

**Appendix 3 Feedback Table Meetings April 30 - May 11 and Written Submissions**

**THEME 1: BUILT FORM**

CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	<p>Comments Collected From Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we planning a corridor or trying to neutralize a neighbourhood? If the latter then the Pleasant Street focus is not enough.</li> <li>• Want to see more mixed use and retail in our neighbourhood and more density/more residents.</li> <li>• Sounds good</li> <li>• This is a small but good step.</li> <li>• Sobeys has a Covance on Development on their lot, no grocery store, why?</li> <li>• Are we too strong on conformity – setbacks and height, but nowhere on creativity.</li> </ul>
2. Portland Street	<p>1.2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is a beautiful green belt used by many residents and should be left alone but I'm sure that won't happen as making money always trumpets what the general public wants.</li> <li>• 8 stories is too high! 3-4 story developments would be more appropriate in that area as there are homes directly behind it.</li> <li>• We do not want 8 story buildings in that part of our neighborhood.</li> </ul> <p>1.2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 stories is much too high for development</li> <li>• townhouses or 3 story developments would be more appropriate in this area.</li> <li>• However, at the current Family Drug/Robins site on Portland Street through to Prince Arthur Street, I do support higher developments, up to 8 stories, as there are no houses directly in the “backyard”.</li> <li>• Transitioning scale, from the 1.5 to 2 story homes in the neighbourhood to townhouses and 3-4 story buildings before scaling up to 8 stories would be more fitting with the surrounding neighbourhood</li> </ul> <p>1.2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The portland st corridor encompasses a VERY SMALL area and thus each lot should be considered carefully. There is only a couple of proposed lots on the north side of portland and they are given a height of 6 storeys. This will completely block the park views of the existing large 4 storey apartment building beside them (4 lakefront). The building has 51 units of which 48 are occupied by seniors who have been there on average 5-10 years. these residents are hesitant to leave the building in bad weather and count on their views of the lake and park to get them through many long days. Since this existing apartment building lot covers about 50% of the proposed hotspot land area north of portland st, consideration to the existing quality of life of its tenants should be HEAVILY considered.</li> <li>• Reduce the height of the only lot in front of it to 3-4 storeys, set any future building back further and orientate it away from the apartment. Allow the existing residents to enjoy their neighbourhood and park</li> </ul> <p>1.2.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 storey max height from Portland &amp; Rodney to before “family drug”, then at Family drug site to Prince Albert have higher 8 – 11 storey buildings.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.2.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why put tallest buildings on one of the highest points of land in Dartmouth?</li> </ul>
	<p>1.2.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider topographical changes as Portland gives uphill in building height max</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 storey max height from Portland &amp; Rodney to before “family drug”, then at Family drug site to Prince Albert have higher 8 – 11 storey buildings.</li> <li>• Max 3 storeys (Rodney to adjacent to Family Drug, back on residences) and higher buildings.</li> <li>• R2 block between Portland/Rodney?</li> <li>• Attract families, underground wiring, underground parking.</li> <li>• A face lift will be a breath of fresh air</li> <li>• Why put tallest buildings on one of the highest points of land in Dartmouth?</li> <li>• Consider topographical changes as Portland gives uphill in building height max.</li> </ul>
3. Green Village Lane	NO COMMENTS
4. Grahams Grove	<p>1.4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRM by Design goals call for mixed use with scale development that respects the existing character of established neighbourhoods. I feel this cannot be achieved with the current RP+5 plan unless specific protections are enshrined in any proposals supported by Council</li> </ul> <p>1.4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I strongly oppose any re-zoning of this area as proposed by HRM By Design to increase building height allowances and further rental accommodation development.</li> <li>• I also am opposed to a fast-tracking site development process and expect that any large-scale developments be put forward to the community for input prior to Council debate.</li> </ul> <p>1.4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The superstore is a very isolated parcel in that it has a wide road next to it and a park across the street. In my opinion it would be a perfect location for some higher densities that would match the 12 storeys proposed across the street</li> </ul> <p>1.4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot size and shape should be a limiting factor to the type of development and not a loop hole for low capital footprint investment choices.</li> </ul> <p>1.4.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what extent does rear yard 45 degree set back from 5 Glenwood Avenue impact the permissible building height? (Is the 45 degree set back from the existing built form line still being honoured?).</li> <li>• Has any thought or effort been suggested by Planning to allow the maximum built form only where terracing is used along existing and established residential side and rear yards (otherwise a strict 45% setback compliance should be applied to the tower portion of any development)?</li> </ul> <p>1.4.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will small and or irregular shaped lots be treated under this plan?</li> <li>• What is HRM's definition of a character home or neighbourhood?</li> <li>• The proposed 29 metre maximum height for the property on the corner of Prince Albert Road and Glenwood Avenue is still high relative to the 1 ½ story to 2 story homes on Glenwood Avenue. The 22 metre height proposed for Lawrence Street would be a much better fit or transition from the residential area and the 35 foot height restriction zone this property abuts.</li> <li>• We've scene examples on the Peninsula where HRM by Design standards have clearly not been adhered to. What assurance do residents of Graham's Grove have the same will not occur in our neighbourhood?</li> </ul> <p>1.4.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NAPA building site appears to support 6 storeys, which is fine, but if the Lawrence-Bartlin through block is carved up into small owner identified parcels, does each owner have a 12 storey right or does the smallness of lot configuration also automatically limit or reduce permissible height</li> </ul> <p>1.4.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of street wall heights in Graham’s Grove – disappointed that it’s 5 storeys</li> </ul> <p>1.4.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor height along street frontage should be 10.7 instead of 5 storeys and adjoining streets with 4 storeys should be 3 storeys instead.</li> </ul>

	<p>1.4.10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graham’s Grove sits between 2 designated opportunity sites and is mostly low level residential. Low to mid-level development should be the goal.</li> </ul> <p>1.4.11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step backs should be layered along street corridors as well. Maximizing sunlight/sky and pedestrian scale with height and step back controls is a great idea.</li> </ul> <p>1.4.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not like the fact that there is a 5 storey &amp; 8 storey frontage on most streets in the Grahams Grove area</li> </ul> <p>1.4.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graham’s Grove does not need a highrise that only serves the developer. We need buildings that have a mixed use (commercial/residential) that will respect our family friendly lake environment(HRM by Design Goals).</li> <li>We want and welcome new people in our neighborhood but: more people equal more traffic.</li> <li>a street that has 1 bus route but you still have to walk to Main street or walk to Mic Mac Mall. What happens to the traffic issues already faced by residents on a daily basis by increasing the traffic, but no extra parking.</li> </ul> <p>1.4.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 3’ then 45 angle setback should be part of the development so that it is sunny &amp; inviting. This should not be reserved to placate the surrounding residential property.</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification of street wall heights in Graham’s Grove – disappointed that it’s 5 storeys</li> <li>The provision for potential commercial uses is valuable depending on how business opportunities develop and alter over time (flexibility is key)</li> <li>Corridor height along street frontage should be 10.7 instead of 5 storeys and adjoining streets with 4 storeys should be 3 storeys instead.</li> <li>Graham’s Grove sits between 2 designated opportunity sites and is mostly low level residential. Low to mid-level development should be the goal.</li> <li>The area between Lawrence Street &amp; Bartlin Road, should require a wind tunnel analysis for anything above 8 storeys. Otherwise it looks Great.</li> <li>Step backs should be layered along street corridors as well.</li> <li>Maximizing sunlight/sky and pedestrian scale with height and step back controls is a great idea.</li> <li>Do not like the fact that there is a 5 storey &amp; 8 storey frontage on most streets in the Grahams Grove area</li> <li>The 3’ then 45 angle setback should be part of the development so that it is sunny &amp; inviting. This should not be reserved to placate the surrounding residential property.</li> <li>The statement about the design form &amp; step backs being uneconomical for small lots is flawed – if it doesn’t fit – “it doesn’t fit”.</li> </ul>
5. Windmill Rd.	<p>Comments Collected From Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be consistency with the type of commercial space usage</li> <li>Deal with vacant lots or commercial space sprawled over large properties.</li> </ul>

<p>6. Wyse Rd.</p>	<p>1.6.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the present population density in the central core and in appropriate sub divisions of the core, including the "corridors" under pressing discussion for 2012? (Wise Road and Windmill Road in Dartmouth).</li> <li>• What are the design goals for population density?</li> <li>• How does this compare to central population densities in cities similar to Halifax?</li> <li>• How may these densities be achieved? What are the alternatives? Why are alternatives not presented at the discussion meetings?</li> </ul>
	<p>1.6.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wyse Road, which is surrounded by residential areas, should not be singled out for towers and highrises.</li> <li>• Because the sun moves during the day to the south and west of the Wyse Road area, highrises will make the area shadier, colder and much windier.</li> <li>• I support well designed, low-rise low-income housing initiatives but am also aware of the association between some low-income highrises and higher levels of social isolation, community disengagement, crime, etc.</li> <li>• Commercial tower areas empty out at night, leaving pedestrians exposed and vulnerable. We need development that helps to solve the social and economic problems in our area, not development that exacerbates them.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.6.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not want to feel like I'm in downtown Halifax. Keep your highrises there.</li> <li>• Low-income highrises and low-income housing in general are associated with higher crime rates.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.6.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we request that the maximum building height under HRMbyDesign be restricted to eight storeys on either side of Wyse Road from the Dartmouth Sportsplex/Holiday Inn to Boland Road—and to six storeys north of Boland Road.</li> <li>• Boland Road was once part of the Dartmouth Common and has provided much-needed green space in our neighbourhood for more than 60 years, and because this area is bounded on about 80 percent of its borders by residential and housing areas, we request that it be exempted from the Wyse corridor area. Petition initiator: Claire McIlveen, started May 11th, 2012”.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.6.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale developments such as high rises, would not be helpful.</li> <li>• More middle-class residents would help, living in low rise dwellings such as townhouses and single family dwellings</li> </ul>
	<p>1.6.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am sadly disappointed that this may be happening in my area.</li> <li>• It is truly disappointing to see so much time and effort placed on maintaining the feel of certain areas in HRM ( Quinpool / Gottingen / Downtown Halifax/Downtown Dartmouth) only to hear the city may allow for such large developments in an area many residents feel is the true Dartmouth</li> </ul>

