

Public Comment Period Summary

Case 23820: Southdale Future Growth Node



Shape Your City Website



Online Comment Period via Website



Information Mailout



Questions and feedback via email and phone

On August 29, 2022, HRM staff uploaded draft planning documents to the municipality's "Shape your city" engagement webpage and opened public comment on the draft documents. The public comment period was open from August 29 to September 19 and received 361 comments. Additional comments were received via email and phone. This document supplies a summary of those comments.

What positive feedback was received ?

The principal aspects of the draft documents and planning process that received positive feedback include:

- Increasing housing supply;
- The variety of housing types being proposed in the development;
- The potential relative affordability of smaller forms of market housing (e.g.: townhomes);
- A balance can be negotiated between environmental concerns and housing development;
- That the area is well situated in an urban area with connections to transportation and existing infrastructure suitable to service development;
- That the development may offer opportunities for aging-in-place and multi-generational housing; and
- That new park spaces will offer enhanced recreational opportunities.

What are the concerns?

The principal aspects of the draft documents and planning process that received comments expressing concern include:

- The health and integrity of the wetland on site;
- The importance of the wetland in the context of a very urban area and as a carbon sink;

- That the removal of trees and effects on the wetland will accelerate climate change;
- Ability of any development to mitigate impacts on the wetland;
- Concern over the early tree removal and earthworks;
- The compressed format of public engagement;
- The transparency of the sale of lands in the FGN and the overall development process;
- The health and integrity of the treed areas on site;
- A desire for housing with deeper affordability than what is likely available from the announced provincial funding, or market-rate units;
- Wildlife habitat and effects on wildlife;
- Concern over the energy efficiency of buildings in the development;
- That units must be universally accessible or at least “visitable” for persons with disabilities;
- Overcrowding in nearby schools;
- That an environmental assessment should be completed;
- Automobile traffic volume and safety within the site and on the surrounding streets;
- That the development does not have enough commercial uses and services for the new community;
- Overland flooding and effects on stormwater management if the site were to be developed;
- That the development is too suburban and car-oriented including insufficient walking and cycling connections, streets that are too wide, and a surplus of surface parking; and
- That the development may not be inclusive or affordable and may result in gentrification.

Southdale Future Growth Node

Draft Planning Documents Public Comment Period

August 29 to September 19, 2022

1. I am completely opposed to this development proposal for numerous reasons.

The process is flawed and there are numerous inconsistencies, errors and downright mistruths in the Land Suitability Analysis conducted by Englobe. Their forest cover maps are inaccurate. The storm water flow from Fenwick Street INTO the wetland is an outright error as water flows from the Wetland towards Fenwick Street (if a simple ground truthing was done they would have seen this). There was no mention of the identified species at risk (wood turtles--I saw a turtle in the wooded area of the fen (approximately halfway between south and north shore of watercourse) myself. There was no mention of the WESP which was conducted by Ducks Unlimited for the property owner in 2020. In this WESP it was mentioned there are known rare waterbird species and possibly rare plants in the wetland. There was mention of the Migratory Bird Act, yet the developer had over 1 acre deforested during nesting season (complaint filed). The delineation of the wetland's edge is flawed. Two GPS coordinates (taken by myself) showed the "field delineation" provided by consultant were on the visible edge of the south brook's outer bank. There has been ZERO community consultation by the Developer, even though they claim to have done so on their website. The narrative of affordable housing is completely false, as the units will be about 80 percent of market value, when real affordable housing is based on 30% of a household's monthly income. The traffic study is flawed as it states minimal traffic increase on Fenwick Street when there will be approximately 1,200 new units going into the Portucana/Legrow build at along Fenwick/Research Drive. It is also grossly flawed with the belief Lynn Drive will be a secondary access point. People who work downtown will not drive to Highway 111 to Mount Hope, up the new causeway into the new development when they can cut multiple minutes by coming up Portland or Pleasant onto Fenwick, Hastings or Clement (none of which were mentioned in the Traffic Impact Study) to get to Lynn--it is human nature to take the path of least resistance. There has been no apparent consultation with HSCE regarding the estimate 1000 new school aged children in the development (Dartmouth South Academy is already 50 students from capacity). There is the access point planned for Mount Hope into the new development. We were originally told it was a bridge, then at the public meeting, in February, it turned into a road or causeway. The original LSA only looked at the main Legrow development. There has never been an LSA done for the Portucana/Legrow build. There is no mention, again in the LSA, why the "high water mark" is further out than the "field delineation". There does not appear to be additional metres added to the 20 metre buffer due to increased slope on the north east or south developments. There are multiple sizes for the wetland, from 4 metres (Ducks Unlimited WESP) to 23 metres (Halifax Water). This needs to be confirmed, again, as stated above, due to the 20 metre buffer around watercourses. The falsehood that the Portucana/Legrow development was part of the original Staff Report presented to HRM Council in January is laughable. There was a brief mention about adjacent property, but no maps were provided. No traffic studies were provided, etc.. This was only done after the fact (in April 2022). There was no (sorry, don't know technical term) ground truthing boots on the ground KML/KMZ provided to show the route the consultant took during their one day survey of the area.

This whole process brings to light that HRM and its parent, the Nova Scotia government, need to reassess how reports are presented to HRM Council. They should never be done via literature or desktop reviews. They should always be done with boots on the ground, ground truthing. Too many things have been missed by a consultant who relied too much on computer modeling.

2.	Although I'm very much in agreement with affordable housing and the current need to increase the number of homes in metro Halifax/Dartmouth, I am appalled at the total disregard for the natural importance of Eisner Wetland. As former president of the NS Bird Society, it was very troubling to see how simple it was for Clayton Developments to apply and the receive permission from the province to fast track, then clear acres of bird habitat while birds were nesting and raising young. The province is well aware that disturbance on the riparian areas will greatly reduce the viable habitat and diversity of the wetlands further down the slope. This carbon sink with its orchids, pitcher plants, amphibians and abundant wildlife will be vastly compromised and likely irreparably destroyed. The area could easily have been allowed to function as it's is supposed to with housing somewhere else.
3.	I sent this letter on Aug 24, 2022. Please include it together with the 2 documents given in the links at the end. Dear Premier Houston, Ministers Lohr and Halman, Mayor Savage & Councillors, Kevin Neattl have attached a document "An Open Letter in support of William Zebedee's Appeal of Wetland Alteration Approval [REDACTED] Can we all take a sober second look at the Southdale Future Growth Node?" for your consideration. It is a lengthy document (21 pages + a 12 page Appendix with figures), The gist of it is given in Section 1: Introduction and Summary (pages 2-6), also in shorter form by Section 5: Conclusion, copied below. 5. Conclusion Evidently, the LSA was the major source of information about possible environmental impacts of the Clayton Developments proposal. However the LSA clearly failed to identify some key characteristics of the site and some very significant potential environmental impacts, and downplayed the ecological significance of the site, its role as habitat, in landscape connectivity and in carbon sequestration and storage. The LSA was mostly a desktop study and relied on existing information about the wetland which is mostly coarse scale information; there have been few published ground observations. Some highly pertinent observations. e.g., the bird study and the drone footage obtained by the Protect Eisner Cove Wetland group, and some of my observations were made subsequent to LSA. For whatever reason, reference to a WESP report on the site dated June 8, 2021 is entirely lacking in the LSA. I have suggested, based on my informal visits to the site, that had local naturalists known about and visited the Southdale site prior to development of the Halifax Green Network Plan, it probably would have been recognized in the HGPN as ecologically significant site. The independently conducted WESP study lends support to that contention. It appears in turn that the LSA was not critically reviewed by staff and few if any councillors read document critically or at all. So in a sense 'we collectively messed up' with the exception of the Protect Eisner Cover Wetland group who have struggled to have their concerns given serious consideration. It is still early on in the development process. Surely now, the right thing to do is to take a sober second look at the Southdale Future Growth Node. I very much appreciate your review of this document. Sincerely– David Patriquin, on behalf of the NS Wild Flora Society and the Halifax Field Naturalists David Patriquin Professor of Biology (retired) Dalhousie University There are two attachments http://nswildflora.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/PatriquinLetter24Aug2022SpCor.pdf PatriquinLetterAppendix24Aug2022
4.	Woefully, inadequate, misleading and incorrect. Ignores the actual wetland boundaries, known species at risk (bats and turtles), hydrogeology is just plain wrong as there are multiple streams in the area. If the reports were accurate, the site would be ineligible for development based on federal, provincial and municipal laws and policy.

5.	I am fully and vehemently against development taking place in ecologically sensitive areas. This includes forest spaces that serve as habitat for wild animals and birds and under no circumstances should waterways or wetlands be disturbed. There are plenty of sites suitable for development in HRM, without forests and green spaces being obliterated. We are facing a climate crisis and threatening our natural spaces for the sake of development is unethical, disgusting and should be illegal.
6.	I do not support this development; the proposed area includes important unique wetlands that are vital to our community. Substantial further research into the irreversible environmental impact this development would cause is needed. Please do your due diligence, and choose an appropriate alternate location for such a development.
7.	I'm very concerned about the impact on the local wildlife. My family does a lot of walking through the trail and we have seen plenty of animals and evidence of animals in the area.
8.	This is a native wetland, and home to a variety of species. It is green space in an area where there isn't much green left. This is a carbon sink and its removal will contribute further to radical climate change. This is not about affordable accommodation - it's about lining the pockets of yet another developer. Destruction of wetlands and forests is fueling climate change. We need the oxygen produced here, especially in city locations. There is no mitigating the destruction. This should never be allowed to happen.
9.	Your plans are destroying a wetland and its accompanying borders. This is extremely bad for the environment, biodiversity, climate change and is bad planning on your part. Water would have to be diverted as the environment that was/will be destroyed will no longer be controlling the wetlands. You are therefore building homes in a potential floodplain. People will have to deal with that water on their properties. From the described plans - there is nothing affordable about these homes. Using old figures to back up false affordability. There have been claims of backroom deals, and work tearing into the landscape prior to the permits. All too familiar bad business practices with these sort of deals where important biodiversity and healthy lands/wetlands that are seen by developers as cheap scrub lands. When they are in fact all important to turning around climate change and preserving, yeah saving our environmental health. There are also species at risk in this area. Other lands are available. Other lands that do not cause the destruction this development does. The days of destroying valuable wetlands has to stop. Destroying the environment has to stop. And it all has to stop now.
10.	I am an HRM citizen and feel extremely strongly that clear cutting Eiseners Cove Wetland is a very extreme and wrong thing to do in this modern day of ecological knowledge and global warming!! Now is the time to protect untouched wetlands that put clean air back into the environment. The old idea of planting a tree to make up for deforestation is no longer!! Monoculture is the death of endangered species and wildlife. Planting evergreen trees is not saving the environment. Saving pristine wetlands and Alex angered species is saving our environment!! Why don't we become environmental leaders in this country ?? Rich men can still Build houses on already decimated land!The real joke here is that these are not affordable houses by any stretch! This is pure greed by a wealthy few that benefit while hundreds of thousands of insects, trees and species are completely destroyed! We lack the appreciation of the fact that fungi, mushrooms, , spores, mosses, insects , pollinators and songbirds need very specific trees and places to live. We are a society that thinks animals thrive in zoos and enclosures!! They do not!! Human existence NEEDS variety and these wetlands provide a biodiversity of epic proportions!! This wetland should be left pristine and intact!! It has many endangered species living in it and our government needs to be held accountable for protecting them. Not just lip service!! I write this to implore the Nova Scotia Government to save Eisners Cove Wetland at all costs!!! Sincerely, A very Concerned Taxpayer and HRM Citizen, Lorraine Simmons-Yerian [REDACTED]

