, and Waverly Rd. Appian Way, Montebello Rd

- Has there been an economic assessment of what this dev will do to the surrounding area w/r to property assessment and market value? Along the lake there are several homes with relatively high market value (i.e +\$1M). What will this dev do to the value of these homes and the existing neighbourhood in general, considering apartments and multi family accommodations are being proposed?
- What affect will this new dev have on property taxes for the existing neighbourhood?
- Trees and vegetation act as natural filters and buffers to lakes. Due to the proximity of the developments to the lake, and taking into account the slope/elevation of these developments in relation to the lake - what measures are being taken to preserve as much of this vegetation as possible - especially as you get closer to Waverly rd? Could we create a "green belt" above Waverly Rd to prevent/limit the run off effect. With new homes come new lawns that get fertilized, foreign materials, more cars, more waste, more chemicals etc etc. Run off and overall storm water management coming off the hill and going into the lake should be a top priority. We can not accept more clear cutting from these 2 Developments like we've seen across the lake. It's a shame that so many trees were taken down for the Dartmouth Crossing Dev - we hope we've learned from this poor planning.

- The Lake Charles area is enjoyed by outdoor enthusiasts, boaters, canoers, swimmers, hikers, runners, walkers. At one end is the historic Shubie Park and a beach. We want to preserve the "natural-ness" of this area - and one of the key reasons many of us live out here. We would ask that the developers assess their proposed elevations from various view points (i.e the walking/running trails across the lake, from the lake itself, from Shubie, and from Waverly rd) to ensure we don't ruin the great atmosphere of the Lake Charles region. Views matter!
- With so much development happening around Lake Charles - and due to the fact that it's a very popular lake for swimming and fishing we insist a regular water testing protocol be put in place to monitor water quality and that these results are shared with the public.

Rene Leclerc

Vice President Sales and Marketing | Spring Loaded Technology

---

From: Doug Skinner

Sent: November-09-16 1:55 PM

To: Morgan, Paul

Cc: Brown, Stephanie;

Subject: Port Wallis Development Proposal

Mr. Morgan

I do not know if you are the person responsible for the public information sessions regarding the subject proposal but I will direct my comment to you. Unfortunately, I was unaware of the November 3 presentation as were a number of my neighbours. I did not receive a mailed notice as was sent to friends in Port Wallis. I found out about the presentation from a friend after the meeting. I reside on Lake Charles Drive and will be seriously affected by the proposed development. It is regretful that we were not included in the mailed notice.



As a preliminary comment, the access to the Waverley Rd. provided near the southern end of the Conrad Lands proposed development is dangerously located. This issue arose approximately 23 years ago when the development proposal for Craighburn Subdivision showed an access to the Waverley Rd, just across from that which is shown on the current proposal. At that time the intersection proposal was rejected by HRM Council when it was shown by protesting citizens that the intersection was closer to the adjacent blind curve than standards allow. At that time Council agreed that this is not an area where standards should be compromised due to the high volume of traffic and the exit was relocated. In discussion it was stated by the city engineers that the average vehicle speed in that section of road was well in excess of the posted limit. The average speed is offset to reflect a situation less serious than reality since there are many of us who do not exceed the limit. Many vehicles travel far in excess of the limit through this section. An intersection at this location is not acceptable!

Waverley Rd. is the primary access to an area that has grown dramatically in the past sixty years. While there have been some improvements, it is an old road that is narrow and has many sharp curves. It is further challenged by the recent development of bike lanes as it serves the active transportation community as a preferred route. Much of this road operates near capacity now. The addition of housing will raise its traffic level further but the addition of high density housing, which is inconsistent with existing adjacent land use, will impose unacceptable increase to traffic levels. Similarly, the 107 bypass operates near its traffic limits and experiences long line-ups and delays now during peak hours. There is no easy solution

There are many other issues of concern with this and the Clayton Developments proposal that need close study. Please include me in your future information emails.

Doug Skinner, P. Eng.

14 Lake Charles Drive.

---

From: Brian Palmer

Sent: November 12, 2016 6:53 AM

To: Nancy Irvine (Office of Andrew Younger MLA); Councillor Tony Mancini; Paul Morgan

Subject: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT

The Honourable Andrew Younger Member of the Legislative Assembly  
Dartmouth East  
Councillor Tony Mancini Halifax District 6 Harbourview-Burnside-Dartmouth  
East  
Mr Paul Morgan Senior Planner Halifax Municipality

Gentlemen,

I am a resident of Dartmouth adjacent to the proposed residential and commercial construction outlined at the public meeting on November 3rd.

I am very concerned that the development process presented at this meeting will result in significant, unsafe and unnecessary overloading of local streets by an additional 3,000+ vehicles each day.

As discussed at the meeting, the way to mitigate this is to build a full interchange on Highway 107 in Phase 1 of this project and create the connections to local streets as part of the final project phase.

I urge you to take the steps necessary to make this happen.

Sincerely,

Brian Palmer  
18 Capistrano Drive

From: Nancy Irvine (Office of Andrew Younger MLA)  
Sent: November-13-16 7:57 PM  
To: Brian Palmer  
Cc: Mancini, Tony; Morgan, Paul  
Subject: RE: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT

Dear Mr. Palmer,

Council has the ability to put whatever restrictions it wishes on the development. This includes approving the development, but only pending the construction of the interchange. This has been done before (Russell Lake West) and the developers were responsible for most of the cost of the Russell Lake interchange and the Dartmouth Crossing interchange. These are conditions, among many others, which can easily be added by council if and when a proposal reaches them.