	<p>1.6.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the former Keating property is not the place for 24 story apartment buildings.</li> <li>Have you considered the traffic chaos this will create?</li> <li>Please consider how many more cars will be in these high rises to add to the mess.</li> <li>there is the wind tunnel effect. Just walk past Metropolitan Place to feel what 16 stories causes and consider what another 8 will do.</li> <li>8 to 10 stories would be more appropriate. If this 24 story development (when it is proposed) is approved, will the city buy our property which is zoned R1 and will no doubt be damaged by blasting all the slate rock that covers most of that property?</li> </ul> <p>1.6.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am opposed to the proposed 24 story towers at the top of Faulkner Street. I am, as are many of my neighbors, a long term resident and this development would have a negative impact on our neighborhood.</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The heights are too much even though the overall approach may be okay.</li> <li>Does the mixed zoning allow hotels?</li> <li>What are the current height restrictions? What Dartmouth areas get 28m (24 storey) tall buildings? Concerned that increased density will increase social problems.</li> <li>Boland street area streetwall height may be too high.</li> <li>Height restrictions are up to 18m in a row of houses having 2-3 storeys. Concerned about traffic in residential areas</li> <li>Will ruin viewplanes in a modest neighbourhood.</li> <li>Overall streetwall and building heights are out of scale; too high.</li> <li>We need to give everyone the opportunity to live close to services, not to mention cost of servicing. The key is good and functional design like this.</li> <li>Sensitive to residential backing on commercial.</li> <li>Like the concept but the 20-24 storey maximum is inappropriate near the bridge.</li> </ul>
<p>7. Agricola Street</p>	<p>1.7.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are for buildings being as high as possible.</li> <li>We would also be for more buildings on the south side of Agricola St and on Isleville St as well.</li> </ul> <p>1.7.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It makes no sense why you are restricting the lots along agricola st between NORTH and Bloomfield to 6 storeys when the agricola lots south of them are going to be allowed to go to 8 storeys and north of them to go 12 storeys.</li> <li>height restriction on one of them (6 storeys) makes it uneconomical (corner mccully and agricola).</li> <li>CORNER LOTS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE CIVIC NODES</li> <li>7-8 storeys would just make it feasible as long as parking requirements where relaxed. Second lot is corner Bilby and agricola (12 storey height). These are all shallow lots (80-100 ft) Once all the front and rear stepbacks are implimented you are left with a very awkward depth of floorplate. Some things have to give. a 4.5m sidewalk aswell as a rear stepback ?. Parking is going to be another major silent killer of these projects.</li> <li>With all this density shouldnt we be encouraging the use of alternative transportation (bikes, buses, etc). relax the parking requirements so these smaller corridor lots can actually get a good number of units (40 units +) in them.</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Astonished by heights and believe you're throwing away the impact of density bonusing.</li> <li>• Last meeting there was consensus that to have an Agricola corridor would have streetwall on both sides. I own property on the street and it makes it undesirable since the 2 sided streetwall was not embraced. How does the single streetwall make my property sustainable?</li> <li>• Prevailing scale on Falkland includes 2-3 story buildings. The new height restrictions would put the scale at 6-10 stories. Is there a discrepancy? The residences in that area are 160 years old and so the appropriate scale is 3 stories.</li> <li>• Require to incorporate historical building materials into the design of the buildings.</li> <li>• The importance of future development reflecting the existing style and architecture of some of the existing buildings.</li> <li>• 10 ft setback for streetscape/ streetwall from existing sidewalk.</li> <li>• The impact of the allowable heights on the Creighton-Maynard neighbourhoods will be negative. You should take the time (especially on streets with existing fine-grained residential) to be more thorough with your analysis. This particular part of the plan sees what are, in fact, vibrant neighbourhoods, only as opportunity sites. They are, in fact, communities, and should be respected. This part of the plan should be completely reworked.</li> <li>• Good form</li> <li>• Provides clarity for development</li> <li>• Provides for good and desirable streetscape</li> <li>• Will provide a wide range of residential options for working people and young families.</li> </ul>
<p>8. Gottingen Street</p>	<p>1.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The form and density envisaged by the clients projects will need more than the 5-6 stories as relates to the Sunrise property and the 10 stories as relates to the Gordon B. Isnor property. Concepts to date relate in height to the existing buildings on these sites.</li> </ul> <p>1.8.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The heights proposed for the staples corner are way too much</li> <li>• I think the viewplane to the north of citadel hill is just as worthwhile preserving as to the south.</li> </ul> <p>1.8.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I see high rise ghettos in the land use you propose and it would not be a safe area for anyone</li> </ul> <p>1.8.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have reviewed the proposed plans and are comfortable that the proposed 36 metre height limit for the block bounded by Gottingen, Prince William, Maitland and Cornwallis Streets.</li> </ul> <p>1.8.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unique fabrics of these neighbourhoods is adversely impacted.</li> <li>• by putting in blanket changes where permitted heights increase to five and even 20 floors where they now are three, the tax burden on the owner rises as does the pressure to demolish the existing building and build into the permitted height.</li> <li>• a raising of permitted heights endangers existing heritage buildings or non-registered historic ones.</li> </ul> <p>1.8.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60 ft fronting Gottingen will be a huge wall giving the feel of a financial district and certainly not a place to buy, play or go out to eat at a restaurant.</li> <li>• the approach will not have the intended effect</li> </ul>

	<p>1.8.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height: 8-10 stories is too high.</li> <li>• The building on the corner of North and Agricola is as high</li> <li>• 8 would be as high as I would like to see.</li> </ul> <p>1.8.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If our City Council insists in having buildings on the street to increase the density of people living in the neighbourhood, they will wind up attempting to increasing the number of Yuppies (young urban professionals).</li> <li>• I cannot support the HRM by design plan as it stands at this time.</li> <li>• The area will become a bedroom community, if the tenants can tolerate the high density traffic flow on Gottingen Street</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change to the Hydrostone is not good, there are already issues in that area with tall buildings.</li> <li>• The impact of the allowable heights on Creighton-Maynard and Brunswick streets will be negative. Existing communities will suffer extreme disruption. This part of the plan should be completely reworked</li> <li>• Corridors-yes, but need to protect small scale neighbourhoods, unique cohesive, Georgian streetscape on Creighton-Faulkland etc.</li> <li>• Height restrictions and heritage districts needed.</li> <li>• Faulkland and Maynard and Creighton intersections should be a historical site.</li> <li>• Unique and colourful housing stock.</li> <li>• I agree with the 11.5 height on Creighton street and think it should be maintained on Falkland street to preserve the street's unique character.</li> <li>• 5 stories would look too high and would be incentive to demolish a great neighbourhood.</li> </ul>
<p>9. Spring Garden Rd.</p>	<p>1.9.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need affordable housing, especially rental properties, so I support the rezoning concept to support more high density development.</li> <li>• Higher density housing and affordable, decent rental housing needs to be much more developed.</li> <li>• Build higher density.. but no need to build &gt;14 stories!</li> </ul> <p>1.9.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel that 5 storeys is not entirely appropriate when economics of the site is taken into consideration.</li> <li>• It would not be feasible for a developer to build with the current proposed 5 storey framework and also provide any real valuable public benefit.</li> <li>• Please consider changing the heights of what are now zoned with a 29m and 18.5m heights to allow more density</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>1.9.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I was surprised to hear that a project for Robie/College/Carleton streets, proposed by the [ ...] family, was only approved for 5 stories, when a neighbouring project on the Spring Garden Road side was approved for as many as 30.</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Taken from Meeting Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too high – 20 storeys to 2 storeys</li> <li>• Too high – preference to SFCT MAA. Height in 6 -8 storey range. Don't like "wedding cake"</li> <li>• We need to go up/cost of servicing/sustainability/maximizing the most of our resources downtown and as many people as we can get should be able to live in these areas.</li> <li>• Higher density will allow the use of higher quality materials and green technologies as well as public spaces and art.</li> <li>• It will help extend the vibrancy of Spring Garden Road to Robie Street</li> <li>• Yes, just make sure "exceptions" aren't the norm!</li> <li>• The most important thing is quality urban design/mix of uses not necessarily number of storeys debate or set-back distance</li> <li>• South development (Spring Garden &amp; Carlton) maybe have high rise force east-west, even though street level can still have commercial access east/west.</li> <li>• Love the comment – keep building density to 6-8 stories – effective, quality density to live, maintain and develop.</li> <li>• I want to see better protection for heritage especially on Carleton Street. I fear/hear that developers are amassing heritage building with the plan to tear them down after the year (by rights) then apply for a higher density building based on the fact that it's now a empty lot surrounded by high rises.</li> <li>• Looks like a good plan, just be sure to consider EVERY proposed development very carefully so that increased density does not come at the cost of low-quality buildings that don't respect the stated design principles. Overall, well done &amp; kudos to the HRM by Design Team!</li> <li>• Design is critical – aesthetics matter! So does wind!</li> <li>• Try to find ways to maintain existing facades (the nice ones) when densifying.</li> <li>• Decrease the street side width of mid and high rise to ensure real sky view and not just token.</li> <li>• There should be more as of right sites approved through this consultation process to allow for density growth during the increase of confidence in our economy to help move our urban core in the right direction.</li> <li>• Putting width vs. height restrictions to stop high rise is foolish. Allow high rise developments in select locations instead of making a development not cost effective for the developer. We want to see this city prosper; don't ****off investors or developers looking for potential here. Make guidelines that provide potential for the developer as well.</li> </ul>
<p>10. Quinpool Rd.</p>	<p>1.10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I fully support relaxing the height restrictions so that 20 stories are allowed at Quinpool and Robie, 12 stories in and around Canadian Tire,</li> <li>• High density quality housing will go along way in bringing community minded residents to the area.</li> </ul> <p>1.10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintaining low-rise streetscape along the Western portion of Quinpool with a maximum height of 4-5 stories.</li> <li>• As you move East toward Robie and North on Robie consideration should be a given to a more gradual increase to a mid-rise streetscape with a 10/11 storey maximum at Robie.</li> <li>• by-laws should require designs to be stepped back</li> <li>• we are extremely concerned with the St. Pat's site and advocate for future developments fit into the adjacent community and maintain the height restrictions addressed above.</li> </ul> <p>1.10.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opinion was against any 20 storey building in the proposed locations</li> <li>• Surely it is not possible that vehicle access to a new residential development, whatever the height, would be permitted onto Robie Street</li> </ul> <p>1.10.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I wholeheartedly support the intent and principles of the Centre Plan and would like to congratulate your team on an outstanding public consultation roll-out</li> <li>• I wonder if the code couldn't include further detailing on the massing of these new buildings. Essentially I believe, that those new buildings should pick up the rhythm and grain of the neighbourhood.</li> </ul> <p>1.10.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it correct that proposed residential development on Yale Street will be required to address architectural design elements? If so, what design elements will have to be addressed?</li> </ul> <p>1.10.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think we should be working to preserve. The commercial stretch of Quinpool serves as a "downtown" for the surrounding neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• I believe these proposals will destroy the very qualities that make this such a successful neighbourhood.</li> <li>• One of my primary concerns relates to proposed height allowances along Quinpool</li> </ul>



