

# Attachment 1 – Centre Plan Phase 1 Written Submissions

## II. Web Submission Feedback

### a. Process

#### General comments/questions:

1. From the 30 April session, you advised that you are requesting legislative change to permit the Centre Plan development control process to use Site Plan review. How is it that the Site Plan process can be used in the Downtown Halifax district but not in the new Corridor intensification areas?
2. 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. 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 !!
3. 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? 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. I could have written a letter or email protesting the threat of yet more tall buildings. I'm sure you will receive a few of them. But at least I am taking the time to tell you why I am not even bothering to write a NIMBY letter. "You" focus on plans on paper, but what "we" see being built--or not built--seems to have little relationship to the philosophy stated at HRM Open Houses and information meetings.

4. Another aspect of The Centre Plan that is troublesome is that 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 bypassing and overriding public input. 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. Surprising the public with news of a new building (massive or not) is a way to cause anger and upset. In almost all of the eleven areas proposed, 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.
  
5. Like every Nova Scotian, I really hope the Ships program will bring us new people and economic development. And I am willing to believe that 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. However 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.
  
6. I recommend that the public engagement presentations make a better effort to "manage the fear", and be customized to address local concerns wherever possible. Believe me when I say that residents around Oyster Pond will only want to know why the Centre Plan has any meaning for them, and they will expect to be told what the RP+5 revised document will do to make their lives better, and their communities more sustainable. 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&A period more productive. Many in the public seem to embrace too much fear, and do not use enough logic to see that many of their concerns are due to a lack of understanding (or an unwillingness to understand) why densification is necessary, and that building low is not always the only way to go... especially if densification goals will not be met.

7. We are disappointed that we were not made aware of your zoning meeting held on May 2nd, 2012. As property owners in the area my wife and I have concerns about who is and what is being planned for our neighbourhood. Who's responsibility was and is it to inform affected residents HRM or Halifax by Design? 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?
8. When will this be presented to the committee? I want to be present.
9. 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:
  - a) 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
  - b) new policy and land use bylaw amendments for Centre Plan Phase 1 which will be tabled with Regional Council in August.
10. I write to express my concern about the nature of the public consultation process for the HRMbyDesign Centre Plan. At the April 30th public meeting held on HRMbyDesign-Centre plan at the Hotel Atlantica Andy Fillmore's 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. 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. Perhaps the fact that Mr. Fillmore, the lead person for the HRMbyDesign process was unable to adequately prepare his power point presentation so that it included maps, is illustrative of how the process is simply too rapid.

11. Please advise me where I can find the survey you ask us to take - all I get is an update on what your plans are but the responses to my and other resident's questions have been ignored or glossed over except for developers who don't live in the area I thought the survey you offer would give me a chance to have some input but I can't seem to find it - only heaps of information of what the planners propose whether I like them or not.
12. The speed at which these amendments are being advanced is disturbing. I was informed by HRM planners on Monday May 7, 2012 that the idea for fast tracked corridor amendments was brought forth in late February 2012. One can assume that it was March when approvals were secured and the process even began. To expect citizens to have comments on the proposal by May 15<sup>th</sup> is unreasonable. People may have been away from their homes for extended periods of time and not received any notice. Considering that many of us participated in the downtown HRM by Design process and thought that the Centre Plan was to be a three year planning process, the corridor process is difficult to accept. I fully appreciate the development pressures on the peninsula. I understand that over the next decade there will be impacts from the ship building contract that we as a municipality will need to assess, but to date, I have not received information from HRM regarding statistics, the development potential of vacant lands (one wonders what happened with plans for the Cogswell interchange??), the unrealized potential of current development zones etc. To be expected to make any informed decision under these time frames is unacceptable.
13. Individual submission by Michael Cuvelier can be found in the Appendix.

Corridor Specific comments:

Graham's Grove

14. The current RP+5 proposal for Grahams Corner indicates a large unconsolidated block for high rise high density development. There is a lack of clarity as to the maximum built form that is permitted under existing small lot configurations. 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. HRM invested in the public consultation models and graphs. 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. What is currently proposed seems a knee jerk reaction for intense densification for the urban core. 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.

15. What is also of concern within the details is the effect of the Developers' meeting input. The effect of any closed door discussions on this very public process requires a review of inputs/changes from the April 2nd meeting. I commend David Lane for an excellent presentation of some extremely complex principles and ideas to a diverse audience on the April 30th meeting. There are a few points lacking from that evening's presentation that are required to tie the integrity of the April 30th meeting into the goodwill generated by the April 2nd proposals. On April 2nd, there were excellent visual diagrams to impress the public with the proposed impact for Grahams Grove under RP+5. There were a series of diagrams at the April 30th meeting as well, but what would be most helpful is a street view representation along Prince Albert Road from Glenwood to Bartlin Road detailing the maximum built form for the streetscape. 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.
16. As residents of the area for over 45 years while living first on Glenwood Ave. and now on Lorne Ave. we have witnessed all of the changes to the Grahams Cove/Paddlers Cove area throughout that period. Based on the history we have observed, and our sense that planning for the future of the area should be very well and comprehensively thought out.

#### Spring Garden Rd

17. My wife and I went to a public meeting tonight regarding development in Halifax at the Atlantica. The nature of public meetings is really coming apart at the seams. People go to a lot of trouble to go to these things. Tonight they were told that the actual "public meeting" part of the public meeting would be limited to 30 minutes (they put a six foot count-down clock up on the display) and the discussion would be limited to the size and shape of new block

developments. Needless to say only a very few people had ideas or comments that fit neatly into that VERY narrow agenda. 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. 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.

Quinpool Rd.

18. 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.

## **b. Land Use**

General comments/questions:

19. I am concerned residents on Shirley Street weren't aware that their properties were included in the re-zoning; would like to request a meeting with a few of them and some HRM Staff.

Corridor Specific comments:

Portland St.

20. I am reviewing your new proposed height maps for the Wyse Rd Area of Dartmouth and I like what I see as far as heights go. At the first meeting I had asked why the Dartmouth Sportsplex location was not included and I never got a response. 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. If the ScotiaBank was allowed to build on the corner I do not see why other parts of the property could not be developed. I also feel it is important to include the lots that are now filled with low income housing along Nova Crst and Demetreous Lane. This area is currently very segregated and it is not fair to the residents to totally cut them out of this plan. It is an area that should be looked at carefully so that we do not end up with

unattractive low income housing such as is there now. It is important to integrate these types of units to create a mix of uses, and economic levels to create a complete community. I truly believe it was a broad oversight to not include these lands.

#### Windmill Rd

21. The presentations for HRM by design state the objective of planners to increase the population density in the central core and hence include strategies for high buildings and towers. There is frequent discussion about these high buildings and much public concern about the suitability of towers in central HRM. I am uncertain whether these tall buildings are a requirement essential to achieve the higher density or are included in the HRM plan to accommodate the requests of developers to construct these apparently very profitable structures. 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). What are the design goals for population density? How does this compare to central population densities in cities similar to Halifax? How may these densities be achieved? What are the alternatives? Why are alternatives not presented at the discussion meetings?
  
22. I attended the HRM by Design session at the Dartmouth Sportsplex last week and have a question about existing privately owned green spaces within the proposed corridor area (specifically, the Killam-owned Victoria Gardens land bounded by Boland, Victoria Road, Demetreous Lane and Nova Court, and Green Road). I would estimate that the built footprint at present makes up about 20 to 30 per cent of that property. My question is: 1. Under proposed zoning, how much of that green space (if any) would the city require a developer to preserve?

#### Spring Garden Rd

23. 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.