11. This area should be preserved as public space. We are so fortunate to have wetlands at our doorstep. Wetlands will become more valuable as time progresses and climate change continues. Failure to underestimate the value of this land will be irreversible	
12. After lockdown we all seeked green spaces, forest to go for a walk for mental health, exercise? Stop the clear cutting and swap to another area that is already cleared?? Clayton is 65 yrs in business? Well, they have not even a care in the world where they build. There are active migratory birds nest in there right now. They are breaking laws. How can they get away with destroying such a place that is perfect to help climate change also.. I suppose AJ legrow whom so called owns this land is the tin man, with no care about our future?? Just another wetland, forest ? Who cares?? Then why the heck did Houston come out with climate / carbon speech??? Cutting trees in that amount releases carbon?? There is no affordable housing being built in the proposal. I know the current government is not going to get my vote.. turns my stomach my home of over 50 years is being stripped to nothing .	
13. They are great. Please incorporate the trails to make use of the land. Add a walkway across circ near gaston. Dont be chased out by NIMBYs	i. The outlined plans are destroying our communities wetland and its accompanying borders. This is extremely bad for the environment, biodiversity, climate change and is poor planning on your part. Water would have to be diverted as the environment that was/will be destroyed will no longer be controlling the wetlands. You are therefore building homes in a potential floodplain. People will have to deal with that water on their properties. From the described plans - there is nothing affordable about these homes. Using old figures to back up false affordability. There have been claims of backroom deals, and work tearing into the landscape prior to the permits. All too familiar bad business practices with these sort of deals where important biodiversity and healthy lands/wetlands that are seen by developers as cheap scrub lands. When they are in fact all important to turning around climate change and preserving, yeah saving our environmental health. There are also species at risk in this area. This is one of the last connecting areas to the woodlands that run towards eastern passage. (Over the years I've seen Bob cats, deer, bear, squirrels etc) Other lands are available and more appropriate. Other lands that do not cause the environmental destruction this development does. The days of destroying valuable and irreplaceable wetlands has to stop. Destroying the environment has to stop. And it all has to stop now.
14. Has this area already been clear cut?	
15. Well if it's like the Eisner wetlands, what we think doesn't matter. Money talks. There is no environmentalist on the committee, just as self interested builder.	
16. This project needs to be canceled ASAP. Build some place else.	
17. Please build these houses. We are in a housing crisis.	The current residents of Southdale are massive hypocrites. It was fine to destroy wildlife habitat to build their houses, but apparently nobody else is allowed to build a home. In fact anyone who is opposing this development with a roof over their head is a hypocrite.

This is a great piece of land inside the circ that is prime for development. Would rather build here than further away and increase car pollution for people coming to the city.
18. One quick direct irrelevant question? And this is consultation? This is a joke right?
19. Stop developing on wetland and stop clear cutting forests
20. First I want to say the development process put in place by the provinces is horably flawed as it operates in a manner disconnected from the affected community. Secondly the secretive process does not sufficiently consider the key points and objection presented by the community and offers little credible mechanism for appeal. Thirdly the process is neglecting the environmental impact on the wetland and green space that buffer the wetland and contains a robust mixture of flora and fauna. Without an enhanced buffer the wetland will be jeopardized and we will lose a space that helps our society both emotionally and environmentally. We will not forget the egregious failure of our government.
21. I love it! So happy to see such a great development planned for the area at a time when housing is so desperately needed.
22. Please pause all site preparation and construction until the public consultation period is completed.
23. Additional housing within the city is needed. If the developer and City can propose a plan that protects the environment and increases housing than that's a win win. Please encourage minimal damage to the wetland. We need places for people to live as this will help to stabilize our housing market. In any new developments in the city, including new condos and apartments there should be a rule where x percentage of the building has affordable units that will always be affordable. This will prevent having "affordable" areas for people to live that sometimes create a stigma for that area. It will increase inclusiveness making our city better as a whole!
24.
25. Dear Councilors, MLAs and MPs, I am writing to you all today concerning the proposed development for the "Southdale Future Growth Node". I am a member of the "Friends of Eisner's Cove Wetland" group and a lifelong resident of the area. I am asking that you protect the Eisner's Cove Wetland by halting development along the steep supportive forested slopes contained in the "Southdale Future Growth Node" area as proposed by Zzap Consulting and Clayton Developments on behalf of the landowner A.J. Legrow Holdings Limited. WHY? CLIMATE CHANGE: I would say a wetland is priceless, however, I did some rough calculations that I think you would find compelling. Undisturbed peatlands accumulate carbon from the air at a rate of up to 0.7 tonnes per hectare per year. The Wildlife Trusts in the UK have estimated that a 2m deep peatland stores 8,000 tonnes of carbon per hectare. Eisner Cove Wetland is estimated to be 15 hectares (out of a 40 hectare forested lot), meaning it could potentially store 120,000 tonnes of carbon. The minimum national carbon pollution price in Canada will rise from \$65/tonne in 2023 to \$170/tonne in 2030. Meaning losing Eisner's Cove Wetland has a one time cost of \$20,400,000! Interesting fact: Although they only occupy 3% of the global land area, peatlands contain about 25% of global soil carbon — twice as much as the world's forests. Retired Dalhousie Biology professor David Patriquin took pH readings of Eisner's Cove Wetland and found they are already at the extreme end of what many of the wetland species require to survive. pH values go up with urbanization. His opinion is that even with the minimum required setback from the wetland, this development, along with all the runoff, especially from road salt, will surely kill this sensitive ecosystem. MENTAL HEALTH: We are in a time of mental health crises. Researchers from Denmark's University of Aarhus found that citizens who grew up with the least green space nearby had as much as a 55 percent increased risk of developing psychiatric disorders such as depression, anxiety, and substance abuse in later years. They found that childhood exposure to green space was especially critical. If this development goes through the city would be adding 700 units to the area. This number rises quickly with surrounding developments such as the Vista on Pleasant, the Penhorn Mall Lands with 950 units, and the ever growing Baker Drive developments. The city is looking at adding thousands of people to the area, yet it is also going to demolish the last large urban forest and wetland within the city center limits. We need to do better and

protect what's irreplaceable. Build on less significant land, repurpose underutilized city spaces, build up! This wetland has played a significant role in my childhood and adulthood alike. I got lost in that swamp and explored endlessly as a young girl, it helped me escape hard times at home and at school, it was a lifeline. It sparked an interest in biology which led me to study and research ecology at Acadia. More recently it's been a sense of peace to escape to during lockdowns and in stressful times. For all that this space has provided me, provides for our environment, and can provide for our citizens and future children, I will not let it be taken down without a fight. Sincerely, Tara
26. How did this piece of former Crown land get significantly devalued and then sold to a private developer for a cut throat rate? "Attainable" housing is not affordable housing. That is a word play used by the developer to give the appearance that this development is going to somehow provide housing for those who desperately need it. It is not. And where are all the ground truthing studies on the flora and fauna of this parcel of land? Apparently, there are none done by the developer or the province when it own the land. There is far more value for everyone in this land if it remains intact. The developer will be the biggest winner in all of this if the development proceeds. The wetland will be destroyed. The carbon it is holding will be released, and once again, humans will allow greed for money trump nature. Stop this development and take the land back, make it into a protected wilderness area, and find a more suitable place for Clayton Development to build (and make sure they pay true market value for the land and not some stinky, backroom deal that sees the land devalued from over a million bucks to a few hundred thousand). The days of dirty backroom deals are ending here!
27. Where are the dedicated bicycle paths? No mention of solar panels? EV chargers? Heat humps? What energy efficiency levels for these houses and buildings being built in a climate emergency? This is 2022, not 1953. You are removing woodlands, which will harm the wetland, for this kind of urban suburb? Why was this public land sold to a developer in the first place, and so quietly? It should have remained wild, as an urban green space and biodiversity sink, and in public hands. There is so much room for more density in HRM, and there are large former industrial sites that could be used for housing to alleviate the crisis. The only thing this ill-planned project will alleviate is the developers' bottom lines. Shame on the province for fast-tracking this (cutting has already begun and NOW you ask for public consultation???) behind closed doors where a hand-picked "task force" meets and decides, and on HRM for not challenging it. Absolutely pathetic.
28. Doesn't seem too bad. Setback from the marsh could be larger, though
29. My major concern with the development of this area is the water runoff. I have been a member of this community pretty much my entire life, 47 years, and honestly have been anticipating this area to be developed long before now. That said the run off from the area is substantial and I'm not sure if anyone really realizes just how much water flows from that area. Around the early 80's, if my memory is correct, we lost a 6/7 year old boy in the culvert behind the duplexes on Clement St. There is a 4' culvert that takes the drainage water from the undeveloped property, down through the old path between Hastings Dr and Fenwick St and then hooks into one of the city's runoff systems. Anyways there was so much water coming from the property into the pipe that this poor child (I believe he lived in the duplexes at the time) was swept into the pipe and became stuck due to the force of the runoff. A fence was later installed around the pipe to avoid future tragedies. I currently live in Maple Ridge Estates and Killiam has had to spend, what I would guess to be, hundreds of thousands of dollars in drainage due to the run off coming from the "development property." My driveway was literally being washed out and I have pictures of how much water would come through my property during a heavy rain. Killiam installed 3 sections of drainage just to correct the water in my driveway, that's not including the drainage added to the field/park to prevent further flooding. The amount of runoff water that comes from this "development property" should be seriously looked at and ensured is accounted for during this development or else there could be some serious long term damage to either the new or current properties in the area.