1.10.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>object to a 10 storey building being placed on this vacant land.</li> <li>Perhaps some appropriately designed Townhouses or Single Family units could be entertained.</li> </ul>
1.10.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>My recommendations: Increase the height on Quinpool rd to 100 feet.</li> <li>Allow an even height on the part of the street close to Robie st.</li> </ul>
1.10.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our preferred maximum height for most buildings on Quinpool is 6-8 storeys.</li> <li>We do not support 20 storeys and would have concern about 12 storeys in the proposed area (Superstore and Vernon to almost Robie) depending on the size of the footprint of the building(s).</li> <li>The site of the former St. Patrick's High School must be excluded from this project. Any sale/proposed development of this site must be subject to public hearings. There seems to be little consideration in this project for the needs of families. Peninsula Halifax needs diversity in its demographics.</li> <li>We need to encourage families with children to stay on the peninsula.</li> </ul>
1.10.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rises do not protect local neighbourhoods.</li> <li>support buildings of 6-11 stories (mid rises) on some parts of Quinpool. As suggested there should be a gradual increase in height as one goes east on Quinpool.</li> <li>Families want houses – the St. Pat's space is big enough to accomodate 4 storey townhouses, many of them facing on the park</li> </ul>
1.10.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional buildings along Robie, Quinpool, Welsford and Winsor will create further shadowing in this neighbourhood. It will block out more light, creating more wind effect and jam more additional traffic into this area</li> <li>suggest further consultation and consideration is necessary for all the affected neighbourhoods before any decisions on this plan can be made.</li> </ul>
1.10.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRM should be supporting higher density by both higher development but also through smaller units.</li> <li>There should be consideration for development units that do not come with any parking.</li> <li>There should be more green options incorporated into any approval for extra heights.</li> <li>the creation of more green space should be part of these amendments.</li> <li>Consideration should be given for the protection of the Quinpool streetscape.</li> <li>It goes without saying that any mixed use neighbourhood must include low cost housing options.</li> </ul>
1.10.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>we should be looking at maintaining a low-rise streetscape along the Western portion of Quinpool (a 4-5 storey maximum height), increasing gradually to a mid-rise streetscape moving East toward Robie and North on Robie, with a 10/11 storey maximum at Robie.</li> <li>the By-Laws should require designs be stepped back, so that at street level they mimic the 1-3 storey scale of the existing streetscape, with any additional storeys being less visible from street level.</li> <li>Maintaining the commercial continuity of the street should also be encouraged by requiring street-level commercial spaces on the ground floor of new residential buildings</li> </ul>
1.10.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems very odd to gradually increase the height as one drives/walks east and then have it end abruptly at Robie St.</li> <li>It is even more odd when moving in the other direction; to suddenly come upon high buildings some distance after leaving downtown and after just passing through an open space.</li> <li>What is it a gateway to?</li> </ul>
1.10.16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRM Staff are going to have to do a much better job of "managing fear".</li> <li>perhaps a real "to scale" architectural drawing for a given "hot topic" streetscape should be presented as an example of how this streetscape plan will look liked. Or fin some real world examples, and provide photos &amp; location data to show how it does work for some existing location.</li> </ul>
1.10.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Yale Street properties are consolidated with Quinpool Road properties, will the set back requirements (from common rear property lines) be eliminated?</li> </ul>

	<p>1.10.18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We should move beyond identifying just the areas that are already "in play" and identify possible future development areas, currently left off the proposal.</li> <li>• I am worried that the heights proposed for Quinpool are not aggressive enough. Will it be affordable to tear down end of life three story buildings on Quinpool that still have a high price tag, and replace them with five story buildings after bonusing</li> <li>• We need to have a very very strong statement that R1 and R2 housing forms outside of these designated areas will be preserved at all costs.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.10.19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High rises do not protect local neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• would therefore support buildings of 6-11 stories (mid rises) on some parts of Quinpool. As suggested there should be a gradual increase in height as one goes east on Quinpool.</li> <li>• mid rise buildings could be accommodated here.</li> <li>• St. Pat's space is big enough to accommodate 4 storey townhouses, many of them facing on the park</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Collected From Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where will there be space to build on Quinpool?</li> <li>• Make Quinpool’s streetscape people friendly.</li> <li>• More people equals more vibrancy</li> <li>• Too high – 20 storeys to 2 storeys</li> <li>• Max 8 storeys (100 ft) is enough. For developments to be viable, they may have to be bigger &amp; higher.</li> <li>• Too high – preference to SFCT MAA. Height in 6 -8 storey range.</li> <li>• Don’t like “wedding cake”</li> <li>• A good balance, although perhaps a bit too restrictive on development Love it! Here to support more residential downtown and affordable housing. This is step in right direction!</li> <li>• We need to go up/cost of servicing/sustainability/maximizing the most of our resources downtown and as many people as we can get should be able to live in these areas.</li> <li>• Higher density will allow the use of higher quality materials and green technologies as well as public spaces and art.</li> <li>• It will help extend the vibrancy of Spring Garden Road to Robie Street</li> <li>• Yes, just make sure “exceptions” aren’t the norm!</li> <li>• Great start but not quite aggressive enough. Buildings have to be economical to get built.</li> <li>• What will happen with the proposed development at Vernon/Quinpool area?</li> <li>• I will be surrounded on two sides by the development on Quinpool &amp; Vernon Streets. I don’t like the idea of no view, no sun on two sides. High hopes co-op 3 family units.</li> <li>• I cannot envision how the plan will work with the current situation of many, many properties with limited frontage. Short of buying everyone out along an extended street frontage area, we will have foolish and unsightly mish mash of properties and heights. Possibly eventually there could be consistency, but things would be yucky in the interim.</li> <li>• Clear rules for height and width requirements for buildings, but.... Check with industry/developers to make sure it’s economical.</li> <li>• How can you avoid too much setback-4.5 m pedestrian realm, 1 flex for façade.</li> <li>• Referring to the coloured maps for Young St. where is meets Windsor at a right angle, are you taking out the curve?</li> <li>• Are there going to be alleys to service these buildings?</li> <li>• Large area with 80+m height-could get more with lower height-too many towers on large site not good way to go.</li> <li>• Need some thought on utility spaces, spaces behind buildings etc.</li> <li>• Have you done 3D renderings? Wouldn’t get 12 storeys as its too small and narrow-can’t meet setbacks.</li> <li>• Restrictions on tower floor plates 8000 sq. ft-11000 sq. ft. Why so restricted? Should rethink when you get to larger lots-specifically on this site.</li> <li>• Concerned about “maximum density”</li> <li>• Nothing over 8 storeys should be allowed at this time. Again the HRM planners have no carrot and no teeth. There should be no density through height until density bonusing has been approved by the province. The other parameters can then be approved successfully.</li> <li>• There is a very real danger of creating out Halifax version of Highfield Park.</li> <li>• Way too much height!! Giant dense buildings will end up costing us in tax revenue in the long run! Set a maximum for storeys.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree strongly with the high storey towers and the negative density it will create</li> <li>• What types of incentives are going to be given to a development in terms of allowing greater number of units per acre (like south end). You have really restricted the smaller lots on Agricola with the setbacks. Compensate with greater number of units/less parking.</li> <li>• The height is too high</li> <li>• Too much stone concrete in one area.</li> <li>• The step down storey process is not gradual enough.</li> <li>• The area inside Robie and Young should not be 12 stories. There are single dwelling houses just across the street.</li> <li>• Why are some areas meeting with a 6-8 storey height and the Kempt/Robie/Young area 12 stories.</li> <li>• The maximum height of 24 storeys is too high.</li> <li>• Look at Gladstone area. I approve to the height but no higher and homes on the face of the streets are a plus.</li> <li>• The area marked as “85” and “64” are too high and will create too much density.</li> <li>• I appreciate the step-down model to the residential areas from Agricola to Barrington. Why not step down 20-12-6 stories at Agricola to provide a more human scale?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like it. About time for Halifax to have this type of positive thinking. The height is not a concern to me, it is all good.</li> <li>• I like the mixed commercial aspects—being able to walk to all the amenities and services I need is part of a vibrant neighbourhood.</li> <li>• A variety of elevations (but none too high like Fenwick tower etc.) would mitigate the fear of monolithic blocks of apartment towers.</li> <li>• Really appreciate the logic of your planning model (status quo is a dysfunctional mess!).</li> <li>• We need change and this plan is a positive change. The current process lacks design and form control. It is out-dated.</li> <li>• I like it. Each growth area should have a desired minimum population/residential unit assigned to it.</li> <li>• I like the proposal main points: 1. Maintain and enhance walkability; 2. Human scale streetscape; 3. Bike paths; 4. High density towers to improve population density on peninsula;</li> <li>• It provides clarity and consistency to the development process; It brings density to where services are available it allocates appropriate heights and provides for good streetscape.</li> <li>• develop the core—strong core makes for a strong city as a whole!</li> <li>• Take a look at contribution to art along streetscape, livability of the units, flexibility in building design,</li> <li>• We need something like this</li> <li>• Treat the Halifax Forum property as a “rear angular plane” which borders Windsor st. (Residential area of Cork &amp; London st. etc).</li> <li>• I do like the plan from an overall perspective but am concerned with the heights leading to residential area off Agricola—that 12 stories with 4 story streetwalls is too high</li> <li>• I think 85 m or 24 storeys is too large for the maximum “Tower” height. I think that less than 16-18 storeys seem more than sufficient. I think 43 m or 12 storeys is too high for the Robie/Kempt/Livingstone block as the topography begins to rise towards Livingstone. Please lower this height.</li> <li>• Support the proposal of townhouse style development on Yale Street.</li> </ul>
11. Young Street	1.11.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am very much in favour of the proposed changes to regulations in the Centreplan</li> </ul>
	1.11.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are almost no lots that are big enough to accommodate the proposed developments when you start applying all of the suggested setbacks and angle controls. Therefore, lots will have to be bought up and consolidated. The present structures would then be demolished to make room for the low-mid-high rise developments</li> </ul>