#### Quinpool Rd

24. I am a resident of Lawrence street (with my wife and two small children). While I am not directly affected by the change in height restrictions and would suggest I am close enough to have a stake in the changes. With regard to the zoning changes, I fully support relaxing the height restrictions so that 20 stories are allowed at Quinpool and Robie, 12 stories in and around Canadian Tire, etc. Quinpool Rd has the opportunity of becoming much more than it is and the increased density of quality housing and further commercial development will greatly increase the neighbourhood feel and vibrancy. There are many rental flats in this area that are in poor repair and which serve as a gathering point for persons not aligned with our community values. High density quality housing will go a long way in bringing community minded residents to the area. In any event something has to be done with the former St Pat's site as it has been an eye sore for some time and blight on the street scape of Quinpool Rd.
25. 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.
26. Having lived in this vibrant community on the corner of Windsor/Welsford for over 25 years we have witnessed it grow into a very exciting area of the peninsula. [...] while we are excited about the possibility of continued growth in our neighbourhood, we are hopeful that it proceed in a manner that protects and cultivates this unique area of Halifax. In summary, we urge the following to be considered: -maintaining low-rise streetscape along the Western portion of Quinpool with a maximum height of 4-5 stories. As you move East toward Robie and North on Robie consideration should be given to a more gradual increase to a mid-rise streetscape with a 10/11 storey maximum at Robie. Throughout the corridor, by-laws should require designs to 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. -as our neighbors have expressed, 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. We appreciate the forum to express our views on these issues and look forward to working with the HRM staff in building a community we can be proud of.
27. We are writing with reference to the proposed changes to the zoning for Quinpool Corridor, as owners of (...) Parker Street, we are of course primarily concerned with the future development of the Cruikshanks Funeral Home, the Armco corner of Robie and Quinpool and St Pats High School. Of the eight



houses on Parker Street, only three are high occupancy rental units. The impression given at the meeting that the opinions of the residents of Parker Street were of no relevance was somewhat concerning! We are concerned with the "fast tracked amendment process". We did not feel that this was fully explained at the meeting. It is our understanding that by October, whatever height allowances are decided upon will be final. This leads directly to our grave concerns regarding the proposed height allowances for this area. It was obvious at the meeting that the consensus of opinion was against any 20 storey building in the proposed locations. Should they be allowed, those of us on Parker Street in particular, stand the risk of living in a "dark zone", being surrounded on three sides by tower blocks. And so to our last concern regarding increased traffic, potential parking and vehicle access in particular. Surely it is not possible that vehicle access to a new residential development, whatever the height, would be permitted onto Robie Street.

#### Young & Robie

28. Just a quick note to say that I am very much in favour of the proposed changes to regulations in the Centreplan, and more specifically the Young/Robie Corridor area. Anything that can be done to increase both the density and the design standards in the community will help what now looks more like a commercial wasteland with no real contribution to the feeling of a neighbourhood.

### **c. Economic Development**

#### General comments/questions:

29. I write to you as a real estate consultant with 25 years experience, a member of several nonprofit Boards (Housing Trust of NS and North End Business Association), a real estate investor and developer, and as a concerned citizen who loves his city. I am hearing some talk of the need to slow down the planning process for Centre Plan. 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. I urge you to keep the planning process for the Centre Plan on schedule. If additional meetings are required in order to allow residents more time to understand the rules, then host additional meetings. As well, 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 ensures only high quality projects proceed.

30. Following the recent RPP+5 processes and an outline of potential regulatory controls we have carried out an assessment on how these impact potential projects for our client Killam. Obviously when controls are established it is often in the context of assuming a certain environment in which we seek to mitigate a potential negative impact on an adjoining property. However, in the real world each site has different characteristics and circumstances upon which the intent of the controls may not be required or the impact is mitigated by site circumstances. If there is not the ability for the developer to demonstrate why the controls are not appropriate to the site then there is a significant risk of lost opportunity to the greater goal that we seek in creating density in our downtown core. It is therefore critical that the setback controls from adjoining boundaries are established as a baseline only with a clear outline in the objectives section of the plan as to their purpose. 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)). In our opinion this could be achieved through the use of the variance approach supported by clear criteria upon which the assessment of the variance would be measured against. This approach recognises that not all sites are the same and there may be circumstances in which the intent of the setback control is not applicable or that a reduction is justified.
31. 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 its 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!

32. New developments often cause an increase in property assessments for existing properties close to a new development location. 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. This should be detailed in the revised RP+5 solution document.
  
33. People seemed to be confused or unwilling to accept that there is an order to things if you want to derive social benefit from real estate development and an increase in population density. There are very few examples where<sup>3</sup>affordable housing<sup>2</sup> provides the financial incentive necessary for a developer to invest in their construction. This is particularly true in the more desirable areas of the city where high land costs provide a literally expensive foundation to build on. 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. The bottom line is that nothing will get built if there is not an acceptable return for the developer and in an acceptable timeframe. Without the developers<sup>1</sup> interest what a community is left with is aging and probably deteriorating buildings in a neglected community.
  
34. It seems that the general consensus of developers and architects in HRM is that the proposed by-law changes would have the effect of moving more development to suburban areas and I've heard that they have expressed these concerns to HRM but their opinions have not been considered. Let me give

you an example, on one lot in this area, under the present by-laws, a 5-story, 40-unit residential development can be built (and this would be an attractive building with landscaping, etc.) Under the proposed by-law changes, only a 3-story building could be built with significantly less units. How is this increasing density? Proper consideration can not 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.

35. I am a PhD student at Saint Mary's University, a peninsula homeowner, and business owner. I have a vested interest in the continued growth and development of our neighborhoods. I am writing you today because (after a great deal of reading) I would like to voice my support for the Halifax Centre Plan amendments. I think they are an important first step towards creating vibrant community corridors that offer what neighborhoods need, Hopefully this will help us along the path to increasing urban density, improving affordable housing options on the peninsula, and decreasing needless traffic. Further, 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. The centre plan is a great vision for Halifax and I look forward to seeing the results.

Corridor Specific comments:

Young & Robie

36. 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.

Gottingen St.

37. As a business owner on the 2000 block of Gottingen Street I am of course interested in what developers will be permitted to build in my area, and indeed in the north end as a whole. 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. Should our block become overly built up I expect increasing pressures on our day to day operations, trucks coming and going, brewing "aroma" etc. I intend to keep producing here for as long as possible. I believe we are an asset to the area both as an employer and also as a retailer of made on premise craft beer, a product that is increasingly in demand in these days of "buy and support local". I don't know what is envisioned for this particular area, but 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. We are a commercial brewery, albeit small, and this does not always mesh with high density neighbourhoods.
38. 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:
- 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.

- 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.

#### **d. Community Design (walkability, complete streets etc)**

##### General comments/questions:

39. Just reviewing the Phase 2 design and wanted to comment on Principal #5, A Connected Downtown. There is an annual award given to the US city with the best downtown. You are probably aware of it. One of the key components for a "northern" city that won a few years back was how they connected all the buildings in the downtown core with pedways, similar to the pedways that connect Purdy's Wharf towers. Especially appreciated during cold, wet weather, it was also appreciated for the speed of getting around (no traffic lights), the cleanliness and the security. Please consider requiring some form of pedway connector option be included in the design of any new buildings erected in the downtown core. IMO, it would increase the value of the building from an office rental point of view and therefore meet with little resistance from the developers. Thanks for listening.
  
40. I have attended some of the public meetings to discuss the proposals of The Centre Plan and frankly I find the proposals very upsetting. Although there are a myriad of details in the proposals, I wish to be brief here. By raising the permitted heights in areas such as Gottingen/Falkland/Cornwallis Sts., Spring Garden Rd./Carleton /Summer Sts., Quinpool Rd. as well as the other eight areas in question the existing and unique fabrics of these neighbourhoods is adversely impacted. Affordable housing already exists in these areas in what are mostly two or three storey buildings. But 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. Perhaps to the suburban areas thereby defeating the desire to limit sprawl and increase density. The other point that comes to mind here is that a raising of permitted heights endangers existing heritage buildings or non-registered historic ones. I find that

when I read, on your website and in the material available at the public meetings, terms such as "street wall" and "step-back" it give a feel of very confining space.

41. 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.
42. Open spaces for recreation, and adequate parking arrangements MUST be detailed in any new development plan prior to a building permit being granted. 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.
43. 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.
44. 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. I have followed the debate and can confirm that you have listened to and have integrated the feedback from the public, design professionals and development industry. This is particularly obvious when comparing the Phase 1 and Phase 2 plans posted on HRM's website. As a property owner living adjacent to another arterial road (I live on Seaforth, north of North), I must also admit that I got some NIMBY jitters when seeing the first plans for the through-lots on Quinpool Road. I am now very pleased to see, that Phase 2 makes a clear building height distinction between the lots facing Quinpool and the lots facing adjacent residential streets (i.e. the removal of the "wedding cake"). However, given that residents on the south side of Pepperell and north side of Yale Street do make a concession by allowing 4 storey residential buildings across from their properties, 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.

45. I have attended all of the meeting thus far regarding this issue and now submit the following for inclusion. I own two properties in Dartmouth both are single family dwellings and have concerns. One I would like to return to as a permanent family home. I am 37 years old and my wife is 35 we have to young children. Building high rises to encourage people to relocate to the urban core is not the answer when HRM developers are targeting seniors who have left the workforce. 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. We want our children to go to school in close proximity to where we work.

Corridor Specific comments:

Portland St.