Andrew

Andrew Younger  
MLA - Dartmouth East  
73 Tacoma Drive, Suite 600 |  
Dartmouth | Nova Scotia | B2W 3Y6

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 9:09 AM  
To: Brian Palmer ; Honourable Andrew Younger ; Mancini, Tony  
Subject: RE: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT

Hi Brian: Thank you for your comments. Your correspondence will be tabled with the public participation committee at the next meeting in

December and will also be made available to Council when recommendations are made.

---

From: Brian Palmer  
Sent: November-14-16 9:49 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Re: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT

Thanks, Paul,

You will have seen the email from the Honourable Andrew Younger the Member of the Legislative Assembly for our area. His point about recent precedents for building interchanges as part of the development is quite good. And as you saw from my response to his email, I believe that there is also scope for some measure of provincial support to building that interchange.

Will you be tabling an agenda item for the next Public Participation Committee meeting calling on the developer to offer a plan option in which a full interchange is constructed in the first phase 1 and road connections to the surrounding communities as part of the last phase or at least later phases?

I would be grateful if you would advise me the date, time and place for the next Public Participation Committee meeting or where I can find that information.

Sincerely,

Brian

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: November-14-16 10:48 AM  
To: Brian Palmer

Subject: RE: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT

Good morning Brian: The next committee meeting has been scheduled for Monday, Dec. 12th commencing at 7 p.m. in the Helen Creighton Rm. on the 2nd floor of the Alderney Gate Library. This meeting is open to members of the public but any request to speak is at the discretion of the committee. If you do want to speak to the committee, I would recommend that you send me your request beforehand and I will make the Chair aware.

A staff recommendation will not be made at the meeting regarding the interchange but the committee will be advised that a study is being undertaken by an outside consultant which will identify infrastructure upgrades needed to accommodate this development (including sewer and water) as well as the cost and timing of the upgrades. This study will be made available to members of the public when it is completed.

I will be compiling all comments received from the public meeting which will be distributed to the committee members in advance of the meeting. The comments will also be posted to our web site and I will send out an E-mail notification to everyone on my E-mail mailing list.

I hope that I have answered your questions but, if you have anything else, feel free to contact me.

---

From: Doug Skinner [mailto:dougskinner@bellaliant.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:07 PM  
To: Mancini, Tony  
Cc: Morgan, Paul; steve@stevestreatch.com  
Subject: Fw: Port Wallis Development Proposal

Hi Tony

FYI, following is the email that I sent to Paul Morgan. You were copied but the address from your website "mis-directed" it.

One concern that I have not yet raised is the issue of the sewage pumping stations located in the Lake Charles watershed. The last time that I inquired, none of these stations had auxiliary power to maintain operation in the event of power failure. This means that any sustained power failure can result in sewage overflowing into the lake. As you are well aware, Lake Charles is the headwater of the Shubenacadie Canal system. If it becomes polluted, the potential to pollute every lake and stream from Sullivans Pond to Minas Basin is real.

Adding homes in the watershed will increase the likelihood and severity of this happening unless all additional sewer development uses gravity mains, which is most unlikely, or back up power is installed to ALL lift stations on the system, since they daisy chain until they reach the treatment plant. If any more homes are added to existing stations without revising the stations, the surge capacity of each receiving chamber is proportionately decreased. This, in turn, decreases the critical length of a power interruption before overflow will occur. This summarizes another reason why development in this area must be very carefully controlled. I have not yet had time to review the infrastructure development report and am unaware if this consideration has already been addressed.

I look forward to participating in the process as it proceeds.

Cheers  
Doug Skinner

From: Doug Skinner  
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2016 1:55 PM  
To: morganp@halifax.ca  
Subject: Port Wallis Development Proposal

Mr. Morgan

I do not know if you are the person responsible for the public information sessions regarding the subject proposal but I will direct my comment to you. Unfortunately, I was unaware of the November 3 presentation as were a number of my neighbours. I did not receive a mailed notice as was sent to friends in Port Wallis. I found out about the presentation from a friend after the meeting. I reside on Lake Charles Drive and will be seriously affected by the proposed development. It is regretful that we were not included in the mailed notice.

As a preliminary comment, the access to the Waverley Rd. provided near the southern end of the Conrad Lands proposed development is dangerously located. This issue arose approximately 23 years ago when the development proposal for Craighburn Subdivision showed an access to the Waverley Rd, just across from that which is shown on the current proposal. At that time the intersection proposal was rejected by HRM Council when it was shown by protesting citizens that the intersection was closer to the adjacent blind curve than standards allow. At that time Council agreed that this is not an area where standards should be compromised due to the high volume of traffic and the exit was relocated. In discussion it was stated by the city engineers that the average vehicle speed in that section of road was well in excess of the posted limit. The average speed is offset to reflect a situation less serious than reality since there are many of us who do not exceed the limit. Many vehicles travel far in excess of the limit through this section. An intersection at this location is not acceptable!