Lee Anne Hacquoil

If you have questions or concerns please contact me at [REDACTED]

30. Eisner's Cove wetland and forest is our version of Halifax's Public Gardens.

It is a necessary piece of wild space that we need — not only for a quiet, nature getaway for the soul, but also for flood mitigation, carbon storage, community coolness, biodiversity, etc. Reducing its size and health makes no sense, especially when cities around the world are trying to rebuild wetlands and forests.

31. With all the vacant lots and sites that can be reclaimed (like imperial oil) in hrm can be used for housing clearing cutting a fragile eco system and disturbing if not destroying a valuable wetland is outrageous. Not to mention the province quietly selling this 124 acres of public land in the city to a developer (A J LeGrow) for the price of medium sized house. Not sure who LeGrow is but I wouldn't be surprised if he was well connected to the Liberal party at the time. The whole thing stinks.

32. This development must be stopped immediately!

33. The Southdale housing plan needs to be scrapped immediately. We have enough evidence supporting the prioritization of wetland that this shouldn't even be an issue. Stop the demolition, stop the cutting. Stop it now. This wetland needs to be protected as an important carbon sink in the area and an important wildlife corridor. The information is out there to support protection - don't ignore it.

34. I am against the development of this property as the government is doing what the previous government did with Owls Head and made their own rules without an environment study or a traffic study .

35. a) the development plan is in violation of Aboriginal Rights; Territorial Rights, Individual Human Rights, and Collective Community Rights.b) the development plan is in violation of Canada's national Biodiversity goals (2020), and in particular violates Goal A, Target 3 & 4 post 2020. As well is UN 2050 Goal A, milestone A.1; UN 2030 action targets 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 21

36. I am unable to attach a separate document, so will send this direct to City Clerk for inclusion.

37. With climate change happening, no wetland should be destroyed. It all needs to be preserved. That is common sense. Mi'kmaw were not consulted when this land first switched from crown land, so all of this is not legal.

38. Wetland Offset issue:

no offset should be permitted. this doesnt meet the National nor UN goals of wetland protection, nor biodiversity protection.

Only 6% issue;

NS hasnt got the territory to meet the required goals of biodiversity protection; incremental 6% here, another 6% there; we have no means of measuring cumulative impacts, just common sense and gut feel. my feeling is that 6% is too much.

Privately Owned Land issue:

The land was once owned by the Province. Then sold. Now under the rules of "as of right". gives the impression of ... we can get around that issue by ... tactic. but that is just my feeling from what I am reading. just a feeling; not data to support. insert face mogi. 😏

Housing reqmts issue:

I totally agree we have failed in duty of care for societal "housing" issues. I can connect. My feeling, however, is that priority is for land preservation. My feeling is that priorities have not been set properly with regard to Eisner Cove heritage property protection (ie. more than was

the rules/legislation calls for in identification of a wetland and the boundaries; the buffer zones are far to small; 500 yards min is required).
39. Does anyone outside the group doing this have any say at all with what they are doing to Southdale?
40. The site should remain a forest and wetland for obvious environmental reasons. There are better sites to build on, like Shannon Park.
41. I believe that this is a suitable site for a housing development and I think new housing stock is very needed in this area right now. My support for the proposal is conditional on its inclusion of a significant proportion of deeply affordable units. I have reviewed the available documents and have not been able to find the number of affordable units to be included, or the definition of "affordable" in this case. I believe that affordability should be determined with reference to the current minimum wage in Nova Scotia rather than market averages, as skyrocketing rents are unaffordable to most and are forcing renters into precarious situations to avoid homelessness. I would want to see any affordable units included such that a full-time minimum wage earning single parent could afford a two bedroom; my estimate is that would put rent for a two bedroom around \$600/month (based on a max. rent of 30% of monthly income). The city of Halifax is under significant pressure to address the current housing crisis. Putting conditions on new developments to include a large proportion of genuinely affordable housing would be a very positive step in the right direction.
42. Why not consider a retirement community like The Crossing in Windsor. There is nothing like that in the city and seniors don't want to move way out of town. This location is close to the hospital and all services, it would be ideal for seniors.
43. This area should not be developed and should be protected as a Park. Development of this area will increase flooding with more extreme weather events predicted. These wetlands already acts as a sponge protecting surrounding areas from flooding. Housing planned is not going to help those who are struggling with housing affordability since these are not "geared to income" housing but "attainable" housing (whatever that means - 80% of market rents is not affordable to those in need). Lots of other vacant lots that already have existing services. Plus the builder bought these lands at a huge discount because they were zoned as Natural Resources and not intended for Development. Another shady deal between government and developers with deep pockets.
44. What is currently on this land ? I followed a link and came here without access to the info you're asking for my comments on. Is this comment area the full extent of feedback ? Does the Executive Panel on Housing contain any environmental representatives or just builders whose only interest is making money? We need more mini home parks and tiny homes as they are affordable.
45. Not in favour of the sale that happened of public hands to the developer. It shouldn't have happened. Now, we (taxpayers) need to buy it back and keep it public.
46. Please, please don't destroy any wetlands or habitats for animals
47. This has been a natural, wildlife area for as long as anyone can remember. While housing is critical, an incredible old growth to old (100 plus years) reestablished ecosystem within a larger urban centre is beyond any housing or economic gain. This area provides for carbon sequestering, heat sinking, air filtering, water filtration, flood abatement, a wildlife corridor as well as critical wildlife habit to migratory birds, owls, hawks, otters, turtles, potential endangered native flora and fauna that has not been subject to a full environmental assessment. Further, the upper slope of this area and subsequent filtration and runoff into a wetland requires far greater consideration than a small buffer zone that is woefully inadequate. Not only does this project demonstrate a lack of knowledge about wetlands and their surrounding ecosystem, but a total disregard for the importance of such critical spaces to all of us. These ecosystems are invaluable and should always be protected now and for future generations. Once gone they are impossible to replace. Each one is unique and can house so much diversity in native flora and fauna, that some is yet unknown. Habitate loss is the single

largest threat to wildlife and biodiversity and yet the proposal is to raze it to the ground, for enlarge the benefit of developers. There are numerous locations throughout Nova Scotia that are already available for development or could readily be developed without devastating destruction to a wetland and a substantial older growth, established ecosystem. They won't make developers as much profit but they will provide for safe, affordable housing. The Province has drastically overstep its bounds and has not considered the long term planning of major municipalities. This planning includes housing but also green spaces, natural spaces, traffic flow, density of use, schools, transportation, shopping etc.. HRM is developing boulevards of native plants, aware of the importance of pollinators and providing habitat. For less than the money they will spend over the next few years this entire property could have been acquired by HRM instead of going directly to a developer. CROWN LANDS should ALWAYS first be considered for protection, then offered as a return to First Nation possession, special interest groups, municipalities, ... only lastly as a private sale. CROWN and Provincial land DOES NOT belong to the government, it belongs to the people and before that it belongs to nature. Throughout the Province people are being vocal and demonstrating the importance of several areas wantonly scheduled for demolition without concern for long term impacts. This is done without financial gain, at their own expense both financially and socially, and done for the benefit of all of use. At all levels of government we need to address these concerns. The concerns, demonstrated impacts, knowledge brought forward, etc are made by the very people who know these areas well and understand the consequences of short-term, nearsighted, poorly planned decisions. If we continue on this current path we will soon destroy the very things that make our Province so beautiful, cherished worldwide, and critical to a wide area of species. PLEASE RETHINK THESE DECISIONS. RETURN EISNER WETLAND AND THE SOUTHDAL Ecosystem AND THE OTHER AREAS OF CONCERN TO THEIR PRIOR STATUS OR BETTER STILL, PROTECT THEM ALL. Thank you for your consideration. G.L. Thomas Sydney, NOVA SCOTIA	
48. Lets get it built.	
49. In spite of your attempted assurances that the wetland will be largely protected, anecdotal evidence suggests that this is not necessarily the case. The planned construction activity is sure to result in habitat destruction, and ultimately in the death of the wetland. Therefore, my position is firmly against any attempt to develop any of this area.	
50. Leave the whole area alone, no development. Large forested areas are extremely necessary especially within the city. For the many obvious reasons, oxygen and moisture production, wildlife habitation and for the general well being of citizens.	
51. I support the plan to develop the Southdale site. It is within the city limits and housing is needed for our growing city. Concerns over the wetland are over.. This one tiny wetland contributes almost nothing to the biodiversity of HRM and its vast rural areas. People need to check out google earth to see the vast areas of wetland within HRH. Does anyone consider the lost of biodiversity related to the historical and continued development of our city (Dartmouth Crossing?). Opposition is just a bunch of people who don't want changes in their backyard, including the additional traffic. They and I don't have the right to restrict the rights of others to live in this planned development just because we don't like change. There was once a brook running down Old Ferry Road from Maynard Lake that is underground now. Maybe I should be lobbying to daylight that brook. Rick Horne [REDACTED]	
52. Deforestation is the root cause of climate disruption. Oxygen and moisture loss predominately. Also wildlife within the city needs a place to live. Keep development out of that area to maintain our need for clean air and healthy environment within the bounds of our city.	
53. Wet lands are so valuable that even a small loss is not acceptable. Climate change, environmental issues and public housing are all important to me	