46. I live in the neighborhood of Portland Street in the area where the development of 8 story apartment buildings are being considered for construction. 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 trumps what the general public wants. That being said if something is going to be built 8 stories is too high! 3-4 story developments would be more appropriate in that area as there are homes directly behind it. We do not want 8 story buildings in that part of our neighborhood.

Wyse Rd.

47. Building heights in the other Dartmouth corridor areas under HRM by Design would be a maximum of eight storeys (10 on one section of Windmill that has little nearby residential development). Wyse Road, which is surrounded by residential areas, should not be singled out for towers and highrises. 4. Wyse Road is now open, sunny and (except for the traffic!) safe. 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. 5. We live in a great neighbourhood in many ways but social problems and crime are concerns (e.g., the recent tire slashings in the Cairn Street area.) 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. 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.

48. 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. I hope you will give serious thought to altering the current plans for Wyse Road. We need well planned mixed-use development on an appropriate scale to enhance, rather than detract from, our area.

#### Quinpool Rd

49. I would like to thank you for the presentation you made recently regarding the design plans for Quinpool Road. I live on Allan Street, so know the area very well. I was generally pleased with the plan, but more pleased that there is a plan. My hope is that it will be adhered to. I know that during and after the event, there was much discussion with regards to the effect that densification will have on traffic. My hope is that when people, such as we did, elect to move into the core, we also elected to reduce the amount of driving we do. I walk to work, to the local shops and to entertainment. That is why I moved back into town. My plea is that urban transportation is not only considered, but made a condition to densification. If we improve public transportation links - walking, biking, bus etc., then leaving vehicles parked, or better, not required will become the norm.
50. Regarding the proposed plan and zoning changes to the Quinpool Road/ Yale street area, we offer the following comments:  
 Maintain the street closure (barricade) of Yale Street at Monastery Lane.  
 Support the proposal of townhouse style development on Yale Street.  
 Maintain the mature trees on Yale Street.
51. I am a long time resident of the south side of Yale St. and have enjoyed living in the friendly neighborhood. After attending three meetings re the proposed changes for Yale St. I have several comments: 1. the proposal for town house style/single resident unit is positive. 2 .end of street closure -- to encourage young families and seniors a to live on Yale St. it is most important that the barricade remain in place. To open the street would result in more traffic from

Quinpool Rd. and the Quinpool Centre. 3. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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?

54. I want to begin by talking about the qualities of the Quinpool corridor that I think we should be working to preserve. The commercial stretch of Quinpool serves as a "downtown" for the surrounding neighbourhoods. Residents are able to shop for groceries, buy clothing, sporting goods and hardware, go to restaurants, see a movie, exercise in a green space, visit doctors and other service specialists, have their car fixed, their clothes cleaned and much more, all within easy walking distance of their homes. Having reviewed proposed changes to land use By-Laws for the Quinpool Corridor, I believe these proposals will destroy the very qualities that make this such a successful neighbourhood. One of my primary concerns relates to proposed height allowances along Quinpool, particularly just West of Robie and on Robie North of Quinpool. Allowing more high-rise buildings all along Quinpool just because we made the mistake of allowing the earlier ones, will only create more "dead spaces." I understand the need to increase density on the peninsula, but I question the high-rise strategy that is being put forth by the planning department. Halifax is not alone in trying to encourage density in its downtown. Even the City of Toronto is working on the development of a strategy to "reurbanize" its arterial corridors, such as St. Clair, Avenue Rd and Danforth Avenue. However, other jurisdictions have recognized that high-rise development can have the opposite of the desired effect, by killing surrounding neighbourhoods. In recognition of this fact and in response to the need to ensure development is compatible with the adjacent neighbourhoods, the City of Toronto is pursuing a strategy that encourages appropriately scaled and designed mid-rise buildings along its arterial corridors. Halifax would do well to follow this example.

55. If we are trying to encourage people to stop moving to the suburbs and live downtown, I don't think this is the way to do it. I would imagine that a large portion of those moving to the suburbs are families who cannot afford to buy houses downtown or who do not want to raise their children in condos or apartments. 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. What is more likely to happen is older, wealthier residents who are looking to downsize from downtown houses to condos will be the ones who move into these new buildings.

### **e. Neighbourhood Protection**

#### General comments/questions:

56. I attended 3 of the second round RP+5 - HRM By Design/Centre Plan public engagements, and I found that I supported some, but not all of a few reoccurring concerns brought forward by many of the public participants. 1. Building heights for most streetscapes were criticized as being too high, it did not matter that the heights were clearly identified a "maximum" allowed heights... this means to me that HRM Staff are going to have to do a much better job of "managing fear". You have to have a better idea about what will be acceptable from the public's perspective for a given location. That does not mean that in some cases the highest streetscape heights that are proposed are out of the question, but 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 like. Or find some real world examples, and provide photos & location data to show how it does work for some existing location. It seemed that many of the public attendees believed that the maximum height would be the logical height for any developer chose for any new development initiative, and that lower heights were not an option any developer would ever consider

57. 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 <http://lakes.chebucto.org/HRM/>

[SUBMISSIONS/RP/2012/RP+5\\_Submission1.html](#)> submission to the RP+5 initiative of the HRM”.

Corridor Specific comments:

Graham’s Grove

58. Graham's Corner is an old Dartmouth neighbourhood. It's an important piece of the fabric of neighbourhoods that surround Lake Banook. There is a nice mix of single family residential, low rise multi units and an under developed local commercial strip. The scale of this lake side community is family friendly and welcoming. It is an important piece of the Lake Banook landscape. Lake Banook is a national and international showpiece for HRM. Planning for Graham's Corner needs to be well crafted to build on the characteristics of the area, and service the needs of residents and visitors to our renowned paddling community. 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.

59. I have lived on Victoria Park for over 20 years. I still own a house there and recently moved to Graham St. When I first moved to John St, with the help of Councillor Pye and Dartmouth Police, it took our community group 3 years to turn our neighbourhood around from the dangerous state it was in to an area where residents could feel safe to enjoy the extensive upgrades to the park at virtually anytime of the day or night. Even with the significant improvements we succeeded in making I still feel that the neighbourhood is fragile, and that it could easily revert to the previous condition. We currently have an abundance of rental properties in our district, which I believe far outweighs any other area in Dartmouth from a density perspective. 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. 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.

Wyse Rd.

60. I'm writing to say I am apposed to the Plans for the proposed Built Form and Land Use for the Wyse Road corridor in Dartmouth which are currently being considered for rezoning. Of the six Dartmouth corridors where zoning changes

are proposed, this is the only one with Towers / Highrises. I understand, when asked why only our area was to be zoned for high buildings, city staff said a Halifax by Design focus group thought it would look good to have highrises at the entrance to the bridge! Give me a break!! I do not want to feel like I'm in downtown Halifax. Keep your highrises there. You've already ruined that site line. I live in a great neighbourhood, but social problems and crime are an issue here already. We have enough high rise and low income housing in our area and construction of new ones could increase these problems in our neighbourhood. Low-income highrises and low-income housing in general are associated with higher crime rates. There is already an element of undesirables living amongst us. As it stands now, I do not feel safe walking in my neighborhood in the evenings or after dark. Low cost housing as well as commercial tower areas emptying out at night leave pedestrians exposed and vulnerable.

61. Petition against Wyse Development: "We, the undersigned, petition the Community Design Advisory Committee of Halifax Regional Municipality as follows: 1. Because of the traffic, wind, shade and the proximity to residential areas, 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—matching what the municipality is proposing in most of the other five Dartmouth corridors—and to six storeys north of Boland Road. 2. Because the Killam-owned Victoria Gardens on 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 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012".
62. Despite this area's problems, many of us are trying to keep the neighbourhood feeling, that visitors frequently remark about. Large scale developments such as high rises, would not be helpful. More middle-class residents would help, living in low rise dwellings such as townhouses and single family dwellings. I realize that developers like to get more bang for their buck, however chances are that they won't be living here. We will have to pay the price for poorly planned development. Surely, more imaginative planning could make the developers and the Wyse Road area residents happy.
63. I just received information from my neighbour stating that the zoning in my area ie Boland Rd and Wyse rd is slated for rezoning to allow high rise buildings up to 24 stories. I am sadly disappointed that this may be happening in my area.