Waverley Rd. is the primary access to an area that has grown dramatically in the past sixty years. While there have been some improvements, it is an old road that is narrow and has many sharp curves. It is further challenged by the recent development of bike lanes as it serves the active transportation community as a preferred route. Much of this road operates near capacity now. The addition of housing will raise its traffic level further but the addition of high density housing, which is inconsistent with existing adjacent land use, will impose unacceptable increase to traffic levels.

Similarly, the 107 bypass operates near its traffic limits and experiences long line-ups and delays now during peak hours. There is no easy solution

There are many other issues of concern with this and the Clayton Developments proposal that need close study. Please include me in your future information emails.

Doug Skinner, P. Eng.  
14 Lake Charles Drive

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: November-09-16 4:21 PM  
To: 'Doug Skinner'  
Subject: RE: Port Wallis Development Proposal

Mr. Skinner: Sorry you didn't receive notice. We did a mass mailout to about 3,500 homes in the community. In any event, I have added you to our E-mail notification list so hopefully you will receive notice all future public events as well as staff report. The power point presentations from last Thursday's meeting have been posted to the HRM website. These presentations, as well as other background information, can be found at the following link: <http://www.halifax.ca/planhrm/portwallace.php>

Your comments to me will be presented to the Port Wallace Public Participation Committee which will be meeting in the near future to review public comments and make recommendations.

Thank you for your interest in this project and, hopefully, communication difficulties have been resolved.

---

From: Roberto Salgueiro  
Sent: November-13-16 6:19 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Re: Port Wallace New Proposed Developments



Hi Paul,

Do you know when the request to reduce lot frontage and area from the requirements of the Dartmouth Land Use By-Law will be presented to council? Is there a planning application case number for this? I was not able to find it listed under the current planning applications listed on Halifax.ca

Thanks,

Roberto Salgueiro

---

Sent: November-14-16 9:56 AM

To: Roberto Salgueiro

Subject: RE: Port Wallace New Proposed Developments

Hi Roberto: I don't know when any of the requested amendments will be presented to Council. Probably sometime in 2017 but I can't be sure. This project does not have a case number but information can be found at <http://www.halifax.ca/planhrm/portwallace.php>

I will add your E-mail address to the now lengthy E-mail notification list. People on this list will be notified of any public meetings or council meetings dealing with this project. Thank you for your interest in this project.

---

From: Micheline Banville

Date: November 17, 2016 at 12:46:43 PM AST

To: "Mancini, Tony" <mancint@halifax.ca>

Subject: Port Wallace Environment Impact assessment

Good morning Mr Mancini,

I had a good visit with Mr Neat yesterday. He is very passionate about the project and has a lot of good ideas. During our conversation, I found out that there was not an environment impact assessment done. I was inform that it was not required for the project.

I am very concerned about the environment impact, mostly the impact on migrating birds. We have a clear view of Barry's run from the back yard and have observed several kinds of birds visiting in the spring and some raising families. To name a few, Great Blue Herons, Common Merganser, Ring-necked duck and American Bittern. Other wildlife visiting are black bears, Bald Eagles, Ospreys, Pileated Woodpeckers. Deers, pheasants and a family of beaver are permanent residents. Once we spotted a Bobcat. Grouses were present when we first moved in but they have disappeared.

Over the years, my sons have caught many fishes in Barry's run and Lake Charles. Trouts are difficult to catch but a pleasure to watch jump out. You can find bass and land lock salmon. Gaspereaux used to run in the brook and children had a great time scooping them out in buckets, they are not returning since the construction started on the other side of Lake Charles.

For all of these issues, you understand why I am reluctant to see any new development near Barry's run.

Please forward my comments to the Residents Comity and let me know why there was no Environment Impact Assessment requested.

For your consideration,

Thank you,

Micheline Banville  
Port Wallace resident

---

From: Paul  
Sent: November-17-16 6:44 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Paul Currie  
Subject: Port Wallace Lands Development info via Nov 18 2016

Good evening Mr Morgan,  
I am forwarding my concerns regarding the Port Wallace Lands Development (as per the meeting you had asked for any concerns or comments be forwarded by Nov 18 2016).

(1) I reside on Lake Charles and there is currently issues that have been documented with the Dept of Environment on the run off / silt after storms that run into the Lake Charles / cove where we reside , resulting in large discoloration and over the past years the cove has been silting in. The storm run off results in the lake being unusable for swimming until the silt settles. We have also had to extend our docks as the lake depth has been filling in.

Additional development could further enhance this issue.

: Concern (A) Lake Run off ...issues to property usage and the ECOSYSTEM.

(2) Traffic on Waverley Road is already high with a narrow road after Lake Charles Drive Dartmouth to Waverley plus speed and cycling concerns. Additional traffic unless addressed properly is a large concern.

: Concern (B) Addressing Waverley Road traffic and safety concerns

Thank you Mr. Morgan.

Respectively submitted,  
Paul F Currie  
819 Waverley Rd

---

From: Glenn Bowie [mailto:gbowie@newcastlehotels.com]

Sent: November-17-16 8:02 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Cc: 'Lesley MacLeod'  
Subject: Port Wallis Development

Hello Paul:

We hope you are well!

My wife and I live on Lake Charles and are in the process of forming the Lake Charles Residents Association!