	<p>1.11.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal for town house style/single resident unit is positive.</li> <li>I am concerned of the proposed heights of the Quinpool Rd. buildings; the six storeys will limit the amount of sunlight for the backyards of Yale St</li> </ul>
12. General	<p>1.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land use bylaw should enable the ability for an applicant to vary the setbacks where the site characteristics negate the intent for which the control was established for in accordance with the Halifax Charter (Section 250(1)(b).</li> </ul> <p>1.12.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept of densification is being misused by being applied equally to all corridor areas. There is no evidence that staff has explored the different ways of achieving densification and the environmental and social sustainability of high-rises over 8 storeys as compared to 6-8 storeys.</li> </ul> <p>1.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by emphasizing human scale and the quality of the design I believe Halifax can integrate new development with existing history while finally beginning to move forward with development.</li> </ul> <p>1.12.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am concerned about inner city families who attend the local inner city schools.</li> <li>The high density developments being proposed will not be suitable for family living and families will be forced out.</li> <li>There is no need to increase density by adding high rises of 6 or more stories to cut out the sun and the green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>1.12.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This letter is in regards to the HRM by design centre plan and the impact it has on our properties. It seems inappropriate to change development rights with a notice that does not adequately explain the significant impact centre plan will have both positively and negatively. In addition we have not received any notices in regards to the properties listed below. We have three properties that are part of this discussion. The first is made up of 5 pid's they are 6100 Almon pid number 00005090, 6070 Almon pid's 00005108 and 40414021, 6050 Almon pid number 40414005 and the last piece is 6061 St Albans Street pid number 40414013. All these pid's are owned by J.P. Shannon Realities Limited and create a rare 2 acres piece of land in the middle of the city prime for redevelopment. Today the HRM by design has a set height of 36 meters or 10 stories. We feel that 36 meters does not make it feasible to create a financial model for redevelopment. The properties around our property are at 14 stories (Danny Chedrawe development on Gladstone street). As well the property across from Almon street (the old Piercy property) has been set to 85 meters or 25 stories. We have a design in progress that has twin towers at 22 stories giving us a feasible financial model. The second property is 2618 Clifton street pid number 00005314 owned by M and J Developments Limited. The HRM by design has set the height to 22 meters or 6 stories. We have presented plans to HRM planning and development and have received a development permit to build an 8 storey self storage building on this site. With the new changes happening we are now interested in developing a new project. With the Gladstone street project next to us at 14 stories we are recommending changing the height from 22 meters to 64 meters. The third property is located at 1389 Robie Street pid numbers 00135541, 00472993 00473009 and are owned by Atlantic Premises Management. The HRM by design has set the limit to 29 meters or 8 stories. Some of the properties adjacent to us have been set to 64 meters and 71 meters. We feel that in order to have a feasible project in the future our property needs to be set to 71 meters. We expect to be working together with the other land owners to develop a corner project. We recommend that the corner of Robie Street and Spring Garden be set to 71 meters. In reference to new conversation with ... we are aware that submission are available to May 15th,2012 and we will be submitting a proposal for review. I am requesting an in person or phone meeting for tomorrow around noon time. At that time we would have a design available for the Almon Street property for us to review. Thank you for helping us with this situation</li> </ul>

	<p>1.12.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think affordable should be just that affordable and planned. Buildings built for living indoors and out with a maximum height of 8 stories are what we need.</li> <li>• The tag line for development should be RESPECT THE COMMUNITY YOU ARE MOVING INTO.</li> </ul>
	<p>1.12.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual minimum population density increases that are desired to be achieved for each of the eleven Phase One "hotspot" growth areas should be stated in clear terms.</li> <li>• The minimum number of people desired to be living in a given growth area within the next 20 or so years must be a known figure or how can HRM Staff ever be sure that adequate residences exist in a given growth area to meet future density goals?</li> </ul>
	<p>1.12.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new development should be set back to line up with existing dwellings and structures to provide a consistent and direct line of sight up each street.</li> <li>• new buildings should be built with a step back design to maintain a 45 degree angle to existing single family dwellings and structures of lower height, located to the sides and rear of the new development.</li> <li>• on smaller lots in close proximity to existing single family homes, height should be restricted to six stories or less.</li> <li>• highrises should be built on lots that are of adequate size to offer enough area for driveway access, amenities space, density, privacy, line of sight, and building set back.</li> </ul>
	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over requirement for commercial – Why is it mandatory? (in Dartmouth)</li> <li>• Likes idea of mixed use, but worried about viability because of continued expansion of Dartmouth Crossing. Would like developers to be required to meaningfully consult with neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Would like HRM to do wind &amp; traffic studies &amp; charge to developers (so HRM property)</li> <li>• The red band along the corridors, there is a miscommunication. There are lots of residential uses.</li> <li>• neighbourhoods later on.</li> <li>• Density bonusing...will this increase the height of these buildings higher than what is shown on the maps here?</li> <li>• How important is densification to enabling good streetscapes, accessible public spaces, etc, type of neighbourhoods we want in HRM?</li> <li>• Any process that helps improve streets like, etc is a good thing</li> <li>• What is the sustainability of high rises vs. low-mid rise?</li> <li>• How can we mitigate a potential/existing wind tunnel?</li> </ul>

<b>THEME 2: BOUNDARY &amp; LANDUSE</b>	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	No Comments
2. Portland Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PID 00221952 should be included cause it is for sale with four other lots along Portland Street.</li> </ul>
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't like that the side streets Lawrence and Bartlin Rd are considered part of the corridor due to their width I think off corridor setbacks should apply</li> </ul>
5. Windmill Rd.	No Comments
6. Wyse Rd.	2.6.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do realize it is on the lands of the Dartmouth Common and that the facility is undertaking a large renovation but I still believe it is important to include it in the plans as there is a sea of parking that surrounds the building and would be an idea location to intensify and put the parking underground or hidden behind new buildings.</li> <li>it is important to include the lots that are now filled with low income housing along Nova Crst and Demetreous Lane.</li> </ul>
	2.6.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Killam-owned Victoria Gardens property on Boland Road, once part of the Dartmouth Common and a valued green space where our kids have played for the last 60 years, should be excluded from the Wyse Road corridor area. Because it is almost completely surrounded by residential areas and provides much-needed green space in our neighbourhood, its inclusion in a high-density corridor area is inappropriate.</li> </ul>
7. Agricola Street	2.7.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order for the "Agricola Street Corridor" to be represented as an actual corridor there must be 2 sides to any streetscape, without this duality there is no corridor.</li> <li>If the HRMbyDesign is adopted as is, while my neighbour on the east side will have the "as of right" to build a 6, 8 or 10 story building on his/her site, I cannot. I would have to engage in a development agreement and incur extensive costs and lobbying with no guarantee of success but my neighbor across the street would not have to do so. [...] Also, my property would be assessed by the PVSC for tax purposes on values created by the new development density criteria across the street.</li> </ul>
	2.7.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use: the residential designation should be closer to the Agricola st. boundary on the side streets</li> <li>I would like to see the current mixed use as grandfathered in and residential being preserved in a more meaningful way.</li> </ul>
	2.7.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I operate Propeller Brewing Company, located just to the north of Staples off Cogswell. I am concerned that we may find it difficult to operate our business here when development does start</li> <li>I trust you keep in mind our presence, as well as that of Staples, which, though principally a retail outlet has an even busier amount of truck traffic than we do.</li> <li>We are a commercial brewery, albeit small, and this does not always mesh with high density neighbourhoods</li> </ul>
	2.7.4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The residential designation should be closer to the Agricola st. boundary on the side streets. e.g. Harris is mixed use to Maynard where there is a line of residential . I think residential should go at least 1/3 up Harris towards Agricola. And then on west as well.</li> </ul>

<b>THEME 2: BOUNDARY &amp; LANDUSE</b>	
<b>CORRIDOR</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
	<p>Comments Collected at Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricola corridor should be 2 sided including existing C2 zones.</li> <li>• Could the corner of Agricola and West street be included?</li> <li>• A light industrial business at 2482 Maynard St. They had concerns about their property being split designated as mixed-use and residential (primarily that the mixed use designation was located in the rear of the lot and the residential was in the front of the lot). They explained that they located their business in the area, and not in Burnside where land would be cheaper, because they live in the area and like that they and some of their customers can walk to their business. They explained the importance of keeping light industrial uses in the area.</li> </ul>
8. Gottingen Street	<p>2.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put mixed use all the way through on Westside Maynard street –this can become a vibrant corridor too. Mixed use would be appreciated, not resented.</li> </ul>
9. Spring Garden Rd.	<p>2.9.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I own property located between Robie that runs along College to Carlton Street. I had requested that my land be included in the center planmeetings for Robie and Spring Garden road area. This makes sense since there are only approximately four owners that have parcels on this particular block.</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings fronting south end of Carleton St should be added/characterized.</li> <li>• What about blocks between Barrington &amp; Summer St? Where opportunities still exist.</li> </ul>
10. Quinpool Rd.	<p>2.10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed regulations concerning increased sidewalk width, mixed use development entailing ground floor commercial and office with residential uses above is acceptable.</li> <li>• Maintaining the south side of Yale Street as residential is good.</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yale/Pepprell NOT included but maps show streets</li> <li>• Important to protect these streets</li> <li>• Concern over hirise in back yards or beside a residential building</li> <li>• Fix the mistake that is Qunpool Centre The most important thing is quality urban design/mix of uses not necessarily number of storeys debate or set- back distance</li> <li>• Need to FIRST consider use.</li> </ul>
11. Young Street	<p>2.11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please record that the requirement of commercial frontage at the property of the corner of Robie and St Albans is difficult for current property owner since it is a place of worship for the Muslim community and this is not an appropriate use for their religious centre at this point in time</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in boundaries in the last few weeks in response to developers has happened obscenely fast. Is the process governed by the same process as downtown-do you need legislative approval?</li> </ul>



12. General	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be minimum requirements to ensure adequate densification?</li> </ul>
	2.12.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to see HRM build a two elementary schools within various downtown areas would increase young families to return to the urban core; it would allow us to work where we live in the urban core.</li> </ul>
	2.12.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would love to see this section of the QEC reclaimed and refurbished as a top notch performing arts hall and repertory cinema, and the gym retained for community use, with a dense new development built around and above these renovations</li> </ul>
	2.12.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please consider requiring some form of pedway connector option be included in the design of any new buildings erected in the downtown core.</li> </ul>
	2.12.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will be the permitted uses in the “Residential Zone”? We would prefer that it be restricted to single family, two-family and townhouse uses.</li> </ul>