The north end of Dartmouth is just starting to get a revitalization of its community and reputation. I had hoped as many residents did, that with the addition of the new multi use building on the end of Boland that the community and city would adopt a new outlook on the feeling of the area. Not allowing such large developments to completely change the feeling of an area so closely related to the downtown Dartmouth planning area which is slated for major revitalization its self. Or clogging the already congested Wyse Road and Nantucket (Avenue) entrance to the bridge. Living on Eastbrook Ave, it currently takes me 35- 45 mins to make the 6km drive to my downtown office, most of the wait being to get down Boland and to the bridge. 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. No one is against seeing development in the area but mandating the type / size of development and keeping height restrictions will drastically determine the feeling of Dartmouth and the the HRM as a whole. We can only hope that our city Planning office is thinking of this area as if they lived down the street .

#### Quinpool Rd

64. I am a resident of Shirley Street and object to a 10 storey building being placed on this vacant land. The reason most people live in this area is because it is zoned R2 and from what I can gather would like to keep that way. Perhaps some appropriately designed Townhouses or Single Family units could be entertained.
65. I am deeply concerned about the current efforts by city staff and developers to rush through new zoning bylaws in our area of the city. I have lived in the north end for the past 33 years with my husband and three children. These are big changes that are proposed and any such decision should be made by the new council which will be elected in October. Developers want to have permission to build overly large high rises in our inner city neighbourhood which is home to many low income families and large number of families of African descent. I am concerned about inner city families who attend the local inner city schools. The high density developments being proposed will not be suitable for family living and families will be forced out. Much effort and planning work is done by inner city schools to help children and families. The changes staff is proposing will cause damage to these neighbourhoods that are already struggling with poverty and discrimination issues. These neighbourhoods are already dense

and include many houses with flats and small yards. They also include some areas of public housing such as those on Creighton St. that are happy homes for many families. 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. We raised out family of three children in an upstairs flat and that is a reasonable amount of space. We have heard from families in other areas who are stuck in high rises and their children have no place to play except the halls of apartment buildings. This is not acceptable.

66. I have attended the HRM by design, and have heard what is being proposed. The loud rude voices that are disruptive and interrupt the meeting against HRM by design are the minority. Please do not listen to them as you will be doing a disservice to the residents of HRM. We need the height your propose, and more height on top of it. The city has seen its budget double in the last 8 years, while population increased 15% and inflation was under 15% in that same period. The expenses of HRM are outpacing the revenue. The only way to stop this is more density so we don't have to waste our money on roads, sewage, widening roads, spreading our services to cover a larger area. Instead we can invest our money and earn a return on it, convention center, stadium. The women's world cup will draw an average audience of over 13.5 million from the USA, and more people will watch the games worldwide than watch the super bowl. They wont be seeing Halifax, they will see a little town called Moncton with 1/4 our population. I'm tired of us bending backwards to people who don't want buildings and density, they are ruining and bankrupting our city. We spend 3x on road maintenance than Vancouver, and they have twice the population, we rely on property taxes to cover 70% of our budget, Vancouver only needs 30% of its taxes to cover its budget. Add more height and density so we can stop having discussions about widening Bayers Rd. Every other city in the world uses traffic to stop urban sprawl, we in Halifax reward urban sprawl by talking about widening roads and eliminating affordable housing on the peninsula in the process. Please increase the height on Quinpool rd and downtown. Next time one of the interest groups are against a development or height ask they to sign a contract saying they will allow for an immediate 50% increase in their taxes to cover the increased expenses due to the inefficiency of urban sprawl. My recommendations: Increase the height on Quinpool rd to 100 feet. Allow an even height on the part of the street close to Robie st. Make the proper business decision we rely on you to make the right decision and that is to keep our expenses in check, lower height is not the answer, density is. Every person who lives near or downtown can walk to work taking a car off the road. We

could also talk for hours how Halifax rates very poorly for its environmental carbon footprint.

67. To all of the hard working, forward thinking and committed individuals behind HRM by Design, I have spent the week urging my neighbours and friends to write PlanHRM with support and feedback for our centre plan. Over the last month I have grown concerned for the amount of dissent but moreover I'm astonished by the mass miss-understanding. Even NEBA appears unaware the breadth of Centre Plan; the comments published in their newsletter are limited in scope and the statement released yesterday hinge on density- specifically height. 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. The principles behind Centre Plan's strategic development are aligned with my personal vision of and aspirations for Halifax. I believe in this process and wish only that more shareholders were fully informed and engaged. 'm looking forward. If there is anything I or my business can contribute please reach out to us.
68. While we appreciate the the timing of this project is dictated by Council, it does not provide sufficient time for the community affected by the proposed changes to become educated and provide meaningful feedback on the proposal. The changes envisioned are significant and once implemented, cannot be undone. One of the obstacles to discussion on the project is the lack of visual aids of how Quinpool Road will look. Our preferred maximum height for most buildings on Quinpool is 6-8 storeys. 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). We do not oppose all tall buildings. Citizens of HRM are criticized for not supporting tall buildings. However, we do not know of any developer who has committed to producing award winning, quality, sustainable buildings which they commit to maintain over the next decades. Why would we want tall buildings that look like the tall buildings currently being developed in HRM? There must be coordination with the traffic authority, which we're not sure there is. There must be restrictions on vehicles exiting and entering from Parker, Yale and Pepperell Streets to buildings facing Quinpool or occupying consolidated lots on both streets. Additional vehicular traffic on our narrow, residential streets will only create resentment and animosity to the project as it proceeds. Incentives for developing on the peninsula and disincentives for developing outside the urban core need to be implemented. 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. We need to encourage families with children to stay on the peninsula. We do not accept that Nova Scotian families are ready to embrace a more European style of living, that is, apartment living with children.

69. 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.

70. It is my understanding that these fast tracked amendments are being proposed to 'protect' neighbourhoods. I think it is clear from the meetings that I have attended, that there are many people in the Quinpool / Robie corridor who do not believe that the proposed amendments will 'protect' their property at all. At the very least, if corridor amendments are to go forward (with revisions) there should be related neighbourhood protective measures put into place. For example, comments have been made about lot massing still happening in neighbourhoods and that applications are being made to change R2 zones into R3 zones. These things will not necessarily stop just because there are new development opportunities along corridors. Developers will take advantage of any and all opportunities. Unless the proposed amendments are linked to equally strong community protective measures, I feel the argument that corridor development will 'protect' neighbourhoods to be somewhat empty. A further concern is the protection of the Commons lands from high development at their boundaries. One can argue that the Cunard side of the Common is already a wall and that proposed height changes along Robie will only worsen the 'bowl' effect.

#### Young & Robie

71. 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.]

#### Agricola St.

72. I attended the meeting last night (May 10) at Bloomfield. One gentleman expressed concern that the proposed changes would result in homes being bulldozed down and replaced with large developments. After reviewing the proposed setbacks and angle controls along with the size of most of the lots in this area, I realized that his concern is justified. 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.
73. May 10th was the last public engagement I attended. 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. 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.

#### Gottingen St.

74. Regretfully, as someone who lives on Gottingen Street, within the Boundaries of this plan, I cannot support the HRM by design plan as it stands at this time, for reasons stated below. The design plan from 2007 does have its merits; unfortunately it is also 5 years out of date. The issue appears to be with the fact that the neighbourhood has already change from the business district of the 1950's to a very eclectic neighbourhood. For example there are eleven (11) non profit organizations on Gottingen Street, three of them are a Micmac Friendship Center, a daycare and the community healthcare center. As well, there is a methadone drug therapy clinic located directly across from the Day Care facility (this organization will definitely be a hindrance to the development of Gottingen Street). Also between Cornwallis Street and Prince William Street, there are two (2) bars both of which are gay bars. There are high rise senior citizen resident buildings as well within the described boundaries. The Micmac Center, the daycare and the Community Healthcare Center, the gay bars, the senior's buildings all contribute to the character of the street. 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), who contribute nothing to either the social or economic life of the community. The area will become a bedroom community, if the tenants can tolerate the high density traffic flow on Gottingen Street.

75. Dear HRM Centre Plan representatives, I have just learned about your plans to create a "Gottingen Corridor" in the neighbourhood where I live. I saw your rationale about "street wells" and a human-scale for living and working. I have worked in Germany, Switzerland and lived in Toronto and New York for extended periods. These are vibrant, beautiful and human-scale cities. What you are proposing is not. 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. Think about where you like to frequent and some of your favourite streets. The interesting thing is that support densification and height, when it is well done. I understand and fully support what you are trying to do with densification. I think, however, that the approach will not have the intended effect.