Is Shannon park area being considered for affordable housing?
54. I participated in the first public consultation meeting regarding to proposed development for the Southdale Growth Node. I live in the Southdale community, off of Pleasant Street, directly in between two significant residential/commercial developments anticipated to bring housing into the area; to the north of me at the old Salvation Army property; and to the south on the lot bordered by Southdale, Prince Arthur and Pleasant streets. Additionally, on the other side of the neighbourhood, I participated in the community consultation process that will see that a three building condo development is built on Portland behind Rodney (which includes the removal of a small wooded area to add the third building). I absolutely support the need for housing development that is aligned with the values of this community. Housing is needed that is accessible, affordable and sustainable. And although, I'm not looking forward to the nuisance of years of construction and increased density in my front yard, I still support it so long as it's done right. In the case of the Southdale Future Growth Node, I wish to express my support with the Protect Eisner Cove group and ask that the HRM and Province of Nova Scotia cease the housing development in the Eisner Cove Wetland. While it has been stated by HRM Council that we need to add density to the core, we have several places throughout the urban core of Dartmouth where this is being pursued. I do not agree that we need to develop housing adjacent to a wetland. I echo the sentiments of many of the speakers at the February 2022 public consultation meeting in stating that once this green space is gone, we cannot get it back. Further, from even just a monetary perspective, it's value is too great to disturb. Lastly, if developing these lands is to seriously move forward, I believe that the Province owes it to the community to proceed with a thorough and vigorous consultation process, focussing on environmental sustainability of the wetland. This should be a minimum standard. Return the process to the municipality. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please consider this response as my feedback related to submitted plans on the Southdale site.
55. I have lived in the area for over 10plus years. This is my home and this is my community. Others flock to our beautiful province of Nova Scotia, and wish to make it their home as well. They come here for our green spaces , our lakes and oceans. Our maritime scenery. They come because we seemed the safest during COVID, we have land like no other, which all can develop and make a profit from. But when all the green space is gone there will be nothing left to profit from and people will move on. And we will be left just like other provinces and places, a concrete jungle. We perhaps are having a construction boom and a demand for housing as such right now, but I believe it's temporary. We as Nova Scotians need to protect what space we have left for our future generations, those who have real roots in the community and have been here before this boom and will remain here after the boom. Our natural green spaces within our city limits are very few and far between, we need them, we require them, and it's part of what make us here in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia so great! After all isn't that part of the reason these Temporary people came to our home. I believe Eisner Cove should remain untouched, let the birds remain nesting, the deer continue to roam and let's all look after and out for these areas together. Let our Nova Scotia and what we have stay strong, stay green and stick together!
56. THe Portucana proposal appears very crowded, with no recreation space available for residents, and buildings very close to each other.
57. I am concerned about the displacement of the animals and the clear cutting of the natural plants and ecosystem.
58. The plan is trying to maximize on the amount of dwellings you can fit into one space. Cut it in half and keep a nature/wildlife corridor.
59. I support the development. However, I hope that there will be enough trees left along the entire perimeter of the development to cut the wind. I live across the street on Holtwood court and there are times I cannot open my balcony door as the wind is so strong, and it is often windy.
60. I am very unconvinced that this project will provide affordable housing. And that the end goal will conclude in having homes that are more care dependent due to our crumbling public transit (especially in dartmouth) and too expensive for the majority of nova scotians to live in. I have

been trying to find where they may have estimates on the costs of living in these areas. I live around this area and have found it extremely difficult to get access to transit while so much of our land is presently being occupied by empty parking lots. I do not think this project is going to be as affordable or useful for our province.
61. The design of the development is beautifully done; however where it is located at in Eisner Cove Wetlands should not be disturbed. There will be run off from road salt, car exhaust, pollution from pets and of course pollution from people residing there. There has been talk the houses and apartments are attainable or even affordable. The newly constructed apartments that are close to the area off of Basswood Run are hardly affordable. They rent at approximately \$2,195.00 for a 2 bedroom 2 bath apartment a month. What will the apartments rent for and what will the asking price be for the the places for sale? While housing is needed, this land is needed more. If it dug up for housing, carbons will be released rather than absorbed. What will happen to the surrounding areas like Maple Ridge Park? It could start flooding and endanger the tenants living there or displace them. What about the people living on Lynn Drive or Fenwick St? It could cause flooding as well, cause more traffic. What about Dartmouth South Academy? It can hold up to 730 students. In 2021 there were 651 students. With the nearby school almost at compacity it is concerning for over crowding if the new development does happen at Eisner Cove Wetlands. There are countless animals living there that will have to migrate and may get hit by the traffic. There are many different floral and fauna there. They provide food, and shelter to the animals living there, migrating birds, butterflies and bees etc. I would really like the city to reconsider this land being destroyed as I believe there is too much to lose compared to what will be gained. Thank you for reading this and please reconsider the destruction of this wonderful place.
62. I think that this area should not be developed whatsoever. Even a small percentage being developed, will affect a much greater area of wildlife and natural habitat. Construction can easily disrupt natural cycles, biodiversity and ecosystems, even just being in close proximity. I don't think this area makes sense to develop, there are many other areas to choose, and that council and HRM are NOT listening to the public's opinion on this, because it is clearly against the development here. Having HRP violently enforce rule at construction sites is not the answer.
63. What's the point now? Since the destruction has already begun??
64. I think it's all great to being in new developments. However, if the planners do not stick to what is said in their plans then it defeats the point. It has to stay positive and listen to the demands of the people
65. People need a place to live, i believe this is a used piece of land surrounded by a highway and a industrial/trailer park that could easily be developed. This is hardly a busting wildlife zone. Build affordable housing to get some of these people off of the streets/rental slums
66. We need as much housing as we can possibly get right now. I am all for it.
67. I'm all for protecting wildlife , how ever we need more affordable housing for people !!
68. You have taken enough of our environment away from animals and other healthy living organisms within it. Time to start thinking about saving this world rather than destroy it. Do you want your following generations of kids, grandkids, great grandkids and so on to live when they're born into this world? Or do you want no world for them to be born into?
69. The development should be moved to a disturbed piece of property with no natural use.
70. I am greatly concerned about the city's decision to begin construction within our wetlands. The wetlands help sequester carbon from the atmosphere which can help reverse climate change. Preserving our wetlands should be a main priority for the province of nova scotia.
71. I believe this is a ridiculous reason to destroy the wet lands, it's disturbing the whole ecosystem in that tiny piece of land just to allow room for some more housing that Nova Scotia could build housing on already developed land, which we have tons of developed parking lots and housing that the government won't fix up and build housing on
72. There should have been an environmental assessment on this land.

73. The current approach to developing this area is an embarrassment. The province is listening to no one, and is destroying a beautiful and ecologically vital piece of land.
74. I am in favour of affordable housing if it is truly affordable - but not when it is built on top of wetlands that need protecting. With the growing climate crisis we need to be protecting these spaces, not building over them. Is there not an already developed and abandoned site that can be used? That work has taken place before the public has a chance to speak on the issues is incredibly disheartening. Please reconsider this location.
75. Hello. I was born and raised in Nova Scotia but was forced to move internationally due to the lack of work in my field locally. I have recently returned to the Dartmouth area with my family and found the housing market impossible to navigate due to rapidly rising prices. Despite the fact that my wife and I have savings and both work full-time in professional capacities, our dream of homeownership in Dartmouth still seems like, well, a dream. Dartmouth desperately needs attainable housing for young families to enter the housing market. Developments like the proposed Southdale site are one of the reasons my family have decided to stay in Nova Scotia rather than leaving (again) for another province or country. By all means, take the steps necessary to negate the environmental impact of the development. But please do not assume that the loud voices raised in opposition to this project are the majority - many young families in neighborhoods surrounding the proposed site are eager to see it take shape! Thanks for your time.
76. I feel that any new, affordable housing would be a good thing as long as the area(s) chosen for it have adequate services and infrastructure to accommodate the number of people expected to reside there
77. Forests are our protection against climate change and we need to protect this area
78. As a resident of Southdale, I strongly object to the planned developments and the inevitable destruction of essential wetland biodiversity. This land has remained untouched for decades, withstanding developments dating back to the 1930s and 40s. My grandparents built their first home here in the late 1950s--a multistory family home that was affordable and well-built, and still houses families to this day. The planned developments will not offer affordable, accessible family housing, and will offer only over-priced, cheaply built units. And even if they would deliver attainable housing, they would not be worth the cost of the wetland. Any disruption of this area will impact wildlife. We already have deer, rabbits, raccoons, and well over 20 bird species inhabiting our urban backyard. The natural habitat here cannot withstand more invasion.
79. It's a terrible idea and plan to destroy our wetlands. There's plenty of other options in HRM including but, not Shannon Park
80. I am disappointed and frustrated by the lack of public consultation before Clayton Developments proceeded with pre cutting in advance of development of the SouthDale Node. I would like to see significantly more ecological protection of the wetland as the revised development plan is not sufficient. Thank you.

81. Hello, I would like to express my concern regarding the early land clearing and proposed development of the Eisner Cove Wetland. The response from the government regarding this project has been disappointing. The lack of engagement and unwillingness to have meaningful discussions (ie the response (dated Sept 8, 2022) to Claudia Chender's letter) is disheartening and frankly - cagey. This project is promising very little - the proposed housing will not be affordable (but 'attainable') and the environmental offset suggested via Ducks Unlimited does not compare to the destruction of a natural wetland. As a Southdale resident, I am sure I am not alone in my concern. I hope for detailed and thoughtful reasoning behind the decisions made thus far and meaningful community engagement going forward. Thank you
82. Tell Clayton Developments/Shaw Group and their investors to stop destroying Eisner Wetland, the Wild Life & the Ecosystem. The already overstuffed pockets of these businessmen and their investors will survive if this development does not go ahead. We can not say the same about our Environment. Please stop the destruction.
83. It is difficult for me articulate how disappointed I am with both our city and provincial governments. Nova Scotia crown land was sold for a pittance without public tender and without consulting Mi'kmaq. The assessed value of the land increased, like most other properties, over the past twenty years, then dropped in value by 75% in 2020, the year it was quietly sold to a private developer. The cost for a FOIPOP to understand how the Crown land was sold was quoted in the thousands of dollars, so we may never know the details. Which city, private, and government officials were involved? Was this corruption or just horrible policy? At a minimum, this is a master class in how to disengage the public in how to shape our city. I am aware this is not the feedback you are looking for, but this request for comments feels like a futile facade, the goal of which is to check off a box to say that the public was consulted. I feel do disengaged from the process that I am not going to waste any more time writing. The city and province are going to do whatever the developers demand. Money talks.
84. I have read the draft policies and the proposal from Clayton Developments. I have to say I am exited about this project and have been since I received the first mailing a year or so ago. The terms affordable housing and attainable housing have really struck a chord with me. We were fortunate to have owned a home as a family with 3 children. So many people in HRM will never achieve that dream. Some find it difficult or impossible to even afford a decent roof over their heads. I know there are environmental concerns regarding the wetlands. I can see the protesters at Eisner Cove from the apartment where we now live. I was impressed when I read that Ducks Unlimited Canada will assist in the construction of wetlands to offset the access road alteration. According to the mailing we received A. J. Legrow Ltd. is considering three 4 - 8 story buildings and Portucana Holdings Ltd. is considering 12 4 - 8 story buildings. I would not like to see 8 story buildings in this area. When you look around the Baker Drive neighborhood, none of the several apartment buildings are 8 story. I believe 5 - 6 is what we see. Thank you for providing this opportunity for me to express my view. Joyce Hiltz
85. I don't feel it is necessary to have a development displace a precious wetland for the sake of greed. Please so not proceed!