Unfortunately we were traveling during the early November meeting, but have been kept abreast from friends who were in attendance.

Our concerns are twofold:

1/ Waverley Road, where we reside, is already ridiculously busy and often unsafe, and the addition of the bike lane seriously compounded the issue. The potential of allowing another intersection with an influx of additional traffic is not remotely conceivable. It is imperative that the alternate option feeding into Highway 107 be followed, or the residents of Waverly Road will be forced to fight the erosion of safety in the neighborhood!

2/ Lake Charles has long been considered one of the cleanest lakes in the Shubenacadie system, so it is important that the ecosystem be taken into consideration with any expansion within the district. The potential results are far reaching and "The City of Lakes" cannot allow further deterioration of this precious resource!

We love my neighborhood and are willing to speak up about it!

We look forward to further meetings, and would be happy to discuss further at any time.

Regards,  
Glenn and Lesley MacLeod-Bowie

---

From: name redacted  
Sent: November-17-16 9:53 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Feedback from the Port Wallace Planning Study Meeting

I live on the Waverley Road and on Lake Charles and am absolutely appalled and disheartened about how the developers and HRM are planning the traffic portion of the proposed development. Obvious that evening was the clear disregard for current residents of the area.

My family's lives are already endangered every time we back out of our driveway. Our section of the Waverley Road daily resembles a racetrack, especially during fair weather. Now for the next 8-15 years (the projected final phase of the development), construction traffic will be added to the Waverley Road, as well as cars of the new residents, due to the access to the Bypass not being built until the last phase (as specified by the developer that evening). In addition, when that access is constructed, the maps showed it as one off ramp only available to vehicles coming from the direction of the airport/Dartmouth Crossing. New residents will not be able to access the Bypass if driving into Dartmouth/Cole Harbour Place/Shearwater/Hwy #7 OR access their homes in the new phases when returning from those areas. So their return traffic will also be added to the Waverley Road corridor as well.

Full access from the bypass into the new development **MUST** be built first, not last, as a firm condition for the developers. Otherwise, the developer and the city are again putting profits and tax revenue first and residents second. I am extremely disappointed that the HRM Planning Dept. and our local councillor would allow the traffic portion of the development plan to proceed in this way.

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: November-18-16 3:14 PM  
To: name redacted  
Subject: RE: Feedback from the Port Wallace Planning Study Meeting

Hello: Thank you for your comments. These comments and all others received will be made available to the public participation committee and will also be posted on our web site. I would like to take the opportunity to respond to your last statement. Neither staff or the councillor have endorsed the development phasing presented by the proponents at the public meeting. In fact, it was the first time that I had ever seen that proposal.

The development phasing and infrastructure requirements will all be considered in preparing the secondary planning strategy for this community. Your input is intended to help inform this process. There will also be an infrastructure study undertaken to determine what infrastructure upgrades are needed, when they will be needed and how they will be paid for. All this information, as well as the draft secondary plan, will be made available and presented at a public meeting with further opportunity for comment. Ultimately the planning documents would have to be approved by Regional Council after holding a public hearing before any development could proceed.

---

From: Brian Palmer  
Sent: November-18-16 8:44 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Re: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT - REQUEST LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE PORT WALLACE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE

Hello Paul,

Thanks very much for the information about the December 12th meeting of the Port Wallace Public Participation Committee.

I see from a review of the terms of reference for this committee that they have the mandate to “guide the preparation of Planning Documents for the Port Wallace Secondary Planning Strategy”. As I understand the terms of reference, the Committee has the authority to make recommendations with respect to the content of development agreements. I would like to make a presentation to convince the Committee to recommend that the Port Wallace Holdings Limited proposal for a development agreement include an option that would see the building of a full interchange on Highway 107 as part of the first phase of the development.

Slide 23 of the Clayton Development presentation given November 3rd at the Ecole du Carrefour gives the intended phases and timelines for this development. This slide indicates that it would be at least the sixth year of development before road access to Highway 107 was created. Until that access is built, all traffic associated with the construction and the rapidly increasing occupancy of the development area (some 2500+ people by that time) must travel across existing municipal streets. As you are aware, the streets in the adjacent neighbourhoods are not currently designed to handle this much additional traffic. Furthermore, adjacent existing neighbourhoods will be severely impacted by the congestion, noise and dirt associated with this very large, multi-year construction project. It was suggested by a member of the public at the November 3rd meeting that much of these problems could be alleviated if the Highway 107 access was built first and connections to the adjacent neighbourhoods opened as part of the final phase. This suggestion appeared to meet with the approval of a large number of attendees. I would like to follow up on this good idea by making a formal, 5-minute presentation to the Committee. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in arranging this for me.

Also, my understanding is the Port Wallace Secondary Planning Strategy does not yet exist. I have not been able to find any information about it, and I would be grateful if you would advise me of its status.

Thanks very much,

Brian  
902-462-3302

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: November-18-16 2:15 PM  
To: Brian Palmer  
Subject: RE: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT - REQUEST LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE PORT WALLACE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE

Hi Brian: I will make the Committee Chair aware of your request to speak.