## f. Environment and Sustainability

### General comments/questions:

76. Here are some general comments: 1. When a developer is given permission to follow up with the development plans, approval, etc and NOT before, the community should be advised so they can go in and remove any living plants or shrubs, natives, that live naturally in our environment. Even Staff could remove for replanting in public places. 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. 2. 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. If required, I could find some links and it is not a new idea. I learned that the provincial D of Ed has included Walkability or AT in their rubrik for selecting a new school site. 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.
77. Consider the challenge of wasted energy and pollution through the negative habit of idling. To date, I have seen very little evidence, one sign near a building recently. In the meantime, many car owners do not seem to worry about increasing costs and still idle for no apparent reason. This is a major campaign required, firstly adjacent to all HRM offices, HRSB schools and the Libraries and RecCentres supported by HRM funds. Transit too! All staff would be asked to consider the challenge. This would make a big difference. 6. 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. 7. Recreation opportunities needs to be reviewed for this area. Just because there is a new regional resource, does not mean access. Lets review access to the schools and other public spaces for adult ed or rec opportunities at affordable prices. Other communities are hosting low or no charge programmes...why can we not do it too? Meeting spaces are not available for

non-profit groups at low or no cost. This discourages folks if all energies are put towards survival...sustainability is important.

78. Individual submission from OurHRM Alliance and Ecology Action Center Appended.

Corridor Specific comments:

Wyse Rd.

79. Also 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. That area is a nice buffer and the kids use it in the winter to toboggan. You are already ruining our neighborhood with the addition of your new transit site. More pollution and noise!! Less green.

Portland Street

80. Also, please preserve, and even enhance, the green space connecting Rodney Road to Hastings Street. The path is frequently used by school children and neighbours strolling or biking and can be used by new residents as well, enjoying the treed area to connect with nature and birds living in the "urban forest". I understand that HRM owns property in that area (easement/right of way?) and pipes are under the path area. Please advise if this area can be developed or if it will remain a green space. I understand from the April 30 meeting that an information session was also held with developers. 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?

Gottingen St.

81. Where are the green areas to be located? As near as I can decipher no allocation has been made for green space (parks, playgrounds, a bigger library these form the social centre of a neighbourhood, people meet in the parks, children play in the playgrounds and both congregate in the library. What of the churches? These places lead to people going for lunch or coffee which support the neighbourhood businesses, this is what makes up a community. Regretfully at this point the HRM by design outline does not.

## **g. Traffic, Parking and Transportation**

### General comments/questions:

82. 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. That arbitrary separation is not reflective of the April 2nd statements from HRM Planning on a comprehensive high quality redesign for the area. This is highly relevant given the recent string of severe auto accidents, including one fatality. Metro and Ferry Transit. 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.
83. Parking concerns were raised at all 3 of the public engagements I attended. 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. Likewise 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. It is not correct to assume that all local residents will be walking to access these new business locations (even if it is desired to be thus); also it is logical to expect some/many come from away customers/clients/visitors will be driving to these locations; thus adequate parking arrangements must be provided to meet ALL possible future requirements. If adequate parking is not available, then potential businesses & residents may choose not to fill the vacant units, or worse a business will fail, and if a lack of parking is given as one of the reasons for the failed business venture... well future business operators will be very wary of such a location.
84. 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. Currently, many routes duplicate service, at about the same time, with no service til an hour later. It has been many years since I recall a practical session for transit riders (current and future) to discuss and discover and plan new

routes. And please make sure that this session is held on a bus route...they are not known for being practical on this topic!!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. Or plan to walk home partway if they were so inclined. Many people do not look at maps but need some direction...Transit management included...their map is missing some major connectors in new areas. INtegrate AT with other partners so all are sharing in the planning and decision making...get rid of the silos of decision making.

Corridor Specific comments:

Graham's Grove

85. There are rumours that HRM Planning is targeting Graham's Corner for additional high density housing units for an additional 1000 to 1200 people. Parking and traffic is a significant issue for high density within such a small area. One of the key mechanisms HRM Planning has been trying to expand outside of the Halifax Downtown is bonus density for affordable housing, where parking requirements are relaxed or removed. This type of development will potentially ghettoize Graham's Corner. 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. The need for transit never disappears, and because of no planned parking, the need spills out into public spaces adding to existing traffic problems.
86. What we plan today could be built tomorrow. Let's make sure we get it right. 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). We want and welcome new people in our neighborhood but: more people equal more traffic. So there is talk of removing the parking need by not having any because of a bonus(density) for building affordable housing? Hmmm, looks good on paper but the reality is 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. I honestly don't get it.



87. To the best of my knowledge, 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. By rezoning and large development agreements fail to address the deficiencies as outlined below: Increases in density from approximately 30 units per acre to 40 units per acre will have a significant impact at the centre of an already existing bottleneck traffic exchange extending from Glenwood Avenue to and including the Braemar Superstore driveway access and traffic lights at Graham's Grove. The impact of the increased traffic will adversely impact the dependent living of seniors within the community, and despite public transit along Prince Albert Road which forms the foot of a hillside of subdivisions, seniors at the top of the hill will see no viable transit improvement, but instead a significant loss of accessibility by automobile. Prefer something more compatible due to the high traffic volumes. 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.

#### Wyse Rd.

88. I'm writing to express the following concerns about the HRM by Design proposals for the Wyse Road and Boland Road areas: 1. 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. This is an inappropriate area for high-density, high-traffic development.

#### Quinpool Road

89. There are several matters that are of concern or are yet to be determined. These include: 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. Access to properties fronting on Quinpool Road- Will access be permitted from Yale Street? Will it be possible for Yale Street (south side) properties to be used for surface parking (i.e. similar to the Athen's situation? We would object to this. As a more general comment, 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.

#### Agricola St.

90. Just a reminder of what was said at the recent planning meeting at Bloomfield. Ourselves and the North End business group are concerned about the potential loss in parking in our area. Whilst we appreciated the efforts made by your department to breathe some life into the area we do need to keep matters in perspective with regard to Parking. Businesses on Agricola do 70% of their business with out of town customers and those who come in by car. For the area to be a success we do require some short term parking. As you will remember from the meeting I pointed out on the map that the proposed Agricola Cycle lane were it to go down Agricola will take away "ALL" of our short term client/customer parking. It is impossible to run a business with "NO" parking . The area needs to incorporate a number of pay to park sites. Whilst we appreciate efforts to reduce downtown traffic it can never be totally eliminated so any vibrant plan needs to incorporate this issue in the overall concept. Our business group are opposed to the cycle route on Agricola but have supported it on the parallel side streets of Maynard and Creighton.

#### Gottingen St.

91. The businesses on Gottingen Street need to have walk-in traffic. There is very limited parking on Gottingen Street today and it does not allow for parking for more that 1 hour during the day. 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. I need not remind people that there are over 300 cars, buses and large trucks an hour travelling on Gottingen Street in the morning rush hour. This is duplicated in the evening rush hour.

### **h. Active Transportation**

General comments/questions:

92. Retrofitting for a healthier community is important. 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.
93. integrate the topic of Trails and Pathways so that there is a comprehensive "PLAN" for connectivity. New developers are planning trails with no local input, except on paper, in a planning office, maybe. Other trails are being planned and built by volunteers with no background on the standards. Contractors are building trails with no trail building standards to follow. The public cannot find the trails we have as there is no comprehensive Signage or Wayfinding programme for parks and trails in HRM. Many parks are unsigned. Trails are unsigned. And local residents or visitors cannot find them unless referred or joining a guided walk. But there is no tourism or comprehensive ongoing promotion of the trails...perhaps a limited few on GOCIO. There are so many more. With no tourism kiosks, there is no hands on sharing. So I suggest that all planning, construction, signage, promotion of Trails be integrated in to a revised programme with knowledgeable, engaged staff. Volunteers have a place but trained volunteers are essential. A new model should be considered for better use of funds and f/t staff equivalents.
94. The Dartmouth Community Health Board has undertaken a significant community engagement process for 2010-2013. This process allowed us to assess community health and identify key priorities for action in our communities and district ([www.ourhealthyfuture.ca](http://www.ourhealthyfuture.ca)). The largest identified community health issue was Healthy Eating and Physical Activity. Along with this 72 % of all respondents in Dartmouth feel they should make future health improvements with 69% indicating they intend to improve their health in the next year, most notably by increasing exercise/sports/physical activity. For this reason we would like to request a significant emphasis placed on "Walkable Communities/Active Transportation" as development arises. 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. We would like HRM to continue to strive to create a culture of walking and

sustainable transportation in Dartmouth. We appreciate your partnerships that support active transportation with groups such as the Heart & Stroke Foundation to support local Walking groups. As well, we encourage collaboration with Ecology Action Centre - *Transportation Issues Committee* who are promoting increased investment in, and improved design of, sustainable transportation infrastructure (Active Transportation 101: Bringing AT to Your Community and Developing an AT Plan) as well, we encourage you to continue to support the Stepping Up, Physical Activity Strategy for the Halifax Region. A vibrant community is safe, active and healthy, encouraging active living through physically active transportation. The Planning Department must continue to involve residents, local government and community groups to identify priorities. This enables HRM to be guided by and support local citizen initiatives to make HRM a better place to play, work and live.