THEME 3: HOUSING	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	No Comments
2. Portland Street	No Comments
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	No Comments
5. Windmill Rd.	No Comments
6. Wyse Rd.	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of Housing Affordability for our use? Addressing needs of lower income-what are the needs being addressed? What happens to existing public housing?</li> <li>• I've seen a dramatic change in neighbourhood housing sales/real estate. Due to increase cost of living people can't afford their housing anymore. Pushing people into core/pushing existing residents out.</li> <li>• Concerned people are being forced out of existing neighbourhoods. HRM should do its own studies.</li> </ul>
7. Agricola Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In your deliberations I would hope you'd consider the protection of streetscapes and the possibility of creating incentive for home owners with old properties that wish to upgrade.</li> <li>• Taxes will go up and the citizens will not be able to pay their taxes.</li> <li>• This is close to a racist document because of the fact that one of the few Black communities of Halifax lives in this area.</li> </ul>
8. Gottingen Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does the affordable housing always have to be in the North end? We should spread out rich and poor; mixed use communities are desirable for the entire HRM.</li> <li>• Density and diversity. Income/profession/ethnic background/age diversity This could be a great opportunity to implement some pilot program and provide carrots and sticks to prevent speculation and flipping in the housing/real estate market as well as rent controls and tax controls.</li> </ul>
9. Spring Garden Rd.	3.9.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As it stands now some landlords are pricing themselves off the market.</li> <li>• A newlywed couple are not going to pay \$1000.00 \$1200.00 per month; they are looking to save for a house. Suggesting they buy a condominium for \$140,000 may immediately appeal to them – until they decide to have a family.</li> </ul> Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Love it! Here to support more residential downtown and affordable housing. This is step in right direction!</li> </ul>
10. Quinpool Rd.	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing cost concerns (Quinpool area)</li> <li>• Will high density create family friendly affordable living space?</li> <li>• Will existing family friendly affordable space be eroded?</li> <li>• Will add more residential in the core, and hopefully lead to more affordable housing. Step in the right direction!</li> </ul>

11. Young Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing-incentive to take out existing affordable housing.</li> </ul>
12. General	<p>3.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are concerns that these increased property assessments will likewise have a detrimental effect on existing affordable housing units... what measures will be invoked to ensure this does not occur.</li> </ul> <p>3.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are very few examples where “affordable housing” provides the financial incentive necessary for a developer to invest in their construction.</li> <li>The idea is to incent the developer to add additional elements to the design that accomplish preferred social goals while allowing them to achieve their overall desired return on investment.</li> <li>nothing will get built if there is not an acceptable return for the developer and in an acceptable timeframe.</li> </ul> <p>3.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I question whether those families who are moving to the suburbs would be able to afford or be interested in living in the type of high-rise buildings that the new by-laws seek to encourage.</li> <li>older, wealthier residents who are looking to downsize from downtown houses to condos will be the ones who move into these new buildings</li> </ul> <p>3.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is concern that privately owned home/townhouse developments will have their purchase prices quickly rise above what is considered "affordable" due to fair market value increases achieved through subsequent resale activities.</li> <li>How can privately owned homes/townhouses that are built to provide affordable residential units have their resale values capped/maintained.</li> <li>is this type of ownership designation even possible to enforce? If not, then how can sustained-affordable housing ever be achieved for designated areas?</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the timelines for developing affordable units, spaces, etc. ie: phase 1 vs. the timelines for the remainder of centre plan?</li> </ul>

THEME 4: OPEN SPACE	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	No Comments
2. Portland Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect green space – path. Rodney &amp; Hastings</li> <li>Enhance this green space – keep it public, community path. Will it stay a green space? Please enhance for current and new neighbours to enjoy!</li> </ul>
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows for greater transition from green space, recreation and existing low scale residential.</li> <li>Traffic and wind studies are essential to Graham’s Grove given existing traffic issues and negative impact of wind on lake.</li> </ul>
5. Windmill Rd.	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Playing fields and recreational spaces are much needed here</li> <li>Green space requirements necessary</li> <li>With recreation services and parks there should be provisions for safety (lighting, security cameras) to ensure the spaces remain fun and inviting.</li> </ul>
6. Wyse Rd.	5.6.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(specifically, the Killam-owned Victoria Gardens land bounded by Boland, Victoria Road, Demetreous Lane and Nova Court, and Green Road). My question is: 1. Under proposed zoning, how much of that green space (if any) would the city require a developer to preserve?</li> </ul>
	5.6.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>we need to preserve what little green space we have. It looks as though the green space on Boland Rd will be gone if these plans are carried out.</li> </ul>
	5.6.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>please preserve, and even enhance, the green space connecting Rodney Road to Hastings Street.</li> <li>Will feedback from developers be posted on the website, by development area, so we can view their feedback as they are able to view citizen feedback?</li> </ul>
	5.6.4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where are the green areas to be located?</li> </ul>
	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very European like. They make up for high density and mixed use by providing small squares. There isn’t anything being given back in terms of parkland as part of this process?</li> <li>Require green spaces</li> </ul>
7. Agricola Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandatory public green space</li> </ul>

8. Gottingen Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but I would like to see us use this as an opportunity to implement some incentives for developers to provide urban gardening space as well as pocket parks. Also, for the HRM to commit some of the tax dollars to purchasing lots of green spaces and smaller units</li> </ul>
9. Spring Garden Rd.	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What principles will be considered for landscaped open space, a potential deterrent of built form.</li> <li>• We could use green space areas inside the buildings designs themselves more like resort type developments with amenities.</li> </ul>
10. Quinpool Rd.	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased density will require more green/open space for cities, ensure this space is protected and maintained (i.e. Bayers Lake same expansion or regional wilderness area)</li> <li>• What principles will be considered for landscaped open space, a potential deterrent of built form.</li> <li>• People and green space etc should be the first concern and not by passed to expediate the record number of rented apartment applications swamping the planning dept.</li> </ul>
11. Young Street	Comments Collected from Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrified by density—seen this in Kiev warzones-hope for creative thinking, parks and recreation in the area.</li> <li>• Don't see open space and that's a need for families-needs to be a designated area.</li> <li>• Is Forum redevelopment to serve recreation for the area?</li> <li>• Green building standards, roof top gardens, urban farming and gardening; regulations to control rents but real estate speculation and flipping.</li> <li>• I note that no public green spaces are proposed. None!</li> <li>• Invest in public green space</li> <li>• Also: need green space/recreation; area shouldn't be all mixed use—should have some residential in the mix i.e. townhousing.</li> <li>• I also want to ensure green space, community gardens, parks, amenities for families</li> </ul>
12. General	5.12.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open spaces for recreation, and adequate parking arrangements MUST be detailed in any new development plan prior to a building permit being granted.</li> <li>• Once the structures have been built it will in all likelihood be too late to try to create parking, and open space solutions that are appropriate to meet the needs of the newly developed business/residential building arrangement</li> </ul>
	5.12.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you decided on whether to follow the Downtown Bylaw model for landscaped open space or an alternative?</li> </ul>
	5.12.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are the green areas to be located?</li> </ul>

THEME 5: Mobility and Traffic	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about a park lane on Pleasant Street for parking?</li> <li>• I like the plan, just need to ensure we encourage transit is sufficient</li> </ul>
2. Portland Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not enough detail for or about parking</li> </ul>
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	<p>7.4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking and traffic is a significant issue for high density within such a small area.</li> <li>• With poor service for public transit in Graham's Corner, currently one single bus route, and the threatened cut backs to the ferry service, this is not the kind of development we need to attract and retain families and seniors to our lakeside community.</li> <li>• The need for transit never disappears, and because of no planned parking, the need spills out into public spaces adding to existing traffic problems</li> </ul> <p>7.4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the HRM has failed to provide adequate controls on proposed developments to reduce conflict with any adjacent or nearby land uses by reason of traffic generation and access to egress to and egress from the site.</li> <li>• The impact of the increased traffic will adversely impact the dependent living of seniors within the community,</li> <li>• Prefer something more compatible due to the high traffic volumes.</li> <li>• Established households or independently living seniors who rely on automobile access for their social safety network will be adversely impacted by such high increases in density along with the traffic volumes</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also, where will people park given very limited usable street frontage on existing narrow streets on hills?</li> <li>• Also concerned about traffic. There are already regular traffic accidents – many leading to death in this area &amp; the streets funnelling into this area.</li> <li>• Presentation stated an asset for Graham's Grove as transit. This is inaccurate. Traffic is poor and there's only one bus #62. Also, ferry service threats make this area vulnerable if density is to increase.</li> <li>• Some good work, but question why Graham's Grove was chosen for increased density given poor traffic network/access.</li> </ul>
5. Windmill Rd.	No Comments
6. Wyse Rd.	<p>7.6.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density development will bring more traffic to Wyse Road, which, because of the bridge, is already a major and often gridlocked thoroughfare for both vehicles and pedestrians.</li> <li>• This is an inappropriate area for high-density, high-traffic development.</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRMbyDesign streamlining the process is all good, but people who support high density around bridge head probably don't live in the area. It is mostly midrise on Wyse Rd with a lot of traffic. The higher heights are going to worsen the traffic situation.</li> <li>• Bridge is an ugly eyesore-is there a plan to change traffic flow-load around bridge?</li> <li>• Must take into consideration of traffic and traffic calming.</li> <li>• Be mindful not to worsen traffic in an already</li> </ul>
7. Agricola Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must consider parking implications.</li> <li>• Reduce parking agreement for developments in area.</li> <li>• No bike lane requirement for developments in area.</li> <li>• Improve short term parking in the area.</li> </ul>
8. Gottingen Street	<p>7.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The businesses on Gottingen Street need to have walk-in traffic.</li> <li>• There is very limited parking on Gottingen Street today and it does not allow for parking for more that 1 hour during the day.</li> <li>• There was comment made HRM Staff, that people would slowdown to look at the shops. There are 2 problems with that observation, 1) the congestion that this type of gawking would create would slow traffic to a crawl. 2) The jay walking would increase exponentially as would the resulting accidents.</li> </ul> <p>7.8.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfortunately, a bike lane will hamper the traffic and parking.</li> <li>• Perhaps the way to mitigate this issue is to convert Agricola to a one way street and Gottingen to one way in the opposite direction.</li> </ul>
9. Spring Garden Rd.	No Comments
10. Quinpool Rd.	<p>7.10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My plea is that urban transportation is not only considered, but made a condition to densification.</li> <li>• If we improve public transportation links - walking, biking, bus etc., then leaving vehicles parked, or better, not required will become the norm.</li> </ul> <p>7.10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the street closure (barricade) of Yale Street at Monastery Lane.</li> </ul> <p>7.10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide assurance that the street closure (barricade) of Yale Street at Monastery Lane will be maintained, otherwise, through traffic movement will increase to an unacceptable level for a local residential street.</li> <li>• Access to properties fronting on Quinpool Road- Will access be permitted from Yale Street?</li> <li>• Will it be possible for Yale Street (south side) properties to be used for surface parking (i.e. similar to the Athen's situation?)</li> <li>• serious consideration should be given to providing public parking (for Quinpool patrons) as part of the re-development of the St. Pat's school site, and potentially the re-development of the Quinpool Center site and the Ben's Bakery site</li> </ul>