---

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: November-18-16 2:42 PM  
To: Brian Palmer  
Subject: RE: PORT WALLACE DEVELOPMENT - REQUEST LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE PORT WALLACE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE

Hi again Brian: Sorry, I forgot to address your question. The Port Wallace Secondary Planning Strategy has not yet been drafted. When it is prepared and reviewed by the public participation committee, it will be made available for public comment. I would also expect that there will be a public meeting to present it and respond to questions.

---

From: SUZANNE Roy  
Sent: November-18-16 10:00 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: Re: Port Wallace Planning Update

Hello Paul,

Sorry for the last minute comments, but I will likely echo what many have already sent you.



My first two paragraphs will provide reference points, my comments on the proposed developments follow.

First, I live along Waverley Rd between between Lk Charles Dr & Spider Lake, closer to Spider Lake. I am fortunate to live along Lk Charles, but I have also seen firsthand the impact of Spider Lake Estates initial clear cutting and later development as the brook that runs through my property and into the lake is fed from the development above me. I have seen and continue to occasionally see heavy silt, and certainly the water along my neighbourhood shorelines has become progressively grimmer with a lot of new weed growth that was never there before.

Second, though I live north of Dartmouth Crossing, I am fairly close to the Burnside Extension. I have experienced frequent 'silt by air', through my property is heavily treed, my windows, decks, outdoor furniture and siding were significantly dirtier than I have ever seen them. I also paddle the entire lake early morning several times a week and frequently witnessed for the first time this year, a thick layer of silt lying on the surface of calm lake water that would start near Lk Charles Dr and be present up to Shubie beach.

Lastly, I drive the length of Waverley Road and also the turnoff from Montague Rd to the 107 to get to city as well as to Main Street, several times daily and at all hours. I can tell you that Waverley Rd and the 107 between Exit 13 and Main Street are already at capacity, especially in the morning and evening rush hours. Further, both arteries have significant safety issues. Waverley Rd is extremely narrow, lacks shoulders beyond Montague Rd turn-off, and is hazardous drive to turn in and out of one's driveway, with the cyclists, dump trucks, and speeding cars. I have cars crash into my road frontage at least 2/year, as result of trying to avoid cyclists or trucks... The 107 is too narrow for its volume of traffic, the 100 km/hr speed limit is too high and the passing markings are unsafe. We know, there have been severe accidents fatalities even since it was "improved".

Now my comments on the proposed developments.

1. Re Traffic - has there been a thorough traffic analysis of both Waverly Rd and the 107? Taken not at 2 pm in the afternoon, but between 6:30 – 8:30 am and 4-5:30 pm?

2. The Conrad Brothers development proposal I realize is at very early stages. But there is no way that this development can be allowed to exit anywhere between Spider Lake Rd and Lake Charles Drive. This is already too dangerous a road for additional traffic due to poor visibility and road drainage, let alone adding a street intersection to the mix. I would also encourage the city and the developers to respect the lake and the existing neighbourhood by ensuring that there is not a high density of houses in this development – ie make the lots larger, with fewer houses on larger properties, not a tight cookie cutter development. Developers and HRM MUST also put in place proper drainage and dirty water and silt control to prevent direct drainage into the lake.

3. The Clayton Development has obviously been extremely well thought out and will likely be a very nice development for newcomers. I also agree that low height multi-residential buildings will be great to allow seniors and youth to live in the neighbourhood. However, it has to be taken into consideration that they are not developing in the context of an established mature community and not in a blank slate. The community along Waverley Rd & Lk Charles in particular, continues to have our quality of life eroded and taken away from us. The Clayton development cannot be allowed to create further erosion.

Before the development work can start, the following conditions have to be in place and have to be respected by HRM and the developers.

a. Capacity and safety of the current 107 from exit 13 – Main St. must be improved.

b. The interchange (s) planned for Phase 3, currently planned for 8-10 years after construction has started, MUST be moved ahead to Phase 1 and be in place before any development/construction traffic starts. These cannot be allowed to go through Waverley Rd or through any of the current narrow old residential streets.

I realize A & B above are dependent upon the Province. But it must be a prerequisite that both HRM and the developers work with TIR to have these in place before bringing in any type of construction equipment. Waverly Road cannot accommodate this type of traffic.

c. Proper consideration needs to be put in place for additional traffic loads on narrow and dangerous Waverley Rd, in context of it also now being a designated cycling route.

d. Developer and HRM must ensure that proper environmental control is in place before construction starts, throughout construction and after development is completed to prevent dirty water from flowing into Lake Charles (& Mic Mac), and from silty air from flying overhead as we have experienced from Dartmouth Crossing & the Burnside extension.

Thank you for your ongoing attention to this development. I sincerely hope that vigilance will continue into the eventual approvals and execution.

Regards,  
Suzanne Roy

---

From: John Cody [mailto:john.cody43@gmail.com]  
Sent: November-18-16 3:23 PM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Subject: COMMENTS RE LAND DEVELOPMENT LAKE CHARLES AREA

Looking at the map, and realizing how dangerous the driving on HWay 318/Waverley Road is, special care will have to be taken for adequate

traffic control measures and traffic calming in order to ensure there are no further casualties on this dangerous stretch of road.