Gottingen St.

95. I listened to several people mention the bike lane going on Agricola Street and how it might hinder traffic and on street parking (which there is not enough of). Unfortunately, a bike lane will hamper the traffic and parking. I am a cyclist so I do want a bike lane. 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. The bike could follow each street, parking could be allowed on both streets, on one side of the street. Traffic density on each street would be reduced while still allowing high commuter traffic in the morning and in the evening.

## **i. Affordable Housing**

General comments/questions:

96. Although rent controls may be able to maintain affordable housing prices for apartment dwellers, 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. How can privately owned homes/townhouses that are built to provide affordable residential units have their resale values capped/maintained... is this even possible? If not, should private ownership of such affordable residential units even be allowed where sustained affordable

housing solutions are desired... perhaps these residential units must be maintained solely as rent or lease type properties... is this type of ownership designation even possible to enforce? If not, then how can sustained-affordable housing ever be achieved for designated areas?

#### Graham's Grove

97. Are we that desperate to build anything on the smallest stamp of land because of the all mighty dollar. 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. Our neighborhood currently reflects affordability because it is. If we throw away all our old bylaws and let developers build on small scraps of land that become available in existing neighborhoods, they should still reflect the community. If the lot is small, so should the building be. If a lot is big than the developer can build big. Why do we have to reinvent the wheel? The tag line for development should be RESPECT THE COMMUNITY YOU ARE MOVING INTO. We respect our neighbors. This neighborhood has been here for over 50 years and we have welcomed most of the changes proposed to us.

#### Gottingen St.

98. As it stands now some landlords are pricing themselves off the market. It is difficult to explain to someone their property is not located on Spring Garden Road. Tenants are highly transitory and do require mobility. They use apartments as a temporary base (students, newlyweds). The average student cannot afford to rent/buy an accommodation for \$1000.00 to 1200.00 monthly, but 3 or 4 students can afford the rent. Unfortunately, they leave after 8 to 10 months as well. 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.

#### **j. Built Form & Infrastructure (including height, streetwall, setbacks, roads etc.)**

General comments/questions:

99. 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. In fact it would be better if the actual minimum number of people that should be capable of residing within a given hotspot growth area should be detailed. Thus a better idea of the scale for future development requirements would be known. 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? Once these parameters are made public, it should be easier to determine what low-rise, and/or high-rise developments are required to meet future population density goals.
100. Unfortunately there are also many things which I do not support. First, let's start with what has happened to HRM by Design. The HRM by Design workshop outcomes (2006) are very clear but for some reason many of the key ones have been overlooked. eg.
- a. "Intensification may be accommodated as long as low-rise adjacent residential neighbourhoods are respected." This is not happening when 20 storey high rises are now being suggested. High rises do not protect local neighbourhoods. The Welsford Apartment is cited as a reason for allowing the construction of more 20 storey buildings, instead of being recognised for what it is – an ugly, wind-producing aberration that should never have been allowed.
  - b. "Intensification may be defined in a preliminary way for Quinpool as being 3-5 stories" While I accept that this would be most desirable, it is probably not practical in all cases and 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.
  - c. "Traffic infiltration into neighbourhoods will be restricted." This was not addressed that I am aware of; this is extremely important.
  - d. "The St. Pat's site.....offers the opportunity to accommodate a significant residential population...and could accommodate more height." Building up from 3 – 5 stories (as proposed in consultations in 2006) I would therefore suggest that mid rise buildings could be accommodated here. However I must add that if we are going to attract families to live on the peninsula, we can't just build condos and apartment buildings. Families want houses – the St. Pat's space is big enough to accommodate 4 storey townhouses, many of them facing on the park.

101. Building lot amalgamation and historical fabric - a - One of the major elements that make most historic and even contemporary cities interesting is the differentiation in building typologies. This phenomena can manifest itself in various ways and can include uniformity in age or diversity in age as well as uniformity in proportions and details, or diversity in proportions and details. One condition, however that seems to be an issue these days is in respect with lot size and rhythm. When too many lots are amalgamated the urban street fabric is torn and pretty soon, people lose interest. The Hydrostone is a great example of this: One side is continuous and active, the other side broken and less appealing. Lets mandate a maximum facade width and promote rhythm and density in business activity on the street. b - Providing an incentive to keep historical fabric and historical scale (3 stories) at the street level (things can get bigger behind this) allows for diversity within the rhythm, while at the same time keeping a more genuine human scale. Infill between, behind, and even in some cases a little on top, combined with restoration work, contemporary adaptations and new material pallets, will provide just the kind of neighborhoods we know and like. We CAN work with what we've got AND move forward with this city. What we have, is what people like about this place. Let's add to it and make it even better.
102. I understand from the Open House discussion at the 30 April session that landscaped open space at grade will not be required as part of the proposed development controls. It can be a significant determinant of built form. Have you decided on whether to follow the Downtown Bylaw model for landscaped open space or an alternative?
103. I am very glad this planning is underway and I hope we'll end up with some good policies. I've attended a few sessions and think that overall the plan looks pretty good. I think the very best thing we could do for ourselves would be to bury the overhead wires. It would be a big ticket item, hugely disruptive and expensive but when it's over we will have a clean slate to work with. It will make an enormous difference aesthetically, as well as make room for more trees and greatly reduce power outages. When work does need to be done, having it take place under the street will be much less disruptive than it is now. If the negotiations can be done this would be among HRM's most worthwhile projects ever.

Corridor Specific comments:

Portland Street

104. I'm for density and new development with character in the neighbourhood, but feel that 8 stories is much too high for development of Portland Street properties, in the area along Portland Street from Rodney Road (Neighbour's Pub area) to the Family Drug Store/Robins area, and recommend that townhouses or 3 story developments would be more appropriate in this area. 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". 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.
105. Though we feel that HRM's Halifax by Design's RP+5 proposals are a step in the right direction, there are several concerns that we would like to bring to your attention. Firstly, we feel that a building set back should maintain the profile of the streets it is located on, even if it is located on a corner lot. That is, the 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. Secondly, new buildings should be designed with respect to the scale of existing neighborhoods. To do this, 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. Thirdly, on smaller lots in close proximity to existing single family homes, height should be restricted to six stories or less. Finally, 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.
106. 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. 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.

### Grahams Grove

107. I would like to provide some feedback with regard to the proposed heights for the Grahams Grove corridor of the Centre Plan. After reviewing the maps I am disappointed to see such low heights proposed for what is currently the superstore property. You have proposed up to 12 storeys across the street and to me it does not make sense to keep the heights adjacent so low. 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.
108. It appears the side yard set back for 307 Prince Albert which would keep development in line with the current residential streetline on Glenwood Avenue has been removed. This will have a negative affect on the streetscape, essentially walling it off from Graham's Corner. There are many large opportunity lots in Dartmouth that can accommodate high rise high density development. The City does not need to approve them on small lots adjacent to established neighbourhoods. 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. A Developer should be rewarded by lot consolidation so that only with larger lots is the maximum built form under RP+5 permissible.
109. Points of concern on detail: the change in elevation for number of floors can be misleading and that change should be highlighted: increase in commercial level is the near equivalency of two ground floor commercial 14 foot storey being 3 traditional residential storeys, ie an 8 storey building equals nine old fashioned storeys. The street line set back along Glenwood is uncertain. According to the first part of David Lane's presentation, the housing set back line along Glenwood would be continued and the tower massing would appropriately be pushed to the main street of Prince Albert. The second phase of David's presentation, which brought in the introduction of the closed door Developer feedback, gives rise to the question of whether side streets do receive this feature set back so as to not block or eclipse the established neighbourhood. again the segment of the presentation incorporating Developer's closed door feedback, it is not clear to me what is the extent of the side wall setback from the 3-5 storey pedestrian podium, as well as the rear

yard set-back and maximum degree of angle from the built form (as I understand it 3 storey in most existing residential areas). For example, are there rewards or incentives to Developers for consolidating 307 and 311 Prince Albert Road and to 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?) It appears after closed door Developers' discussions that the cost of terracing buildings has been rejected as a norm of building construction in favour of a two level columnar approach - a pedestrian podium of 3-5 storeys with one or more towers on top. 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)? After next week's Appeal, a small group of us can get together to discuss these concerns and provide feedback prior to the May 15 requested deadline for submissions.