86. Will the housing be truly affordable? To whom? Will it be subsidized, and less than 30% of one's income? Any development is unnecessary and harmful at this point of the housing crisis, unless it is meeting this criteria, and I strongly disagree with any wetland development unless the proposed development will be TRULY affordable.
87. Unfortunately the way that this project was planned is completely unacceptable. Taking away the community's right and opportunity to have input is criminal. Handing the committee over to five unknown individuals and allowing no access to them is unheard of! Why was this done? Clearly there can be only one answer and that is too allow construction activities that would not otherwise be allowed. Why was the sale of this property carried out without public consultation? Why was it sold for so little when it was clearly worth more as the assessments gave evidence of? There was not an adequate traffic survey of the Lynn Drive neighborhood? One was done on a Sunday! The increase in traffic in this and surrounding areas will be very significant! Those good folk should have been heard! With increased traffic the value of their homes will no doubt be adversely affected not to mention their quiet and safe enjoyment of their homes! What about the influx of new students to the newly built Southdale school? Was this a consideration? We, the public don't know because there was no public reporting or consultation! Between the Southdale and Penhorn buildings one would have to believe there will be a considerable increase in the number of students. There was not an adequate environmental assessment carried out on the wetland! This wetland is irreplaceable in terms of the environment! The federal government is conducting a campaign to save wetlands! Why would our province then knowingly destroy the last existing wetland in our city? Why would you consider allowing the construction of a causeway right across the wetland area effectively destroying it? Why is the special planning committee ignoring guidelines in place to allow an adequate buffer between wetland and homes? Who is caring for our environment! Clearly not our government! Why are you forcing the good people of this city to have to try to protect this special area. You were elected and it is your job to protect the environment! Our planet is in danger! This area is home to many animals and migratory birds. They matter! How can the province be so uncaring! Finally, let's stop trying to fool the people with the talk of affordable housing! We are not stupid. None of this housing will be affordable to any of this city's housing vulnerable! SO JUST STOP LYING! STOP LINING THE POCKETS OF THE CONTRACTORS WITH HAND OUTS AND START CARING ABOUT OUR ENVIRONMENT!
88. Where are the kids from all of these homes going to attend school. We just opened a new school and it is FULL
89. It should be illegal to develop, destroy or disrupt in any way. Eisner Cove Wetland that has sadly been clear cut should now be converted to a protected parkland!
90. What is the point in making any comments? The land should be left as is. The City has been overruled by the Provincial Gov't in this matter and thus it is decided. It will be built on. The housing, while needed, is not affordable to anyone who is unhoused at present. Therefore the reason the Provincial Gov't gave for ramrodding this through the approval process is irrelevant So it is goodbye to Eisner's Cove woodlands, hello to more concrete, asphalt and ricky-ticky boxes. Therefore planning by the city has not moved on from when I was in that Dept. in the 1970s. Why do you think the Metro Centre is where it is? The Provincial gov't decided that that is where they wanted it. Q.E.D.

91. comment: what will happen to the south dale community, as most of them low income, are this plan will improve their futures regarding the affordable housing rents and other services, or make worse than current time in regard of high rents.
92. You have no business selling off crown land and destroying valuable to us all wetlands in the process. Shame on you. You can be sure that you'll be voted out at the next election but unfortunately, your neanderthal choices will have already negatively impacted the well being of Nova Scotians and future generations to come. I simply can't believe in this day and age small little government minds are still doing small little government things.
93. Much of the draft policies, agreement and plans sound reassuring on paper but, in practice, developers have already clearcut large swaths of the wetland's protective barrier of trees, and they're already treating land once held in common as private property.
94. Would strongly prefer that the wetlands were left undeveloped.
95. Please do not approve destroying the Eisner Cove wetland. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. Wetlands do the work of carbon sequestration and water filtration, they provide habitat and breeding grounds for wildlife, are home to diverse flora and pollinators, and they are an abundant source for food and pleasure. They are ecological and environmental powerhouses. I urge you to read this article by Annie Proulx who describes what wetlands mean to we dwellers upon this planet. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/07/04/swamps-can-protect-against-climate-change-if-we-only-let-them
96. You are destroying our Province by over development and not protecting what is left of our wetlands and urban wilderness! You seem to have no regard for our environment. There have to be other lands to build housing on that don't interfere with and destroy animal habitats and wilderness areas! Very disappointed in your government policies..
97. "desktop" analysis of environmental constraints. Not Good Enough! Wetland must be protected
98. This area should be retained for the public good and protected from private development.
99. Th Eisnor wetlands should be left intact. There are birds, plants and insects, etc. which should be allowed to enjoy this habitat. Wetlands are not useless waste space; they are vital carbon sinks. If they are destroyed the opposite will happen; as they are disturbed by development, the sequestered carbon will be released. There are other places that can be "developed" for housing that are better suited. This property was crown land, meaning that it belonged to the citizens of NS and especially to the indigenous peoples of our province, the Mi'kmaw. The land should never have been secretly sold to a developer. I object to this lack of transparency. The public only learns about this transaction and plan after the act and when it appears to be too late. The developer now believes they have permission to begin destroying the protective trees before permission has been given to begin construction. That too is unacceptable to me, and it is illegal. Yet a peaceful protest to stop this destruction is treated by police as the criminal, illegal act. The plans for housing are not for the kind of housing most needed in Halifax and yet the developer has been given \$20+million for this construction. This is my tax money which Shaw and Clayton Developers are far from needing. They have wealth enough to build houses anywhere without provincial help to do so. The viewpoint of HRM planners has been overridden. HRM planned to keep and create forest and wetlands as green spaces in our city, recognizing the need to connect with nature and to provide shade and carbon sinks. Whatever new parkland is created by this development cannot take the place of what is there now. These lands have value as do the species which inhabit them, some rare and endangered species. Why do we have to monetize everything? These life forms have a right to live here, and they contribute to human wellbeing. We are all interdependent and interconnected.

100.	I join many others in strongly advising you to spare Eisner Wetlands an area important as a carbon sink and we need all the natural help we can get in this climate emergency we are facing!!
101.	There is no way the parties involved can spin this into a narrative that demonstrates due, democratic process, factual, objective assessments, studies, reports. Actions taking place on the ground are disgusting, and undemocratic with unnecessarily ambitious police presence. Written responses to other members of government are full of blatant misrepresentation. The current government will see the results come election time. It's amazing to watch such short sighted views and complete disregard for optics. What a legacy all involved are leaving Nova Scotia with. And this is only one instance of many. I really don't know how you all can sleep at night. Someone is asking you for a public meeting. If you were certain of your actions, you would accept. Facts speak loudly. This manner of governance only serves to alienate voters and give rise to interests fueled by unfounded beliefs.
102.	Wetlands everywhere should not be altered in any way. Wetlands are critical to wildlife (animals, birds, fish, insects) in their function as connectors in the cycles of all living things. In addition, wetlands are vital to the natural filtering of water on which all life is dependent. Policies, development agreements and plans have nothing to do with the preservation of natural cycles. In fact these paper instruments have no place anywhere near wetlands and so are meaningless. Your penchant for development at any cost to the natural environment is useless, myopic and destructive. Do not build on wetlands. Wetlands exist for life in the natural environment; they do not provide a solid foundation for man-made development.
103.	Please save Eisener Cove Wetlands. We already have far too little habitat left, we cannot afford to lose any more.
104.	This is not the space to be building a development. Wetlands are important for our environment and no matter what amount a developer makes, doesn't make this right. The optics are also really bad for the government decisions on this, proceeding with clearcutting before this supposed community feedback is accepted. Why should we even give input if you're just going to do whatever you planned and in the first place? The police presence has made this even worse - I saw the video of the policeman hitting that grandmother in the head and was horrified. What an ugly scene that could have been avoided with actual community input and listening to experts and biologists about the importance of this type of wetland. I'm disheartened but honestly not surprised.
105.	Please, please please, protect our wetlands. Wetlands are integral to any reasonable carbon emissions reduction planning, and they are sacred lands to be protected for generations to come. Worse, once they deteriorate, wetlands are costly to restore, and their environmental contributions are impossible to reproduce effectively. If government is committed to reducing carbon emissions, meeting climate emergency targets, and respecting and reflecting Indigenous knowledges, they cannot move forward with wetlands development.
106.	Dear Mr. Lohr: I am originally from Dartmouth and recently learned about this proposed project at Eisner Cove Wetlands. It seems such a shame to allow this important ecological wetland to be destroyed. I do not support the project and would prefer that developers leave this area alone. Why must we remove all of our natural spaces for residential development? Sincerely, Marilyn Cameron, [REDACTED]
107.	Protect the wetland. No development!
108.	6.1% (8,064m ²) development of wetland is 6.1% (8,064m ²) too much!!! We can't get that wetland back once its developed. This type of disregard for the environment indigenous peoples' rights is all too common in Nova Scotia. It is government's role to preserve and protect sacred, eco-sensitive lands. When will you, the government, stop acquiescing to the insatiable greed of developers???!!!! I personally know how difficult it is to protect the environment, based on efforts I have made to stop cutting on crown land in my own community. I have

suffered retaliation, ostracism, harassment, bullying... You, the government, should have the highest respect for the law and indigenous peoples' rights, to set the example and send the message that the law and the environment prevail.