	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be additional traffic on Pepperele Street will there be access onto Quinpool, be charged?</li> <li>• Lots of parking and traffic already occurs on Allan St, parking restrictions hurt more than they help. Width and traffic flow on Quinpool makes it a bottleneck</li> <li>• Densities will be too intrusive of abutting residential uses especially of corner lots. Where are all the cars going to park?</li> <li>• Onsite parking must be mandatory 1 – 1.5 spaces per unit.</li> <li>• No parking requirement (like it)</li> <li>• Envision Quinpool involves relating to reality of traffic!</li> <li>• Too many cars on peninsula. Too much Traffic. Dangerous to use bicycles!</li> <li>• But....pay attention to ALL the comments from meeting #1h. It was discussed tonight (as per an audience member’s question) that HRM has no power to force property owners to beautify ugly buildings. However, since you are some sort of tax incentive for property owners who agree to improve their ugly properties? (or development incentive or other incentive). For example, take the Canadian Tire</li> <li>• Quinpool doesn’t have to be a traffic monstrosity. Introduce tolls! Improve transit! If traffic from Quinpool is overflowing to Allan, consider traffic calming measures (ie. Bulb outs nearby. like on Romans Avenue) to help reduce traffic overflow.</li> <li>• If traffic gets worse on Quinpool people will stop using it as a freeway from rotary to downtown and if you use traffic calming on Allan, Pepperall, etc they can’t use these streets either, they will walk/bike/use transit.</li> <li>• There are three keys to its success: transit, transit, and transit (must reduce car traffic)</li> <li>• Pay attention to traffic density and social impact on recreational areas, ie. Bars, cafes, local hot spots. Keep local environment alive</li> </ul>
<p>11. Young Street</p>	<p>5.11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• concerned about the potential loss in parking in our area.</li> <li>• For the area to be a success we do require some short term parking.</li> <li>• It is impossible to run a business with "NO" parking .</li> <li>• The area needs to incorporate a number of pay to park sites</li> <li>• Our business group are opposed to the cycle route on Agricola but have supported it on the parallel side streets of Maynard and Creighton.</li> </ul> <p>5.11.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Halifax Forum Community Association met on May 16, 2012, with one of the agenda items being the recent public meeting for the HRMbyDesign, “Proposed Built Form and Land Use.” As an organization operating a complex in the Windsor/Young Street neighbourhood we thought it important to formalize our support for Centre Plan Phase 1-Young Street, Building Height, Street Wall Height, and Proposed Land Use Designation, all supported by the board, and in line with our thought process for any Forum future development. As a designated site, we are somewhat concerned about possible parking lot restrictions along Windsor and Young Street. Any loss of parking spots would be devastating to the Forum</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about parking?</li> <li>• Parking is a reality that goes with people. Need adequate parking for businesses—either fail or anger neighbours. Perhaps require developer of towers to include public parking</li> <li>• Why is there no mention of traffic study and the pedestrian realm?</li> <li>• Traffic is an issue: I walk my kids to school and work from home and see grid lock daily.</li> <li>• What is the plan for transit?</li> <li>• Important Considerations: Transit and transportation &amp; traffic, active transportation (bike lanes etc), street scale and quality pedestrian experience, mixed use and mixed density to encourage diversity in the neighbourhood (mixed cost/subsidies/required percentages).</li> <li>• Think through traffic patterns please (not only vehicles but bikes and pedestrians too). We need some traffic calming on parts of Robie and Young Street</li> <li>• To make this area more liveable, traffic density (cars) should be reduced—this means reducing the “superhighways” through the neighbourhood, providing better facilities for active transportation and keeping the car: person ratio lower the traditional numbers (e.g.: with better public transportation and car sharing services)</li> </ul>



<p>12. General</p>	<p>7.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic control has been arbitrarily separated as a matter not part of the Regional Planning review process, set apart from the issue of densification in our area.</li> <li>To cut or limit Ferry service while the Planning Department undertakes densification of our area is a red flag highlighting the municipal government's need to co-ordinate area traffic/transportation and planning redevelopment concerns. One department can not be upselling positive features of densification while at the same time the department with the pursue strings cuts or restricts the required transportation services.</li> </ul> <p>7.12.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If roadside parking is removed to facilitate new bicycle lanes then that parking must be made up somewhere else in order to meet local requirements.</li> <li>if new street level - store front businesses are to be a requirement for some new building/residential developments, then more than adequate parking arrangements need to be available for their clients/customers.</li> <li>If adequate parking is not available, then potential businesses &amp; residents may choose not to fill the vacant units</li> </ul> <p>7.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage Transit to work with the public to achieve practical and realistic routings in the new areas of the city so that more cars are off the roads.</li> <li>Provide a bus map that includes the trails and pathways so that folks can plan their walk to the stop that is useful from their residence..</li> <li>Integrate AT with other partners so all are sharing in the planning and decision making...get rid of the silos of decision makin</li> </ul> <p>7.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retrofitting for a healthier community is important.</li> <li>Walkability, walkable communities, improved and safer routes in our neighbourhoods. Work with neighbourhoods to help them improve. Post the Walking Charter which was signed by the Mayor last year, work out some outcomes that are achievable in the next couple of years so that we can understand what it really means in practical terms. Work with the shopping malls/other private land owners to guide them towards safer sites for the walking public</li> </ul> <p>7.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate the topic of Trails and Pathways so that their is a comprehensive "PLAN" for connectivity.</li> <li>I suggest that all planning, construction, signage, promotion of Trails be integrated in to a revised programme with knowledgeable, engaged staff.</li> </ul> <p>7.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>we would like to request a significant emphasis placed on "Walkable Communities/Active Transportation" as development arises.</li> <li>We would like the Municipality to ensure ample street lighting, continuous sidewalks, and sidewalks free of ice and snow, close proximity to shops, focus on active transportation, with safe biking lanes, continue to improve and monitor the waterfront trail, enhance outdoor areas; such as parks and playgrounds, and focus on other creative approaches to safe and healthy neighborhoods.</li> <li>We would like HRM to continue to strive to create a culture of walking and sustainable transportation in Dartmouth.</li> <li>we encourage collaboration with Ecology Action Centre - we encourage you to continue to support the Stepping Up, Physical Activity Strategy for the Halifax Region.</li> <li>The Planning Department must continue to involve residents, local government and community groups to identify priorities.</li> </ul>
	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see parking in the plans, &amp; prescriptive language</li> <li>The encouragement of parking underground, encouraging alternative modes...is this written in the Plan?</li> <li>Need provisions for guest parking</li> <li>With respect to enhancing transit within these corridors...are you going to encourage transit if existing policy encourages cars, ie road widening, ex. Ridership is down, reduce routes.</li> <li>When you look at densification # in 25 years, Do we have a transportation Plan/model? Is is actually going to achieve our sustainability goals?</li> <li>Add bike lanes, public amenities like benches, well, designed buildings Mix use is great but continued expansion of Dartmouth Crossing will prevent this and also subdivisions outside of core. Developers should still consult with</li> </ul>

THEME 6: PROCESS	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Get people and maybe developers thinking.</li> <li>• It would sure be nice to have a design or concept study, a visual concept of street and buildings.</li> </ul>
2. Portland Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are models available of sunlight as it would be impacting on residences based on building height?</li> <li>• Schools – what is consideration or impact of schools from increase in families in neighbourhood as result of developments</li> <li>• Change will be good, area needs improvement. Good opportunity for input with this process.</li> <li>• Where are the comments from developers’ round table? Should be posted online so we can see what they are saying (as they can see our comments) by hotspot area ie: Portland Street and Graham’s Grove.</li> </ul>
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	<p>6.4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be helpful to see a streetscape rendering indicating maximum built form with the current lot configuration and a comparison for through block lot consolidation by a Developer willing to invest in the neighbourhood by amassing a sufficiently large lot to support a high rise.</li> <li>• What is hidden is the input from Developers and how the built form shown in the earlier models will be impacted for the overall area.</li> <li>• What is currently proposed seems a knee jerk reaction for intense densification for the urban core.</li> <li>• Will this type of development attract families to set down roots in the urban core, save our schools, and stop urban sprawl - not likely. This is not smart growth - just profitable growth</li> </ul>
	<p>6.4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is also of concern within the details is the effect of the Developers' meeting input.</li> <li>• I commend David Lane for an excellent presentation of some extremely complex principles and ideas to a diverse audience on the April 30th meeting.</li> <li>• Two versions of this Prince Albert Road streetscape mock up should be made available by HRM for the Public: i) one with optimal lot consolidation; and ii) one under RP+5 rules within the confines of the current property PID configuration.</li> </ul>
	<p>6.4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• planning for the future of the area should be very well and comprehensively thought out</li> </ul>
	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worried that concerns for Graham’s Grove area were not adequately captured. Wants to review &amp; edit report before it goes to CDAC.</li> <li>• Concerns about development already in the que not conforming to HRM by Design</li> </ul>
5. Windmill Rd.	No Comments
6. Wyse Rd.	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This process of carving out specific areas of interest to be dealt with before the overall plan is mistaken. All of the HRM byDesign considerations should be done as an integrated whole (and after the new council is elected).</li> </ul>