110. The following are my comments stemming from the second RP+5 meeting held for Graham's Grove. Overall, I like where you are heading. I do have some questions, comments and concerns. David Lane made a reference to small lots in his presentation. He said something to the effect that height and angle (step back) restrictions may be uneconomical for small lots. I believe this came out of the meetings held with developers. He did not provide any clarity on how small lots would be treated. It seems reasonable that lot size is a limiting factor for scale and bulk. He left an impression that small lots would not be subject to the same standards. How will small and or irregular shaped lots be treated under this plan? David also talked about protecting character homes/neighbourhoods with the application of low rise 3 story development. Am I correct in that statement? What is HRM's definition of a character home or neighbourhood? Graham's Grove sits on the periphery of the Penhorn/Woodlawn Urban Local Centre. It's actually cut in two by it. It is my understanding that the periphery of Urban Local Centres is designated for low rise low density development. 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. The take away from the last meeting was at the end of the day this is about streamlining the development agreement process. As I stated in my previous email I lack confidence in HRM by Design after the public consultation phase. We've seen 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?

111. The impact of diverse ownership = unconsolidated land parcels. The area between Bartlin Road and Lawrence Street show permissible 12 storey development, but is split into non-functional smaller lots that would make highrise development problematic. It is important to understand how HRM Planning addresses small lot configurations within this designated twelve storey zone. For example, on the south side of Bartlin Road, not forming part of the proposed 84 unit building, lands owned or managed by Bob Yuille form part of the 12 storey block area. Does that mean these residual lots could be consolidated into a narrow ½ acre lot and support a 12 storey tower, or does the narrowness of the lot reduce or limit the permissible maximum tower height? 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.

Wyse Rd.

112. Having lived in our home on Faulkner St for 56 years we know that the former Keating property is not the place for 24 story apartment buildings. We believe that Metropolitan Place is 16 stories high and these would be half as high again. Have you considered the traffic chaos this will create? We have seen many, many, many times when traffic is tied up and not moving heading toward the bridge, and that is just on our street, not to mention traffic coming down Wyse Rd. and Nantucket Ave. Also, more busses will be using Nantucket Ave when the new terminal opens. Please consider how many more cars will be in these high rises to add to the mess. Also, there is the wind tunnel effect. Just walk past Metropolitan Place to feel what 16 stories causes and consider what another 8 will do. We are not against that property being developed but feel 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?
113. 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.

## Spring Garden Rd

114. I am an owner of a condo unit on Spring Garden Rd. I attended the Phase II HRMbyDesign Meeting April 30th. My comments:

POSITIVE: Very much approve of HRM by Design concept for planning our downtown development. Seems from my reading/local comments old planning is too cumbersome, undefined and buried in red tape. It's Hard for developers to get approval. DEFINITELY support downtown development.

- We need affordable housing, especially rental properties, so I support the rezoning concept to support more high density development.
- Definitely feel better high density development should be focused in areas walkable / close to Barrington / waterside/downtown .
- ViewPlanes and historic feel of downtown core very important to maintain.
- Focusing on areas like west of Summer/ Commons good plan as close to downtown, but won't disrupt either of these important factors.
- Higher density housing and affordable, decent rental housing needs to be much more developed.

### NEGATIVE:

- Build higher density.. but no need to build >14 stories!

One very important comment made at the meeting on April 30th reflected on the 'displaced focus' on highrise as the way to high density residential housing.

Highrise.. ( > 10 stories) often harder to maintain, more expensive housing, more transient residents, single or non-children occupants, etc, They do not contribute as much to the community stability and quality development. Residential housing in buildings lesser height, offer sufficient development and expansion of residence and affordability . and are more 'neighbourhood' feel and stability of residents.

- With the current plan proposal, a 24 story height can be buildt directly across the street from me. This will TOTALLY obstruct my light, sunshine and view ( obstruction of light and sun very important to me!) Viewplans... that loss is part of city living and I accept that.
- If the structures were a little less high, or some buildings in this high density block plan allowed for orientation east/west , this might break up the solid wall of shadow created for residents on the north side of Spring Garden.

115. As a condominium owner on Spring Garden , I pay > \$2200/year for 1000 sq ft home. My complex houses 160 units, similar to mine, ... so huge taxpaying contributors to HRM. But to live 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.
116. I own property located between Robie that runs along College to Carlton Street. I had requested that my land be included in the center plan meetings for Robie and Spring Garden road area. This makes sense since there are only approximately four owners that have parcels on this particular block. This is a site that has the ability to house great density and create a very strong tax base for the city. To my surprise, my property has been overlooked. It is my sincere hope, that this has been just an oversight.
117. I would like to add some comments with regard to the Centre plan map for the Spring Garden area. I have been made aware of a few potential plans for that area and this has affected my opinion on what heights are appropriate. I believe where Robie Street is such a large, wide, and main thoroughfare that development on that street should be of a large scale to match the scale of the street. In particular I am talking about the lands on the corner of Robie and College Streets. Where the street is so wide, and Dalhousie is across the street there are no direct neighbours that would be impacted by larger scale development on this site. The map has allocated 20 storeys abutting these properties on the Spring Garden side so this would also provide context for larger scale development on this site. I feel that 5 storeys is not entirely appropriate when economics of the site is taken into consideration. The property owner has acquired a large piece of land which makes it possible to build larger buildings and provides more flexibility in providing public benefit such as affordable housing with any new development. One of the larger goals of the Centre plan is to increase private money that gets sunk into public benefit and I do not see a reason why that should be restricted on this site. 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. If the site allowed for 20 storeys or more it would give that flexibility for the site to be able to provide money that would go towards the betterment of the community. Please consider changing the heights of what are now zoned with a 29m and 18.5m heights to allow more density, and thus larger public benefit on

one of only a few main arteries in the city which is capable of handling such density.

### Quinpool Rd

118. 22 Story Streetscapes you can't be serious. As I sit on my front step on Williams St. I look at the towering Welford tower apartment building that looms over my property. How tall is this structure I wonder as it cast a shadow over Welsford, Williams and Compton Streets. To consider it a picturesque view would be a stretch in anyones imagination. I walk in the shadow of it daily as I navigate my way to work. I then pause at the Willow tree intersection where the towering Atlantica Hotel is situated and try to keep my hat on in the turbulent winds that swirl around these tall buildings. This evening some neighbours visited and asked if I was aware of the changes that are being proposed. I responded, oh yes they are talking about cleaning up and redeveloping Quinpool road and improving the streetscape. Maybe cleanup the St.Pats site and provide a means to better manage the traffic that comes and goes up and down Quinpool. Now I am coming to a realization that there is a plan to allow monstrous 22 story buildings. 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. There appears to be sufficient space along this corridor for development of a more modest height specification. My neighbourhood is not a downtown district but a quiet residential area and I find the plan unacceptable and suggest further consultation and consideration is necessary for all the affected neighbourhoods before any decisions on this plan can be made.

119. We After attending several meetings in the neighbourhood regarding the proposed plan and zoning changes to the Quinpool Road/ Yale Street area, we offer the following comments and questions: General approach to enabling the intensification of development along Quinpool Road is sound. The proposed regulations concerning increased sidewalk width, mixed use development entailing ground floor commercial and office with residential uses above is acceptable. Maintaining the south side of Yale Street as residential is good.

120. If Yale Street properties are consolidated with Quinpool Road properties, will the set back requirements (from common rear property lines) be

eliminated? How will such developments be regulated in terms of height, massing, step-backs, angle controls, etc.

121. First of all, let me applaud the work done to date on this project, especially given the tight timeline. I wish we, as a community, had more time to spend to really discuss options and issues, but I am also understanding of the need for speed as mandated by council. Most of my concerns have been captured in the public meetings, but I want to highlight three areas of focus for me. 1) We should move beyond identifying just the areas that are already "in play" and identify possible future development areas, currently left off the proposal. 2) 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. One comment I heard in the community was "big enough to need an elevator, too small to make a profit." 3) Part of why I am all for more aggressive heights and larger areas for development is that I think the other part of this social contract is missing. 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.

122. I own property and a business on this street and sit on the Quinpool Merchant's Association. I am excited about HRM by Design. We need this desperately. I believe this is our only chance in the next 20 years or so, that we can improve and grow the peninsula. Since I was a child there has been almost no change on this street. There hasn't been a new large project since Quinpool Centre circa 1977!!! 35 years. This is, in my opinion, unacceptable. As I stated earlier, HRM by Design has me quite excited that we will have growth on the peninsula for the first time in decades. I am wary though, that both the HRM by Design committee and HRM city council will allow this vision to become clouded and watered down as every "special interest" group comes forward with their lists of demands. From the Yale Street residents to the Pepperell Street residents to the Heritage Property Trust members, HRM has a tendency to cave to these folks. 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. I know it sounds harsh but that is reality. If a resident on Yale Street, say a retiree, has a problem the ceiling heights of the buildings allowed on the Quinpool Road side, 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.