109. My wife and I strongly oppose any development on these wetlands.

110. Wetlands are a rapidly disappearing habitat on a global scale...everyone knows this: including those who work for government agencies that should be finding alternate sites for new development instead of risking any damage to existing wetlands.

Wetlands, the same as all water environments, are extremely fragile and sensitive habitats on which many species are dependent -- including homo sapiens. There is much to be learned through the protection of existing wetland habitats. No land development projects should ever endanger an existing habitat and no guarantee of creating twice as much to replace what will be destroyed is adequate. Existing habitats have been established over time and no newly minted wetland can be guaranteed to provide a suitable replacement for what once was created by nature's system of checks and balances.

From mining, to oil exploration, and commercial development projects, the long-term damages and harm to our environment is often not seen until many years after the commencement of such wildly destructive endeavours. There is not one instance of such 'progress' that has left the Earth better than and always leaves it less than. There will ultimately be a price we all pay for this reckless sale and development of land that is supposed to be protected against further encroachment.

This said, the second part of this protest is with regards to the sale of 'Crown' lands without the consultation of the Indigenous Peoples to whom this land really belongs. I recently completed reading The Indian Act of 1876 (in my pursuit of understanding half my heritage). Much to my dismay and disgust, instead of finding a document that protects Natives, I discover that The Indian Act is nothing more than a document of Apartheid where the government had granted themselves exclusive authority over Native lands, Native People's, Native Monies, and Native Resources.

This peculiar wording implies the government of that time, as well as all that have followed, were and are aware the that none of these things belonged to them. These are things that have been taken through force, subterfuge, genocide, and a mandate for complete forced assimilation. Today, having once been an assimilated, off-reserve Native, I find myself disillusioned with all Canadian government and am ashamed I was ever once proud to be Canadian.

Charging a Native Elder with assault is just more of the same old application of a law designed to kill or assimilate all of us without respect or regard for our unique heritage.

However, among us are now many who are well educated and know the ugly truth of The Indian Act.

The fight to protect these wetlands is being taken up by non-Natives as well as Natives. If the government continues this course of action, they will also continue to create more public support for Natives and their land claims issues. So, while I hope you all show some wisdom and prevent development at the cost of these wetlands, I do pray that you continue along your

	merry way...for in the aftermath of The Residential Schools recent exposure, I have found that non-Natives are finally beginning to see and hear the truth behind government and corporate lies, and myths. The Non-Native population will become allies is Natives...this is already growing and happening...and one day soon, government will be called upon to answer the biggest question of all about Canada's inception: "How is it even possible that Canada has an Act of Apartheid that is still very much alive and applicable in 2022?" So, keep on doing the very things you set out to do in 1876...it will only create modern examples of the levels of depravity and indifference that have brought this country to the environmental and social crisis we are all a part of today. MONEY CAN NOT BE EATEN AND FRESH AIR IS A BASIC NECESSITY.
111.	The Eisner Cove Wetlands should be preserved as wetlands for all of the obvious environmental reasons. Given the governmental concerns for reducing the climate crises that are affecting the entire planet, this section of wetlands should be protected from all development.
112.	I applaud your ambition to create new and affordable housing, however I don't think this wetland it a suitable location for such undertaking. Wetlands have become scarce and every single remaining one should be protected for the benefit of plants, birds, wildlife and our planet. Wetlands also act as a carbon sink which we need many more of if we as human species want to survive and thrive. Keep the wetland intact. There's got to be a better location for housing than this wetland.
113.	As a resident of HRM, this development agreement has me extremely concerned and upset. We need to be protecting Eisner Cove for our future common well-being! It is habitat to an array of species of wildlife, a vital carbon sink keeping carbon out of our atmosphere, and a space where local residents gather, and hikers and birders commune with and learn about our natural environment. It is an invaluable piece of urban wilderness. While I support the goal of creating much-needed, affordable housing, this CAN and MUST be done while also respecting wetlands, which are essential to carbon-emission reduction planning. We are in the midst of a climate crisis that needs everyone of us to solve! Government should be leading by example. This shows the same short-sightedness that has gotten us into this crisis in the first place. I am appalled and angry at the lack of accountability, and the actions taken against protesters, specifically indigenous land protectors who are fighting for all of us.
114.	There should be no further development without Indigenous consultation and consent on the Southdale site.
115.	It appears this process has bypassed regular public in person consultation with local citizens and with the Indigenous peoples. I find this unacceptable and probably illegal.
116.	I believe building on wetlands while our planet is in a global environmental crisis is a terrible decision. Not only is it's vital to retain areas for the natural wildlife within Nova Scotia. Building on wetlands can result in houses that will receive an influx in water levels and can become properties that will be exposed to flooding and other issues in the future. Developing on wetlands has been done across Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario and many of the houses situated on devolved wetlands have had to deal with mass flooding and the deterioration of their homes in the recent years. Personally I think it's disgusting that this project is going ahead dispute push back from community (L'nuk) Elders. There are other areas of land that can be developed and claiming that only a small portion of the wetlands that will be removed negates that overall impact that human infrastructure and human activity will have on the overall sensitive wetland ecosystem. It is small-minded and a bandaid-solution style of thinking to believe that construction and the materials used to solidify a solid structure will not have adverse effects to the rest of the wildlife and environment.
117.	Developing this site and dedstroying the welland kin it is a wrong and stupid action!

118.	I think that this proposal has started on under the table sale of this land. First, you can't replace or "build" wetlands to justify the destruction of real wetlands. I am sure that there are many other sites that would be more suitable for this housing project! However, I am not surprised at government doing things illegally and NOT what the people want! Government has become a dictatorship, not a democracy! this is one more example of gov't NOT caring about the environment, only about money and their own agenda!! Just to make sure you understand, the general public DOES NOT WANT this project on this particular site!!!!!!!!!!!!
119.	I feel the early policies and plans for this development were not based on a full evaluation of the wetlands to be replaced.
120.	Please make sure the wetlands are still a viable habitat and carbon sink. We need to protect our climate or more housing will be useless.
121.	Typical short sighted profit driven capitalist activity.
122.	I am shocked and appalled by the action of politicians to turn a wetland into a housing development. It is against all rules and environmental regulations to touch a wetland, let alone tear it apart and fill it in for a developer to build housing. Wetlands are vital to mitigate the ravages of climate change. I have a wetland in front of my cottage and I am not allowed to destroy it in any way. Why are politicians and developers allowed to do this. It is morally and ethically wrong.
123.	Please, Minister Lohr, stop the development at Eisner Cove. Accessible housing is vital to the well-being of Nova Scotians, but there are other, more suitable sites for a housing development in Dartmouth. Eisner Cove Wetland is a critical habitat for a robust and vibrant array of plant and animal species, a vital carbon sink that helps keep carbon out of our atmosphere, and a place where residents gather in community, hike, collect medicines, and so much more. The shameful sale of this parcel of land to developers happened without public consultation or consideration of the NS government's obligations under the Peace and Friendship Treaties with the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, and Pasamaquoddy. This is the last near-pristine wetland in our region. I understand that your government feels they have done due diligence, and that the area that will be destroyed is too small to matter and will be offset by wetlands construction elsewhere. But offsetting carbon capture is a highly problematic solution at a time when we need to be capturing more carbon and preserving more biodiversity, not maintaining the status quo while deciding who has the right to destroy natural ecosystems based on financial wealth. Existing wetlands are a vital tool in surviving the climate emergency, and they must be preserved!
124.	It's only recently that I've come to fully understand - through my reading - the vital importance of wetlands to the environment that sustains life on earth. Destroying it would be a terrible, and irreversible mistake. Don't do it.
125.	I am extremely concerned this wetland and the forest around this has even been chosen for this project. We are in a Climate Emergency and we are not acting like it is. There are numerous empty sites all over HRM for real affordable housing which this project is clearly not. If we can slam together a emergence housing task force for housing, where is our emergence task force for Climate Mitigation? This now clear cut land should and could be turned into a new science centre for biodiversity explaining all the work biodiversity does and the power of Wetlands. I want to know who is paying for the release of this emissions during this project? Wetlands are the leaders on sequestering carbon! only second to the ocean, yes wetlands! please do your homework and stop this project and lets build a eco learning centre.
126.	In the future we will regret the government's decision not to protect this valuable wetland area. Today we are cutting down trees; tomorrow we will be replanting. Leave the area for the people/wildlife to enjoy.

127.	I think it is not right that the land was sold without proper public consultation and with consultation with our First Nations. That was wrong. We all know how important nature and our environment is for our health and the future of our Province and country. I am talking about climate change. We need nature, our forests, wetlands to be able to survive. It is disturbing to see how the Government, HRM and developers disregard the importance of these wetlands and the nature around. It is all about money and profit right now. Sooner or later it will bite us back but that seems not to be a concern right now. Right now it is about profit. In short, I do not agree with the development on a precious piece of land. I think we should be more creative and work with land that is already developed and build there. There are plenty of properties that are derelict and can be turned in something nice instead of leaving that as is and using undeveloped land. I grew up in Europe where space is much more precious and limited and there are plenty of ways to use existing developed land. Do not use our precious nature and environment to develop. We have so little left in our Province and need to protect any piece of it. Thank you for your consideration.
128.	I have been a member of the Planning Advisory Committee for mainland Halifax and a close follower of Halifax planning processes for more than 50 years. I am aware of the pressure that developers put on City planning staff, and the readiness of some developers to attempt to skate around the plans approved and the commitments made by developers. I am also aware that some members of the planning staff have also been willing to mislead City council to get them to approve policies and individual projects without full background information. As an economist, I know it is necessary to take the full cost in evaluating a decision to properly evaluate trade-offs. This is especially true of environmental sacrifices as the costs are often unassessed or difficult to assess, particularly when they may arise some time in the future. It appears that the provincial government feel that shutting down the Owls Head project has given them all the environmental bona fides they want. The decision to thwart Halifax' planning procedures and policies exemplifies this. Eisner Cove needs to be fully protected, not gradually eroded.
129.	This development and the impending destruction of a valuable, rare, urban wetland, is nothing short of insanity. Squashing the democratic process of local residents and council to debate and approve developments like this is antidemocratic. Handing over the remaining \$22 million budget designated for affordable housing -- defined as no more than 30% of a person's income -- to a wealthy developer is nothing short of theft and robbery from the poorest who desperately need affordable housing while giving it to those who will not be developing any affordable housing whatsoever. ("Attainable housing" is a deceitful, weasel term designed to fool the public while lining the pockets of Clayton Development. Destroying a public commons whose ecoservices are valued at over \$20 million is also theft and robbery from the public who need this important urban wetland for the natural services it provides, including physical and mental health services that will be lost forever. Not to mention the desperately needed carbon storage during a climate crisis that only wetlands can provide.
130.	At a time of global climate catastrophe, we need to nurture our natural wetlands. They promote biodiversity, which is under threat, and they are a natural carbon sink. The proponents of this development need to get their heads up out of their bank accounts and accept social responsibility for their greed.
131.	Watershed management is minimally necessary. We do not need to turn Halifax Regional Municipality in to rabbit-warren.
132.	Wetlands are necessary carbon sinks, areas of natural diversity, and very much needed to capture excess water in an area. Construction would be very detrimental to the future of HRM and negatively impact our ability to meet climate goals. With provincial laws protecting endangered species and plants, this area should also be investigated for permanent protection.