John Cody  
2 Craighburn Court Dartmouth, NS  
B2 X 2Y3

---

From: sandy bryson  
To: morganp@halifax.ca.  
Cc: Suzanne Roy ; Currie, Claudia (NRCan/RNCAN) ; Glenn Bowie ; Mancini, Tony ; Andrew Younger MLA ; Tony Gordon  
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2016 5:53 PM  
Subject: Re: Waverly Road development .....

Hello Paul ,

I think most of the Folks are still in shock and can't figure out why anyone would want to develop such sensitive lands .

Has anyone calculated the cubic meter volume of rain water run-off that will no longer be soaked up by vegetation and swamps ? Water that will be sent down storm drains and eventually into Lake Charles and will run both ways from there ..... to the Harbour and Minas Basin .

We all heard the Sales Pitch from Clayton , Conrads , Whebby's etc . They really don't give a damn . Once their land is sold , they'll move onto the next parcel some one will sell cheaply and the circus continues . We're left holding the bag .

HRM is one of the worst stewards of water shed lands in Nova Scotia .

Dartmouth Crossing has out-classed HRM ten times over with precautionary measures and originally we were worried about them .

HRM's answer is to run water across pavement , into storm sewers and into our Lakes with little or no thought to what will happen in the future .

Plants growing in the Lakes concern you , Paul ??

Additional traffic on the Waverley road in asking for someone to have a fatal accident .

Who ever was responsible for allowing a Tim Horton's that close to a busy intersection should be fired ! Let alone adding 2000 more cars , you people must live in a dream world , of sorts .

Of course , none of this effect you or the Developers . You all live somewhere else !

They can throw out all sorts of squed facts and figures , the proof comes when the rubber literally hits the pavement !

Look at thre 107 BYPASS at 5 pm in the evening ..... back to back traffic , well hidden in the woods . Add 2000 more cars trying to get home .

Why not do something right instead of something quick .

The suck in is to scare people into thinking that development will have to use Wavwerley Rd for phase #1 , then find out , low and behold , that they could install a sewer system and dump the traffic out to the 107 via the main Rd by the Francophone school .

We jump at the alternative route and the Developers go away rich and happy .

I have had the pleasure of working with Morris Lloyd back in the early 70's . There's a man with ideas and insight . Get him onboard as an arbitrator and designer .

The people will be much happier , I guarantee it .  
Conrads still dump tons of sediment and flocculent into Lake Charles each year not to mention arsenic etc ,HRM does nothing about it ..... WHY ??

Dartmouth IS The City of Lakes ..... NOT the bedroom of Halifax !

We are Taxpayers , We are Residents of Port Wallace ..... WE CARE !

Sandy Bryson  
365 Waverley Rd.  
Dartmouth , NS.

---

From: Stefan  
Sent: November-23-16 10:41 AM  
To: Morgan, Paul  
Cc: Sivak, Ben; Mancini, Tony  
Subject: Re: Port Wallace Planning Update

Hi Paul,

Here are some comments for consideration in relation to the Port Wallace Master Plan.

1) I don't understand why the lands slated for commercial and industrial development on the other side of the highway are not included in the same process. If this is a true HRM driven master planning exercise for the community all development area should be included in the plan and thought of in relation to one another. Perhaps you could explain the rationale?

2) I am concerned about the impact of additional impervious surface area on storm water flow into Lake Charles. We are already seeing rapid changes in Lake Charles depth during storm events and drought, and given that houses on the lake have FFE's set back in the 70's I think there is high potential for flooding if this is not handled correctly. I know they will design

to a 100 year flood event, but we also know that these events are happening more and that even the best designs fail. Over the past six years I can recall at least three or four 100 year flood events. I'd like to see a comprehensive flood study and storm water management plan done that examines these issues on the lake.

3) I think the city and the developers need to be more transparent about the construction impacts of this project particularly as it relates to the installation of sewer infrastructure. There was no discussion of this at the public meeting, yet as I understand it the plan is to install a new pipe all the way down Waverley Road, Jaybe, John Brenton and across Shubie park. Residents should be made aware of this. It will undoubtedly create significant inconvenience and disruption. There should be a plan to mitigate the impacts as much as possible.

4) The area already has significant infrastructure deficiencies (i.e. lack of sidewalks, sewer that floods John Brenton and areas of Waverley Road that require the use of pumper trucks during storm events, etc.). I'd like to understand if some of these deficiencies can be addressed at the same time as the new truck sewer is installed? What is HRM's intention in this regard? I think it possesses a great opportunity to improve things in a cost effective way.

5) As you know, one of the biggest issue relates to transportation infrastructure. I believe everyone is in agreement that Waverley Road and the Forest Hills Extension are already at capacity at peak periods. They also have serious safety issues. In my view, very little additional development should proceed until a new interchange is installed and the Forest Hills Extension is upgraded to a 4 lane divided highway from the 118 to the development area. I'd like to see the plan revised so that there is a more direct connection to the existing and proposed Forest Hills Extension interchanges as opposed to Waverley Road. The developer can still put in the sewer lines to Waverley road but stub the roads at least until the timing is appropriate. I'd also like to see the phasing completely revised so that traffic is pushed towards the highway.

6) For the Conrad Lands development it was suggested that the building would have a view of the lake, but that the buildings would not be visible from Waverley Road. This may be correct, but the building will be clearly visible from the Lake and the trail system along Lake Charles. There should be HRM design requirements in place keeping this impact in mind.