123. The HRM by Design process identifies a modest streetscape for the Quinpool corridor, but to now have 4-6-8-20 stories brought forth begs the question, where did this come from? The current heights permitted through zoning should be the height restrictions. Any exceptions to current zone restrictions should follow a regular democratic development agreement process. It is my opinion that citizen input can never be seen as a bad thing! I am not against higher buildings, but they should only be supported for the following reasons:

- Innovation

- \*HRM should be supporting higher density by both higher development but also through smaller units. I would like to see smaller more modest units developed.

- \*There should be consideration for development units that do not come with any parking. If these peninsula developments are to keep people from driving, I suggest we start with the obvious, remove parking benefits.

- Sustainability

- \* There should be more green options incorporated into any approval for extra heights. This means possibly a car share per building, or community gardens on rooftops or lower buildings that do not require continuous energy use.

- \* Considering Quinpool / Robie is next to the Commons, a parcel of land that continues to shrink in size from true "green space for the sake of green space" to hospitals, parking lots, schools, permanent outbuildings, skating rinks etc., the creation of more green space should be part of these amendments. I have not heard anyone speak about reclaiming green space in the corridor proposal. A corridor with a real mix of green and developed would be attractive to consumers and residents.

- Culture and heritage considerations

- \* Consideration should be given for the protection of the Quinpool streetscape. Heritage is not just about 100 years ago, there is a tangible unique streetscape on Quinpool Road that tells part of the Halifax story. To have it all potentially torn down through corridor developments would be a loss.

- Community benefit

- \* It goes without saying that any mixed use neighbourhood must include low cost housing options. The peninsula is already financially off limits to many.



124. I understand the need to hear what people want, not just what they don't want, so I will try to be as concrete as possible. I believe 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. Throughout the corridor, I believe that 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. 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.
125. The terms "gateway" and "gateway architecture" were used by staff. This is a concept I do not understand. It seems to me if we want a gateway, it should lead into downtown, not an open area (the Commons). It seems very odd to gradually increase the height as one drives/walks east and then have it end abruptly at Robie St. 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. What is it a gateway to?

#### Young & Robie

126. I am in shock at the turn of events with regards to my property. For your information I met with a planner and he suggested that I submit massing plans for my site, which encompasses well over 50 thousand square feet on Robie Street, College street and Carlton street. I met with MNA architects and associates and they provided the massing for me. 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. There has been no feedback from the planner with regards to my massing provided him positive or negative. So you can imagine my surprise when I see the land I own being included in the center plan but with a much different view then I had been lead to believe. My site is bigger than all the sites on spring garden but it seems to be left with the worst allowable height. 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.

127. 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.
128. 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 first say that in the language of the community feedback/input sessions I attended, I am "Amber" (proceed with plan providing specific changes are made). 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. 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 hurdle 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. 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.

129. Good day. I thought I would take a few moments and comment on how pleased I am with the HRM By Design Regional Centre Municipal Planning Strategy. As a resident of downtown Halifax and property owner in the area, I think your vision of a livable, vibrant, and prosperous Regional Centre is a most excellent goal. Job well done!! 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. The site I'm writing about shares in the future success of the neighbourhood and I think it would be unwise to limit this site, of over 60000 sqft, to a mere five stories. Not only will five stories add zero aesthetic value to the neighbourhood, but the city will have missed their opportunity to truly achieve the goal of sustained economic benefits through densification. The look of this project and potential vibrancy it will create for the neighbourhood should not be overlooked.

130. 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. This concept of a true corridor was expected to be carried forward and embodied from input from the public session of April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2012, however, no revisions were incorporated in the May 12<sup>th</sup> presentation. This lack of embodiment of this public expression must be acknowledged and corrected when presented to the advisory committee in future discussions. [...] I'm the property owner of a C2 commercial address on the west side of Agricola. 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. If sales of property are realized, which most likely will occur in the process of land assembly, these values will be in excess of sustainable rates relative to the eastern side of Agricola Street. This action of consequence will be devastating for property owners in the dissected Agricola Corridor in it's form as proposed in the May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012 presentation without the true integration and presentation of the Agricola Street corridor as a duality of streetscapes.

Gottingen St.

131. When looking at this area it is apparent that the agricola parcels of land that fall into this corridor have not been fully thought out. I own 2 very visible corner lots on agricola that are 8000-10,000 sf each of predominately asphalt parking. Would love to redevelop them but the latest height restriction on one of them (6 storeys) makes it uneconomical (corner mccully and agricola). CORNER LOTS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE CIVIC NODES. A point of increased height given the extra open area around it. 7-8 storeys would just make it feasible as long as parking requirements were 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. 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. As it stands now it is going to be very difficult to make a business case to redevelop these lots. I encourage you to rethink how you address parking and the few corner lots you have in this corridor.
132. It was brought to our attention that feedback was wanted in regards to planning for the North End of Halifax. We are for buildings being as high as possible. There are no real view planes that they would block and we would not be losing trees for these buildings to be built so it does not bring any negatives to the area. We would also be for more buildings on the south side of Agricola St and on Isleville St as well. More people in the area will help the local businesses to thrive as well as help with the revitalization of the North End.
133. First, we would like to congratulate HRM on its initiative to revise the secondary planning strategies in the urban core. Based on our experience with two significant properties on Gottingen Street, the existing plans are out of date and don't reflect the reality associated with the challenges to redeveloping property in the urban core. The nfortunate result has been the stagnation of certain areas of the city at a time when we need new development on the Peninsula. 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.

134. 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. You are creating a low rise "dip" in a zone that has NO substantial residential buildings. There are 3-4 extremely large underutilized lots that make up a sizable chunk of this zone. (a car rental lots, underutilized ambulance parking lot, old warehouse). prime opportunity to create some density without having to consolidate lots. A no brainer that is been stunted.
135. land use: 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. This would preserve more residential land. I understand that mixed use means both residential /retail however I would like to see the current mixed use as grandfathered in and residential being preserved in a more meaningful way. height: 8-10 stories is too high. The building on the corner of North and Agricola is as high as I would like to see buildings in this area (I think it is 5 stories?). If there were large lots and the centre column of a building was taller than 8 would be as high as I would like to see. The Paramount bldg on Cunard is too high for the area and I would not want to see a development such as that in the Agricola area.
136. Placing height restrictions on buildings on Gottingen Street is an excellent idea; the problem will be in keeping people from "creeping" over the height. Add two other factors to the mix, 1) some construction is being rumoured to be going to 10 to 20 stories. From the handouts given at the May 10<sup>th</sup> 2012 public meeting the restriction is to a max of 5 stories. Of course the way HRM Council has been operating there are exceptions to all bylaws. One property owner has already very neatly out manoeuvred the bylaws and the community. Your handouts state that that facing onto Gottingen Street buildings are "required (to have) Street front retail/commercial" space. All the property owner did was present a design that included the requirements to a neighbourhood meeting and then built the building without any "street front retail/commercial" space on Gottingen Street. By doing this, the owners were able to increase the occupancy of the building (and therefore the income from the building). What we have now is a 4 story wall facing Gottingen Street. HRM Council must have approved this as an "exemption to bylaws". If exceptions/exemptions are being made then why impose bylaws and only have a few obey them?

137. Land Use: I think you run into a very dangerous design issue when large sections of land are totally mixed use/high rise. The streetscapes in the area are still walkable and feel reasonable safe. I see high rise ghettos in the land use you propose and it would not be a safe area for anyone. Height : The heights proposed for the staples corner are way too much and I think the viewplane to the north of citadel hill is just as worthwhile preserving as to the south. I object to the erosion of that historic view and in fact WHEN I AM WALKING DOWN CITADEL HILL FROM MY HOUSE one of the pleasures is looking over to my left and seeing the harbour.

### **k. Culture, Arts and Heritage**

#### General comments/questions:

138. Individual submission by the Heritage Trust is available in the Appendix.
139. I also have grave concerns about lovely historic buildings that are not being included for consideration. Halifax has a special charm due to historic buildings such as the one and a half story buildings on North st between Agricola and Gottingen and on Creighton St and yes these areas are being considered for high rises. This is simply not appropriate for a historic city.