7. Agricola Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our existing process is broken with antiquated plans. DA's do not allow for change. Changes to Gottingen and Agricola are important.</li> <li>• Need more people on the street to reinvigorate our city.</li> <li>• This process is a great way to move that along.</li> <li>• More important than heritage is getting the city working again.</li> <li>• No issue with heritage and modern buildings side by side, this juxtaposition just highlights and accentuates what is so fantastic about heritage buildings.</li> <li>• I'm noticing that people in this room seem to be divided; you are either for development or against development. So we must move beyond that and vouch for positive development and growth.</li> </ul>
8. Gottingen Street	<p>6.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placing height restrictions on buildings on Gottingen Street is an excellent idea; the problem will be in keeping people from "creeping" over the height.</li> <li>• If exceptions/exemptions are being made then why impose bylaws and only have a few obey them?</li> </ul>
9. Spring Garden Rd.	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be more as of right sites approved through this consultation process to allow for density growth during the increase of confidence in our economy to help move our urban core in the right direction.</li> <li>• It is really difficult for me to look at your map with the orange squares with foot number on them (71,28, etc) and say "I like this" or "I do not like this". If you could put a bunch of photos on the wall of existing buildings of the heights and set backs you propose with this connecting them to your map. And/or do an architectural rendering of part of the streetscape as you envision it (pedestrians – eye – view) if would be much more helpful.</li> </ul>
10. Quinpool Rd.	<p>6.10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• powerpoint presentation failed to or was unable to include the maps which showed the present building heights restrictions and the proposed changes to building heights in designated building lots for the Spring Garden Road and Quinpool Road corridors.</li> <li>• The too few visuals available for public display had map illustrations which were too small and font size that was too small to actually be able to be read from any distance, especially in such poor light.</li> <li>• the process is simply too rapid.</li> </ul> <p>6.10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature of public meetings is really coming apart at the seams</li> <li>• I believe that traditional style public meetings, where people identify themselves and the community, the media and government bear witness to what is said, are cornerstones of the democratic process as much as the trial is part of the judicial process.</li> <li>• If we abandon this kind of meeting we abdicate responsibility and break down democracy at the local level into a kind of faux process, an easily forgettable and deniable sham.</li> </ul> <p>6.10.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I recently attended an information session at which City planning staff very helpfully presented the proposed amendments for the Quinpool Corridor and answered residents' questions. I commend them for their professionalism and patience and Councillor Watts for making it happen</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good planning for a standardized process, wish that elements of Phase 2 were included now, ie: green space, transit.</li> <li>• I like the process, and as a business owner &amp; resident of Quinpool we want to see the street improve. Challenges yes, but the process works. We care, take pride in our building/business, seek to improve it constantly welcome a unified effort – Growth change have to occur!</li> <li>• Great. Increased density will make area more sustainable as well as reduce carbon foot print.</li> <li>• Well prepared and good long term view!</li> <li>• More education and information on proposed legislative amendments</li> <li>• Check Bloor in Toronto between Prince Edward &amp; Royal York. Selective commercial with 2 or 3 streets residential over ground floor.</li> </ul>

<p>11. Young Street</p>	<p>6.11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two meetings that were held for this area [North End] came with rather short notice, only 5 weeks between the first and second meetings, were not well attended and, in the case of the second meeting, very poorly run (allowing speakers to ramble on and on, make personal attacks, etc.) Please reconsider.</li> <li>Stick with your original 2015 completion date. Carefully consider the comments of the residents, developers and architects. THESE PROPOSED CHANGES ARE NOT GOING TO HAVE THE OUTCOMES THAT HRM IS HOPING FOR</li> </ul> <p>6.11.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why should we have faith in claims that our opinions about the look and feel of our neighbourhood matter when no one seems to care that a decrepid building surrounded by a security fence seems to be considered preferable to a new and attractive building that would make a contribution to the Windsor and North neighbourhood?</li> <li>It is hard to believe assurances that you will try to keep future needs of our neighbourhood in mind when you appear to overlook the needs of the neighbourhood a few blocks north on Windsor.</li> <li>what "we" see being built--or not built--seems to have little relationship to the philosophy stated at HRM Open Houses and information meetings</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't support density bonusing-you should use development agreements instead.</li> <li>Ok with height, I like the vocabulary-streetscapes, participation etc. What's missing is estimation of population increase with full build-out and demographics. This would help to know there's a long range plan-schools need to be addressed</li> <li>Considering these areas before the overall consideration of the whole plan is a mistake. It anticipates the final overall outcome. It will also put pressure on the final overall outcome.</li> <li>Site plan approval process will not give anyone who is a citizen a feeling that they have any say, any control—this is because they will not have any say or control.</li> <li>Why do you really think that if you do not get the charter changes you want that you can simply decide to give the developer what they want as-of-right?</li> <li>Great job, HRM staff. I think this plan is respectful of our beautiful and stable neighbourhoods. I question however, the wisdom of such extreme heights. I recognize the attempt to make the street level more engaging but a tall tower will not encourage more walkability but create an unpleasant environment.</li> <li>A well done consultation process.</li> <li>I am concerned with how a plan can be arbitrarily overturned by Council. There should be an extensive consultation and approval process if an application is outside criteria.</li> </ul>
<p>12. General</p>	<p>6.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is it that the Site Plan process can be used in the Downtown Halifax district but not in the new Corridor intensification areas?</li> </ul> <p>6.12.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by restricting or even doing away with public hearings, even from near and abutting property owners, (but not the developers) the Plan severely limits democracy by by-passing and overriding public input.</li> <li>While some may regard public hearings as nothing more than vexing safety valves they do serve a purpose and eliminating them is an anti-democratic decision.</li> <li>Surprising the public with news of a new building (massive or not) is a way to cause anger and upset.</li> <li>The Centre Plan infers that existing properties are expendable and protection of existing neighbourhoods and heritage properties will be dumbed down. It abrogates stewardship over heritage and other affordable resources, "puts the run to" local neighbourhood retail as well as the arts community, all of which contribute to vibrant and unique streetscapes. The result is the feeling of being in a vice</li> </ul> <p>6.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is already demand for space and real estate. And so I can accept that there is some urgency to discuss these issues and make some plans.</li> <li>I am appalled at the idea that this whole process has been fast-tracked. Once complete it will become THE plan and there will be no room for further consultation with citizens or neighbourhoods. This is not democratic</li> </ul> <p>6.12.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I recommend that the public engagement presentations make a better effort to "manage the fear", and be customized to address local concerns wherever possible.</li> <li>Before going to the public at large, have a private screening of your various future public presentations with some people who will do a good job of asking the "hard questions"... being better prepared to provide reasonable answers to the fearful questions will make the Q&amp;A period more productive</li> </ul> <p>6.12.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are disappointed that we were not made aware of your zoning meeting held on May 2nd, 2012.</li> <li>Who's responsibility was and is it to inform affected residents HRM or Halifax by Design?</li> <li>We ask to be advised of our rights in this matter, and the opportunity to see your plans before you change our neighbourhood and have a voice in a public meeting. Why were we not advised? Will we be advised of the next meeting?</li> </ul>

6.12.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will this be presented to the committee? I want to be present.</li> </ul>
6.12.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it is the case that we are not to be given the opportunity to review and edit the draft of the summary and response to public input on Centre Plan Phase 1 to be presented and discussed at the CDAC committee in May, we will be at a major disadvantage. The same holds true for The final report containing land use policy and design standards which will be tabled before the CDAC and Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committees in July, and new policy and land use bylaw amendments for Centre Plan Phase 1 which will be tabled with Regional Council in August</li> </ul>
6.12.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please advise me where I can find the survey you ask us to take</li> </ul>
6.12.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speed at which these amendments are being advanced is disturbing</li> <li>To be expected to make any informed decision under these time frames is unacceptable</li> </ul>
6.12.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While some additional meetings may be warranted, any significant delay would further accelerate the shift of our population to the suburban areas of the Municipality.</li> <li>we dont expect the Municipality to reduce the requirement for good design on new projects and in fact would encourage a design review process that ensure only high quality projects proceed</li> </ul>
6.12.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposed by-law changes would have the effect of moving more development to suburban</li> <li>How is this increasing density?</li> <li>Proper consideration cannot be given to such drastic changes in such a short period of time without in depth consultation with those who have experience in this area - the architects and developers, and those who live in the area</li> </ul>
6.12.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I have grown concerned for the amount of dissent but moreover I'm astonished by the mass miss-understanding.</li> <li>While height is of significant importance the focus on density exclusively detracts from the other guiding principles that shape a healthy, connected and functional city.</li> <li>The principles behind Centre Plan's strategic development are aligned with my personal vision of and aspirations for Halifax</li> </ul>
6.12.11	<p>The web site asks residents a number of questions about the character of Quinpool Road and how we would like to see it develop. The following is in part an attempt to assist you in this process. But as the officials present at the meeting, May 7, at St Vincent's Nursing Home will have noted, we, the residents, question whether a plan that provides a 71-meter height allowance at the Quinpool-Windsor-Robie intersection is likely to achieve any of its other laudable objectives. 1. Think about a street that you like anywhere in the world. What is it about it that makes it great? Roncesvalles Avenue in the Parkdale section of Toronto has emerged in the past 2-3 years as an attractive example of urban planning. It is an important local corridor and planners have achieved a good balance between public transit and the needs of automobiles. 2. Take a look at the proposed building model. Understanding that this is a corridor intended for densification, does this massing and scale fit well with the neighbourhood? Do the setbacks and transitions respect adjacent properties? Quinpool Road has much greater strategic importance for Halifax than does Roncesvalles for westend Toronto. However, should the corridor plan achieve the kind of low to mid rise development that is envisioned along much of its length, it is possible that the street would retain some of the same sense of neighbourhood that the Roncesvalles planners aimed for. The question is whether it is possible to combine such development with Quinpool's function as a main traffic route. 3. Think about Quinpool Road and its surrounding neighbourhood. What do you like about it and what should we protect and enhance? What other design qualities should be considered the mixed commercial/ institution/residential uses along Quinpool Road are vital to its character. Denser residential development would surely benefit the survival of the various locally-owned businesses which are an attractive part of the mix. 4. Do you have any other comments? Yes! The plan as presented to local residents would undoubtedly attract proposals for ultra-high density development for the St Patrick's High site at Windsor and Quinpool, and the Lindsay funeral site on Robie Street. Given the sale value of land zoned for high-rise or tower construction and the potential tax revenue, such proposals will (or would) be highly attractive to HRM Council. For precisely this reason, the proposed rezoning represents an enormous gamble. It will focus the attention of our present "development community" on making the most of a rare opportunity to go big and capitalize on the expected demand for residential housing in the centre of the city. The impact on the surrounding neighbourhood and further along Quinpool cannot be predicted with great confidence.</p>
6.12.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>do not believe that the proposed amendments will 'protect' their property at all.</li> <li>there should be related neighbourhood protective measures put into place.</li> <li>A further concern is the protection of the Commons lands from high development at their boundaries.</li> </ul>
6.12.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were concerns raised about possible detrimental heritage building encroachments. Although some of the concerns expressed may have some merit, it basically sounded a lot like a "NIMBY" initiative.</li> <li>A process is already established to make a case for the heritage issues that were raised, and that process should be followed by those who wish to further heritage protection initiatives</li> </ul>