7) I'd like to thank you and the rest of the people working on this file for the efforts to appropriately notify residents and generate public interest. Well done!

Thanks,

Stefan

From: Morgan, Paul

Sent: November-25-16 3:58 PM

To: 'Stefan'

Cc: Sivak, Ben; Mancini, Tony

Subject: RE: Port Wallace Planning Update

Hi Stefan: Thanks for your comments. These will be forwarded to the Port Wallace Public Participation Committee for consideration in their review. With regard to your question posed under 1), I will respond by cutting and pasting excerpts of the staff report which recommended proceeding with the Conrad commercial and industrial development proposal independently:

#### Secondary Planning Study Area

At the March 4, 2014 meeting, Regional Council considered a staff report that recommended that two additional parcels be included in the secondary planning process. The recommendation originated from a request received from the property owner.

The Conrad family proposed to develop a serviced residential community on a 53 acre parcel between the Forest Hills extension (Hwy. 107) and the Waverley Road. The family also proposed to develop an industrial park



over its 525 acre quarry site of which 242 acres abutting the north side of the Forest Hills extension and Montague Road is proposed to be serviced with municipal water and wastewater services (see Attachment A). The serviced land are also proposed to allow highway commercial uses. Approximately 55 acres of the north-east portion of the property are within the Lake Major water supply watershed. A submission in support of these requests, prepared by East Point Engineering Ltd. on behalf of the Conrad's, is presented as Attachment D.

The quarry is currently regulated by three land use by-laws (Shubenacadie Lakes, Dartmouth and Cole Harbour–Westphal). In addition to the public water supply zone, portions of the site are zoned for industrial uses and other portions for residential uses.

Council directed that the merits of these requests be considered under the land suitability assessment and the baseline infrastructure studies and that staff report back for direction prior to undertaking further work.

The Conrad's have subsequently requested that the requested quarry rezoning proceed independently of the Port Wallace Secondary Plan. The secondary planning is expected to take some time to complete and the Conrad's wish to build a maintenance building on a portion of the quarry that is currently zoned residential. They acknowledge, however, that the request for municipal water and wastewater services is related to and dependent upon servicing of the Port Wallace area and therefore the quarry lands would remain serviced with on-site systems until such time as servicing approvals are obtained for both the quarry and Port Wallace Secondary Plan area.

#### Conrad Requests

Staff reviewed all available information and remains supportive of the Conrad requests to consider its' proposals for the following reasons:

- the watershed study concluded that developments serviced by on-site wastewater systems around the lakes pose more risk to water quality degradation;

- the LSA study did not identify any reasons why the proposed uses were unsuitable;
- the servicing issues raised by the baseline study are general to the area;
- the quarry lands are not suited for residential development but offer an excellent opportunity for industrial and highway commercial uses that would benefit from having direct access to the regional highway network; and
- regional plan policy states that “HRM may consider permitting private business parks in appropriate locations within or adjacent to designated growth centres”.

The request to allow for industrial rezoning of the quarry lands to be considered independently from the Port Wallace Secondary Plan also has merit. The link between industrial development of the quarry lands and the community development proposed for Port Wallace lands is the shared municipal water and wastewater infrastructure and possible upgrades to the transportation system.

These servicing matters will be addressed through infrastructure design and costing studies. The Regional Plan does not allow for extension of municipal services until charges needed to pay for transportation upgrades have been approved by Regional Council and CCC charges needed for the oversizing of the water and wastewater systems have been approved by the N.S. Utility and Review Board. Therefore, there is no reason that the request for industrial rezoning cannot proceed independently.

The quarry is bordered by single unit dwellings on its eastern boundary and to the west along the Montague Road. Staff proposes that the public participation program entail a public meeting to seek input from neighbouring residents on the merits of the rezoning request. Items for review include buffering requirements and the range of highway commercial and industrial uses which should be permitted.

---

Tony Mancini - Priority Management.  
Sent from my BlackBerry Passport smartphone .

Original Message

From: Rene Leclerc

Sent: Thursday, November 24, 2016 8:46 AM

To: Tony Mancini

Subject: Traffic around Lake Charles

Hey Tony,

Further to my note a few weeks ago. One of the concerns with the new port Wallace dev is around the additional traffic/congestion it's going to bring to an already congested area.

I snapped these pics last week on my way home. It was around 5pm. Note also that the dev of Dartmouth crossing is also going to add a lot more traffic.

Braemar/Waverly roads are already bad, and sending more cars along there isn't the solution either. I think they need to consider twinning up the highway to Cole harbour to accommodate all this extra traffic.

Rene Leclerc

---

From: lorna khan

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2016 4:33 PM

To: Mancini, Tony

Subject: comments on proposal for Port  
Wallace"[halifax.ca/planhrm/portwallace.php](http://halifax.ca/planhrm/portwallace.php)"

Could you please forward these comments-I could not send them to the address provided. Thanks I attended the meeting the end of October-the presentation was lengthy and insufficient time given to discussion because the actual meeting did not start until 730 pm after it was advertised as 630 pm.

At any rate these are my comments:

the streets are very long and I think there should be more cul de sacs-you can always put walkways between them instead of having such long streets.