133.	I think that the development is NOT needed in Eisner cove wetland. There are rare species of birds that live there! In 20 years when we are all wearing gas masks because people like YOU took away our important wildlife and trees and polluting our air with your "affordable" housing. Whoever created this development and plan is seriously sick in the head, along with anyone who agrees with it. You are making a horrible mistake and I find it pretty f**ked up that Tim Hallman refuses to listen to the citizens who elected him. If we could go back in time we'd all revoke that vote. If you don't want people unhappy and moving away, or causing protests which you have to send out police for, listen to the citizens. What you don't realize is you're losing money in sending out patrol officers and people leaving NS because ALL of our systems and organizations are corrupt. NO ONE IS HAPPY WITH THIS! So why are you doing it? Because you guys have no compassion for our rare species and important wildlife. Disgusting. Have some compassion. As if we don't have enough construction and developments happening right now.
134.	I do not agree with it one bit as someone who grow up in the area and still live in the area and now are having the woods I grew up playing in as well with my parents and they went to now destroy it to build "affordable" housing!! When we are 25 years down the road having to wear gas masks and can't go outside cause of pollution maybe you guys will second guess it.. there is so many animals and plant life that is rare at the Eisener cove wetlands there aren't many left and wetlands are very rare and important!! All this corrupt government cares about is money not about the future generations... if they actually cared about the next generation of even the young ones now they would actually take a moment and listen that no one wants the wild life ruined.. I've seen so many deer and that coming from those woods cause they don't care but then wonder and confused on why we see deer and bears etc. on the street..hmmm maybe because we are destroying there's to make "affordable housing" which is a lie is won't be less then 1,000 a month for a basic unit... this is all a huge mistake on the governments end that land has been there for years not touched there is spirits connected to that land that are not happy hence the fire that happened in there a couple of days back that is only gonna get worse the more they dig back there.. and they aren't even in a properly fenced in construction area I can get right in the construction zone from my back yard with ease so I will many of y'all in the woods and around the area at the protests etc!!! Have fun y'all PROTECT ESINER COVE WETLAND
135.	Growing up in the Rodney Rd area in the 1950s and early 60s, the fields and woods beyond Prince Arthur school were the best thing about the area. A municipality that is unable to leave natural spaces makes itself a less satisfying place to live.
136.	I do not support any development on the Eisner cove wetland
137.	You should do whatever you can to save the site...not develop it...trust me, I come from away...Halifax is being turned over to developers...you WILL regret it
138.	I am extremely disappointed that Halifax cannot lead the way and clean up sites already heavily impacted by people for development instead of destroying critical wetland habitat for housing, power projects etc. I am not all-or-nothing opposed to any of these things, but how and where the work is taking place is absolutely critical. Our economy rests on our visitors and the quality of life in cities. Our ecology rests only on what we are willing to protect, and it supports all species on the planet, including humans. This smacks of nepotism that the destruction of the Eisner Cove Wetland started BEFORE THE END OF THIS COMMENT PERIOD. Should any of the people who were arrested trying to stop this travesty run for office, I would vote for them. This kind of greenwashing (public comment when plans are already a "done deal" just shows how disingenuous the government/developers are in Nova Scotia. Just. Like. Peggy's. Cove. To say I am angry is an understatement.

139.	I do not agree with the aerial spraying of this area and feel it will have horrendous health and environmental effects for all persons in the affected area. Much research has been done in this area to prove this and people have been sacrificing their time and careers to prove this. What does this say to the rest of the world when we as a province are continuing to do this in the light of recent findings? It would sadden me to think that we are being portrayed as a most backward and unintelligent area on the world stage that do not care about our citizen's health or our very precious natural environment. We cannot get either of these things back once lost and this move will only exacerbate a very strained health and environmental system in our province that may lead to a collapse we can never recover from.
140.	I am pleased to read that the vast majority of these wetlands will be preserved and that Ducks Unlimited will be aided in the establishment of new wetlands as compensation for the development-allocated section. Preservation of habitats especially long-standing, significant biologically-diverse areas such as this parcel of land - within close proximity to residential and/or mixed residential & commercial areas - is vitally important for sustaining quality of life for residents, newcomers, future generations and fellow inhabitants (plants, animals, birds, microbes, etc.) all of which contribute to the long-term survival of life on planet earth. From what I can tell the undertaking proposed by Clayton Development promises to ensure a somewhat balanced approach for dealing with environmental concerns while addressing the urgent need for more housing in HRM. PLEASE ensure that ALL undertakings being considered for approval, include a goodly (ideally a high) percentage of well constructed AFFORDABLE HOUSING units. HRM already has an inordinately high proportion of high-cost condos, apartments, etc. I'm concerned that most new development is simply unaffordable for "average" earners, students, retirees or those on disability pensions and think Developers wanting to build expensive (largely unaffordable) units SHOULD ALSO be required to build a goodly proportion of affordable housing, as a mandatory part of their right to pursue business in Nova Scotia. I would like to see HRM establish policies requiring that type of balance development for any future developments within the municipality.
141.	Corporate Greed.
142.	Get off TREATY LAND. Not your land. Not your right.
143.	I am opposed to this development. Saying the wetland will not be affected is not plausible as any development around/close to a wetland will change the hydrological flows and significant effects are unavoidable. It is time for HRM to begin respecting its commitment to combating climate change and protecting the environment. Housing issues and growth can be accommodated by using space that is wasted on parking lots, car dealerships etc.
144.	This project is detrimental to the Mi'kma'ki land, water, flora, fauna, and Mi'kmaq people for whom this directly effects. This proposal is not what any of us want to see in the world, especially right now as we need as much of our natural environment kept intact as much as possible. Wetlands provide benefits to our entire ecosystem much more than how this proposal minimizes the destruction to be. Shame on this group of people for undertaking this project for their own project benefits, let that shame be your teacher to know when to stop your harm. That time is past due, and if you've been ignoring the call both from within as well as from the communities that have been begging you to stop, the time is absolutely right now to listen and concede to people who know better than you do about something you have no right to take.
145.	How many Grandmothers are you gonna imprison for having feathers "as a weapon", and bash their heads in with bikes before you see yourselves as maybe, perhaps, just possibly being on the extremely wrong side of history?
146.	Why not fix what needs fixing on already-developed land than sprawl out where you have no business polluting & looting?

147.	How would this survey have any relevance when the trees are cut, habitat and animals have been destroyed? Since the destruction began the deer who lived in those woods have been wondering around Lynn Drive. What happens to them? I played in those woods as a child and am sickened by how the provincial government approved this without consulting HRM and the neighbors living in this area. How can I 'shape my city' when the province can walk all over HRM's government? So tell me what is the point of getting involved?
148.	Although very aware of the need for more housing on the peninsula NOTHING GOOD can come of developing lands that have been protected by treaties with our native population. Have they not suffered enough humiliation, dismissals and injustice? The exact same goes for the way we are developing every wilderness space we can get our hands on ie crown land, when there aren't enough of them left to help nature recover from our constant encroachment. Please go back to the drawing board and find a more sustainable solution to our housing shortage. Hopeful you will do the right thing for future generations, Chris Ritchie, senior [REDACTED]
149.	Definitely oppose this property being developed!!
150.	In light of the climate crisis we find ourselves in, it is critical that we make strategic decisions in what lands get developed. We have to be a lot smarter than our forefathers to avoid a climate catastrophe. Because wetlands are extremely valuable in sequestering carbon, not to mention their inherent importance as ecosystems, I completely oppose this development! Please listen to your people. - Margo Boyd, Wolfville
151.	Shouldn't be developed
152.	Its quite clear that climate change means nothing to the government and the planning people who do as they are told. Its a disgrace and everyone involved should be given climate change training before they can do the damage they are about to commit.
153.	1. Stop the clear-cutting of the Eisner Wetland 2. Plan to build the neighbourhood within the existing forest, clear only what is needed for roads and buildings 3. Leave more space between buildings. Reduce the number of streets, and leave pockets of original trees in the centre of street blocks. 4. Incorporate a system of paths in the neighbourhood, bordered by a buffer of existing trees - similar to the trail off Bellbrook cres. in Portland Estates (begins behind the playground at Pebble Creek Cres; across the street there is a trail through a larger forested area to Morris Lake). Have these trails connect to the wetland. Add a boardwalk so people can cross the wetland with minimal disruption to wildlife, and to make it accessible during the wetter seasons. 5. Increase the buffer between development and wetland areas 6. This is an opportunity to create a new urban park space and become a leader in balancing urban population growth with ecological concerns. 7. Urban residents need places to experience nature. Shubie park is over-crowded with dog owners. More residents will only increase the demand for park spaces. This development can be both a new more accessible park space and new housing. 8. The park areas will be much better if they contain original trees. Preserve the existing trees growing on areas designated as parkland. Do not plan to plant new trees after the development is completed, but keep existing trees instead. The clear-cutting is senseless - treed areas with mature trees will improve the look and value of the neighbourhood.
154.	I agree with these plans. Looks like a great development and minimizes impacts to wetland.
155.	Why do you ask for input when the destruction has already started?