	<p>6.12.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There hasn't been a new large project since Quinpool Centre circa 1977!!! 35 years. This is, in my opinion, unacceptable.</li> <li>• I urge the people who are the decision makers to stay true to the original design and think about the next three generations on the way in rather than the next three generations on the way out.</li> <li>• the HRM by Design plan should not be re-worked to his or her whims and wishes, instead that one person or few people should adapt to the majority</li> </ul>
	<p>6.12.15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When I went to the city planner on April 10th 2012 I submitted my massing with all the info required, he told me that they would try to include my site.</li> <li>• My site is bigger than all the sites on spring garden but it seems to be left with the worst allowable height.</li> <li>• I request that my land be allowed the same benefits as the Spring Garden road area. I am totally against this plan as it now sits and will not just accept it.</li> </ul>
	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the plan be protected?</li> <li>• There is not enough information to judge, give feedback on prior to the CEDAC meeting. Will we get a chance to look at this document again before than? How do we know if you are interpreting our feedback correctly if we do not a get a chance to see the document prior to CEDAC?</li> <li>• I do not believe the notion of allowing development without public opportunity should be fast tracked. Too many bad ideas or clear-cutting of lots has gone on. With the Urban Forest Master Plan at hand, tree retention bylaws need to be considered.</li> </ul>

THEME 7: OTHER	
CORRIDOR	COMMENT
1. Pleasant Street	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My only hope is that residents will be able to flaunt the plan just like developers can.</li> <li>• I wish there were a way to jump start a development of the street without waiting for one big developer to come along.</li> <li>• Density may be more achievable than vibrancy</li> <li>• Connections between street &amp; neighbourhood need to be articulated</li> </ul>
2. Portland Street	No Comments
3. Green Village Lane	No Comments
4. Grahams Grove	No Comments
5. Windmill Rd.	No Comments
6. Wyse Rd.	<p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the car dealership area, I'd like to see HRM take initiative and negotiate with existing owners and sell Master Plan to developers (buy land from existing owners). If not, not enough change will happen. congested area.</li> </ul>
7. Agricola Street	<p>7.7.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I also have grave concerns about lovely historic buildings that are not being included for consideration.</li> <li>• This is simply not appropriate for a historic city</li> </ul>
8. Gottingen Street	<p>7.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connor Architects and Planners Limited (CAP) are writing to you on behalf of NS Housing Development Corp (client) to comment on the Gottingen Street Corridor as defined in the Centre Plan and its application to future projects intended for development in the very near future by our client. Although no formal Development Application has been made, recent discussions and meetings have been held between our client and HRM. CAP has reviewed the Gottingen Street Corridor as described in the Centre Plan and offer the following comments:</li> <li>• Three sites are proposed for development: Sunrise Manor (PID 00148809), Gordon B. Isnor Manor (PID 00155796) and one other associated property. The client also owns property at North and Gottingen. On behalf of our client, CAP proposes that the Gottingen Street Corridor be extended to include these properties, and that further consideration be given to height at the North Street end of the Corridor not unlike Cogswell Street. CAP also suggests that the Corridor be extended through to North Street.</li> <li>• The form and density envisaged by the clients projects will need more than the 5-6 stories as relates to the Sunrise property and the 10 stories as relates to the Gordon B. Isnor property. Concepts to date relate in height to the existing buildings on these sites.</li> <li>• The proposed projects will be mixed market and include unit sizes much smaller than those present in the market today and also include mixed use to accommodate other departments of the provincial government as well as retail and office spaces and will provide entry level housing solutions to first time home owners.</li> <li>• The client is to be the developer of record and will stay as the owners in some capacity. The Regional Plan will have a significant influence on future urban housing development. We respectfully request a special meeting at your earlier convenience to provide further input as part of the review process</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re: mid/high rise buildings, all telephone and electrical lines should be buried. If nothing else to allow fire trucks access, otherwise they have to be outside all lines on poles.</li> </ul>

9. Spring Garden Rd.	<p>7.9.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a condominium owner on Spring Garden , I pay &gt; \$2200/year for 1000 sq ft home. My complex houses 160 units, similar to mine, ... so huge taxpaying contributors to HRM.</li> <li>as an apartment dweller, Consideration to loss of light/sun/ shadow plans is VERY important to me. And I'm sure for any other owner of a home on this peninsula</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If developers say cost is a problem, why doesn't the province provide elevators for free, rather than having horizontal roads, have vertical ones.</li> <li>Fix taxation system – cost per unit of service, not inflated property values. That will be an incentive for more sustainable development.</li> <li>Government should have government sites/buildings sold through different processing to allow for more money to the government for infrastructure of the streets and improvement of areas.</li> </ul>
10. Quinpool Rd.	<p>7.10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sunlight penetration - we would like to know the impacts of the proposed 12 storey height maximum on the Canadian Tire property on Yale Street properties (both sides), particularly in the AM during both summer and winter months. Also, the impact of the proposed 6 storey height maximum for Quinpool Road on Yale Street properties (both sides), particularly in winter months.</li> </ul> <p>Comments Collected from Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the timeline for infrastructure improvements for SGR/Quinpool?</li> <li>Taxes being so high for existing buildings prohibits property owners from investing in the streetscapes</li> <li>Please don't rush the process, once it's in place and buildings are approved, it's too late.</li> <li>I think the bigger challenge is on the back where residential neighbourhoods are affected.</li> <li>Maintain the mature trees on Yale Street</li> </ul>
11. Young Street	<p>7.11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am writing to express my concern on 3 specific aspects of the Zoning and Plan amendment changes for the Centre Plan Corridor of Young/Robie/North/ Almon/Windsor St areas. Overall Let me fist say that in the language of the community feedback/input sessions I attended, I am "Amber" (proceed with plan providing specific changes are made).</li> <li>Specific Change # 1 One of the fundamental elements of the new Centre Plan proposal is the concept of "Density Bonusing". In reviewing the Center Plan at the community meetings HRM Staff described "Density Bonusing" as the ability of HRM staff to negotiate with any developer in order to allow the developer to maximize the new height and density rules. It is my understanding that the permission to do Density Bonusing must come from the Province of Nova Scotia. It is also my understanding that Density Bonusing is not connected formally with any aspect of the new Centre Plan proposal. The result is that, unfortunately, the Centre Plan proposal can be approved without Density Bonusing being part of the fabric of plan. To me this is a core "lynch-pin" of the Center Plan and an element that must be included in the Center Plan prior to the plan's approval.</li> <li>Specific Change # 2 The core principle of the new Center Plan for the Young Street and Robie Street Corridor is premised on encouraging a vibrant retail in this area with the goal of creating a strong robust pedestrian focused area. The intersection at the corner of Bayers Road and Young Street is huge hurtle to this goal. Changes made to this intersection made over 3 years ago has undoubtedly made vehicle commuting traffic onto the peninsula streamlined. However, and it is a big however, the same intersection changes have effectively made this intersection a BARRIER for all residents living in the residential area bordered by Windsor / Bayers /Connaught/ Almon.</li> <li>Specific Change #3 Given that the west of side Windsor Street is a core residential area I strongly believe the proposed building height of 29 meters /8 storeys is too high. How the existing residents feel and react to the Center Plan will be largely influenced by how the Center Plan transitions from the current residential areas to the new area of development . There are two options for a change to the plan would solve this: 1. Reduce the height to a maximum of 22 meters/6 storeys for the east side (Halifax Forum area) of Windsor Street. 2. Reduce the "Streetwall" height to 11.5 meters/ 3 storeys for the east side (Halifax Forum area) of Windsor Street.</li> </ul>
12. General	<p>7.12.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am very glad this planning is underway</li> <li>the very best thing we could do for ourselves would be to bury the overhead wires.</li> </ul> <p>7.12.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the major elements that make most historic and even contemporary cities interesting is the differentiation in building typologies.</li> <li>Lets mandate a maximum facade width and promote rhythm and density in business activity on the street.</li> </ul> <p>7.12.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recreation opportunities needs to be reviewed for this area.</li> <li>Meeting spaces are not avaiable for non-profit groups at low or no cost. This discourages folks if all energies are put towards survival...suatainability is important</li> </ul>



	<p>7.12.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district I live in has been pretty well clear cut by all developers and there is nothing left of a natural sense except in a couple of parks! Many have 'put up a parking lot' in place of the former forests! And any plantings by the HRM Horticultural team has disappeared in recent years. The community might want to plant a few flowers if there were designated sites... we met with the councillor, and then a parkland planner several years ago but it seems they closed the door on any possible ideas for a community garden.</li> <li>There are definite ideas for planning for a healthy community. The built environment planning guidelines and protocols are important to review and share these in context of the RP+5.</li> <li>HRM may not have any new schools coming in the near future but going forward, this will be an important goal to keep in mind for new development and neighbourhoods</li> </ul>
	<p>7.12.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We plead that you let all the relevant multi-disciplinary staff of the RP+5 project (and its several advisers/consultants) aware that our formal submission to the present strategy is on our web site with the title of "Formal <a href="http://lakes.chebucto.org/HRM/SUBMISSIONS/RP/2012/RP+5_Submission1.html">http://lakes.chebucto.org/HRM/SUBMISSIONS/RP/2012/RP+5_Submission1.html</a>&gt; submission to the RP+5 initiative of the HRM</li> </ul>
	<p>7.12.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a number of things I would like to support in this Plan eg. the attempt to bring more people to live on the peninsula, the talk of high standards of design and beautification of streetscapes, the connection to HRM by Design, and the talk of improving transit and supporting healthy lifestyles in a vibrant urban space.</li> </ul>
	<p>7.12.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am a real estate broker with an MBA, an understanding of re-development, commercial projects, and the economic factors surrounding redevelopment. The state of this city strongly disappoints me! Every research paper and scientific study I have ever read has supported the concept that a city with a strong downtown is a healthy, wealthy city. [...] Healthy, strong cities have seen development in the downtown core. [...] Halifax on the other hand is slowly fading away. We have not invested in our downtown, in fact our city council is doing it's very best to strip the downtown bare. There is a small, vocal minority that is screaming loudly to be heard. They would like things to remain as they were in their childhood. However, the vast majority of our population is interested in having a strong economy. Yes, the choice is between a strong economy and a vocal minority! Unfortunately the vocal minority has been winning! If you want to hear the voices of the silent, strong economy supporters, you just have to look at the flow of people leaving to find work. The flow of investment money to other cities. The flow of strong stable companies to other cities. We have only been able to attract low wage subsidized jobs that leave as soon as the subsidy ends. I will concede the fight for development in the view planes. Right or wrong I don't think any politician will ever step up and do anything reasonable there (yet somehow skye has been approved??). If we are not going to allow any development in the downtown where are we going to allow it? I have seen the list of "approved" developments, and I have heard the argument that it's the developers fault for not building. I would like to point out that all of those developments are very, very minor in scale compared to what healthy cities have experienced. I would also like to point out that in most cases those developers were put through years and years of red tape to get approval for these minor projects. This is not an acceptable practice if we want Halifax and Nova Scotia to have strong economies</li> </ul>