I would like to see some of the seniors housing be walkup separate units with a garage . Similar to some of the housing you see in other rural communities for seniors- not all of us want to live in condos in big buildings. Like a 2 bedroom street level town house type of housing available for purchase or rental.

I still feel the 2 exits to Waverley Road will make it too busy.

Thank you Lorna Khan

---

I am contacting you regarding my concerns related to the proposed development in Port Wallace. The powerpoint presentation on the HRM website titled "*Clayton Development Presentation*" includes a proposed design of the development with a trail system throughout the development including trails along the north and south sides of Barry's run.

The proposed trail on the north side of Barry's run is illustrated with direct access from Waverley Road across currently owned lots. The diagram below identifies the area of concern. This portion of the trail system is of concern for the following reasons:

- **Damage to the wetlands.** The proposed trail from the Waverley Road to the new development area is in very close proximity to the wetlands and would be damaging.
- **Safety Risk.** Establishing access from the Waverley Road introduces a safety risk as people will:
  - a. Park on the side of the road or be dropped off/picked up there to access the trail impeding traffic flow on Waverley Road or
  - b. Park on the cul de sacs in close proximity to the proposed access on Waverley Road (Meadow Walk and Garden Court). These cul de sacs are used by children to play road hockey, basketball, and other sports and with more traffic on these cul de sacs children are more at risk. Parking on the cul de sacs will result in trespassing through properties to access the trail and/or vehicles.
- **Privacy impact.** The proposed trail would impact the privacy of properties that have been established for over 20 years.

As an alternative to accessing the proposed trail system from Waverly Road and going through existing properties access to the North side of Barry's Run could be achieved from within the proposed development as is being proposed on the south side of Barry's Run thus reducing the risk of damaging

the wetlands. In order to support public access the proposed development could be revised to incorporate a small parking area allowing safe access to the trails that does not impede traffic flow on the Waverley Road or increase traffic on the nearby cul de sacs.



From: Lynn Cashen  
Sent: December-15-16 2:09 PM  
To: Mancini, Tony; Morgan, Paul  
Cc: info@andrewyounger.ca  
Subject: Port Wallis Development

I am writing to voice my concerns with regards to the Port Wallis development. I am a resident in Keystone Village.

I attended the public meeting last month and I was very disheartened and disappointed. I found the developers from Clayton extremely dismissive and disrespectful to the community members - as well as Mr. Conrad.

With all due respect, I'm wondering if Mr. Conrad is willing to sacrifice part of his land on either side of that Highway to be twinned?? Either that, or is he willing to have it expropriated? That highway definitely does not have the capacity to withhold the traffic in the volume density that you're speaking of with both of these developments. That Highway currently can

barely accommodate the traffic that's on it now traveling to Cole Harbour and our area at rush hour. Furthermore, since that part of the development was a later phase, there is an even bigger issue with using the Waverley Road. As someone who travels on Waverley Road on a daily basis, that CANNOT possibly handle 700+ new dwellings (at approx. 2 cars per household, that equates to an additional 1400 cars travelling on that road at rush hour).

I took great exception to the assumptions that have been made with regards to the community needs and wants. As a member of Generation X, I was raised in this area and then moved on to further my education. I have lived in the city center, I've lived in Clayton Park West, and I along with many other families, have moved back to the community in which we grew up to raise our family. That was our choice. We did not choose to live in a community like Larry Uteck or the hill of Bedford West or Russell Lake. We chose to come back to the community where we lived and grew up. Yes, indeed, it is most certainly a more established and spacious community. They are indeed larger lots, that was our choice. It was extremely insulting to hear a member of the development team say that the lot sizes in Dartmouth were a waste of land. Well Mr. Morgan, with all due respect as an owner of one of those pieces of a waste of land, I was highly insulted and indeed felt that that comment was extremely condescending towards the homeowners in the port Wallace Community and Woodlawn. I would like to know when the next consultation meeting will be and more importantly, how it will be advertised? I certainly hope that the possibility of a project of this magnitude, you will give the residents more than a 4x6 postcard in the mail, as many of the residents in my neighborhood have not even heard about this development.

Regards,

Lynn Cashen Basso BBA, Med

From: Mancini, Tony

Sent: December-15-16 2:29 PM

To: Lynn Cashen; Morgan, Paul

Cc: info@andrewyounger.ca

Subject: RE: Port Wallis Development

Hello Lynn,

Thank you very much for your comments. The Port Wallace area is a very special place in HRM and we have to make sure this development is done properly. Paul Morgan will share your thoughts with the rest of the committee. They committee is scheduled to meet again in January. I am not sure when the next public meeting will take place. I will place you on my distribution list so that you are kept in the loop of any updates related to the Port Wallace Development.

From: Morgan, Paul  
Sent: December-15-16 4:34 PM  
To: Mancini, Tony  
Cc: info@andrewyounger.ca  
Subject: RE: Port Wallis Development

Hello Lynn: I will submit your correspondence to the Port Wallace Public Participation Committee for consideration at their next meeting and will include them on the consolidated correspondence list which can be found on our web site <http://www.halifax.ca/planhrm/portwallace.php>

Councillor Mancini: The next committee meeting will be held on Monday, January 9th, commencing at 7 p.m. in the Helen Creighton Rm. of Alderney Gate Library.

---

---