156.	Why would you destroy more wetlands? These are our precious few protections against the ravages of climate change.
157.	I am very disappointed that these acres of wetland park was sold to a developer and that they plan to put a road through it. A Road! In scarce wetland as well as scarce trees within an area that is already has too much pavement, cement, glass and steel. The world is suffering from a climate emergency so its irresponsible to destroy forests and wetlands that are required to capture CO2. There is a need for more housing but we cannot destroy a vital wetland park; there are many acres of land far more suited to development that must be used instead.
158.	As we consider the way we balance not only our footprint on Nature but also our duty to respect the Treaty with the Aboriginal Peoples of this Land, please do not develop this remaining wetland. As we move forward to maintain climate goals for generations to come, HRM must take the initiative to protect wetlands that take care of all of us. Both New Zealand and Australia have sanctioned a law that expects government to address climate science in their governance. Do protect the land and select another location that would serve for suitable housing. Greenspace is critical for our good water, air and peace with Nature.
159.	The urban wetland should be protected from development. Wetlands play a vital role in the health of ecosystems and habitat creation for all species including those at risk. There are other suitable housing construction sites in HRM
160.	wetlands are a possible solution to climate change. please consider very carefully, with respect Christine Walton
161.	• 2014 - HRM Regional Municipal Planning Strategy - Buffer Zone Guidance https://www.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/about-the-city/regional-community-planning/RegionalMunicipalPlanningStrategy.pdf The follow extracts from the HRM Municipal Planning Strategy provides some information regarding buffer size and the scope of the intentions for buffers. pdf pg 34 The Water Resource Management (Study 9; Dillon Consulting Ltd. HRM Water Resource Management Study. Dec. 2002) recommends the adoption of riparian buffers as established by the Department of Natural Resources. These setbacks are considered adequate for stream bank stability, water temperature regulation and aesthetic value. They also provide minimal protection of wildlife, flood mitigation and partial benefits for sediment removal. They will be used as general riparian buffer protection for the whole of HRM until buffers that meet the specific needs of each watershed can be determined through the watershed studies and implemented through secondary planning processes. Pdf pg 35 “HRM shall, through the applicable land use by-law, require the retention of a minimum 20 metre wide riparian buffer along all watercourses throughout HRM to protect the chemical, physical and biological functions of marine and freshwater resources. Through a secondary planning process, the width of the riparian buffer may be increased.” • Observation: The HRM Regional Planning strategy, using the advice of the 2002 Dillon Water Resource Management Study, recommends the adoption of riparian buffers as established by the Department of Natural Resources. A search of the NS website, Wildlife Habitat and Watercourses Protection Regulations [https://novascotia.ca/just/regulations/regs/fowhwp.htm] does not reveal any information or guidance regarding the mechanism for establishing riparian

buffers. One might conclude that HRM is ahead of the NS government in its work relating to wetland conservation.

In the planning strategy for Eisner Cove wetland and the Southdale Development, NS has, by some means, adopted the HRM Planning Strategy Buffer Zone requirement of 20m minimum. Concerns are raised here in that HRM has not updated the HRM Planning Strategy Buffer Zone analysis since 2002. The 20 m buffer requirement is based on old science. New data is available with the study by Rideout, E., 2012 [HydroLogic Sys Group, Setbacks & Vegetated Buffers in Nova Scotia; A review and analysis of current practices and management options], which is one of the reference documents provided to the HRM Regional Watersheds Advisory Board. Extracts from that study are provided later in this paper for the readers consideration.

Furthermore, the HRM Planning Strategy concept of providing “minimal protection for wildlife” in today’s climate warming emergency is in error. The HRM strategy dated 2014, is out of date with respect to the emerging biodiversity protection requirements of 50-70% protected areas. If the science wasn’t / isn’t available for HRM planners to determine an appropriate buffer zone size for Eisner Cove wetland, then the default should now, in this current environmental emergency, be towards the end of the scale that maximises biodiversity protection; maximum biodiversity protection until the science is available to determine differently. Taking the position at the lower end of the protection scale is folly.

Furthermore, the intent of buffers as described in the strategy is limited to wildlife protection. This is a overly restrictive approach. Wetland buffers must be developed for consideration for a variety of factors including but not limited to Water Quality, Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife Habitat, Terrestrial and Aquatic Vegetation Habitat, all integrated with our understanding of the current climate warming emergency.

Consideration must be given to Updating the HRM Planning Strategy of 2014 to address new science available regarding buffer zone size as provided in the Rideout study.

Urgent Consideration must be given to initiating the secondary planning process to assess the appropriate riparian buffer requirement for the Eisner Cove Southdale FGN development; as well as all other FGN development plans now under consideration.

Consideration must be given to amending the HRM Planning Strategy with respect to Buffer Zone size to accommodate maximum biodiversity protection, to accommodate the new emerging science of 50-70% protected areas.

Interestingly, HRM Regional Watersheds Advisory Board has updated its Buffer Zone Guidance towards the type of buffer that is termed a “Universal” approach; an approach that is applied to all wetlands. The following bullet with extracted data provides some additional discussion points.

- 2017 – HRM Regional Watersheds Advisory Board – Buffer Zone Guidance
<https://cdn.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/boards-committees-commissions/170920911pres.pdf>

The following extract from the Regional Watersheds Advisory Board presentation indicates the shift in 2017 to a Universal approach to buffer size.

pdf pg 6

Regulations (Land Use Bylaw)

- Amended in 2006 to reflect riparian buffer requirements, coastal elevation requirements, and wetland requirements
- Generally –
 - Minimum 20 metre buffer

– Maximum 60 metre buffer

Observation:

The concern here, with a Universal approach is that the result is the ecosystem functions for wetlands under the microscope for development, are not appropriately evaluated, and subsequently, without this appropriate evaluation, are exposed to destruction or degradation and consequential loss of biodiversity. Its this biodiversity protection which is now a priority in this climate warming emergency.

Larger buffer widths will be unpopular with various groups not committed to the biodiversity protection requirements, with the resulting consequence being that a small fixed width is the only politically feasible option. But this is no longer the time for politically feasible options. Leadership at the Public and Corporate levels is now needed more than ever, with correctly aligned priorities to protect us all from the chipping away at our natural environment until it is beyond recoverable in the remaining 8 years time.

The problem with this Universal approach, is that it has not been developed with science that considers our current climate warming emergency. As well, it is not scientifically defensible to apply this Universal approach to every wetland. Rideouts 2012 work shows that for certain criteria, buffer zones of 600 m may be required. Clearly the HRM Watershed strategy guidance of 60 m maximum is not scientifically based, and is likely based on old science that has not accounted for our current climate warming emergency.

162. I am very pleased that you are actively acting on the housing crisis. However I feel that every decision has to be looked at through the lens of the crisis emergency, since it is becoming very critical. Wetlands sequester carbon and filter water. They are also at risk; there has been a steep decline of our wetlands in Nova Scotia. Eisner Cove is the only substantial wetland left in N.S. Please stop this development - to reduce carbon emissions, meet our provincial climate emissions targets, - and also important- respect Indigenous knowledges and cultures.

163. I believe that there are other places in the Southdale/Dartmouth area that could be used to create housing or "development". Yes, the amount of space proposed may not be "that much" of the wetlands, however this wetland is the only remaining untouched wildlife area in all of Dartmouth, if not the Urban centre. We have seen time and time again what happens when we remove too much wilderness area, and I do not stand behind it happening here in Southdale. Climate change is here and the effects it will have on our environment is going to get worse. Wetlands have been proven to help reduce the effects of some natural disasters such as drought and flooding, which in the long term will help reduce the financial costs associated with these disasters. We need to protect nature and animals, not destroy these areas just because it is the cheaper option in the short term.

164. I am writing about the Eisner Cove Wetlands. I'm no expert but I've been reading a lot. I understand that once a wetland is disturbed, the damage is done. I know trees around the wetland have been disturbed. A road or causeway is set to go through the wetlands. Wetlands take forever to come back - this is one of the last in HRM - we are in a climate crisis - we will need everything we have in the next 8 years to make life livable in HRM. By the time the appeal goes through ,the damage will be done! Who is this expert who decided this wetland is not of special significance?

I 'd like to talk to him/her in 8 years when we are really struggling.

Yes, I know about the housing crisis - very well in fact - but that is not sufficient reason to ignore science. Give Clayton Developments another place to build.

165. No, no, no. Use already-developed land that sits empty instead. No more destruction of the natural lands.

166. Firstly, I want to say that environment/climate change, and housing can co-exist. That this is not a choice of one or the other as has been put out in social media. Before the Southdale FNG development came out, I was pretty complacent. A little uneasy about the re zoning of Institutional and light industrial in the Woodside Industrial Park back in 2019, but nothing indicated that it was more than that. Very different picture today.

I have read the reports that are available to the public. My thoughts? The reports were incomplete and sloppy. Were the reports ever gone over? If so, why weren't the glaring inconsistencies found and corrected before sending out for public consultation? Solar energy, passive heating, heck thermal energy, green ideas for the development are lacking. Lots of concrete, cramped housing, little to no parks (15 acre park? that's the wetland! Even the drawings show it as park. Yet, the planners who read through did NOT pick that up. It looks green and great on paper, but not with scrutiny). Hidden (purposely?) in the Portucana development section is the AJ LeGrow report on the wetland alteration. It must be confusing, but no one seems to have caught that detail and corrected it almost 7 months later.

Affordable housing (Dec 6th/21 HRM report) is the stated reason for the development; then it has changed to "attainable" - HRM quotations used. Myself and fellow residents would all like to hear how the zoning changed from light industrial and institutional to open development without consultation. Not even is the ER-1 with an 11 meter height restriction. This occurred before the Provincial Housing Task Force was formed. The land was sub-divided for Mount Hope access when the Mount Hope Drive was built, therefore, long term planning without consultation. Look at the results of the liaison meeting with the Woodside and Penhorn/Woodlawn Vision statement. We were concerned about the wetland then and believed that our suggestions were being heard. It seems it was just all hot air and a waste of our time and energy. Thoughts of a park, a training centre for students to learn about the importance of wetlands in the city environment without going far. All I have heard from the Mayor, councillors, and city planners is a resounding silence.

The fact that concerned residents have taken to protest, so that this will be recorded, to stand up and say there is something rotten going on in Halifax. The planned, coordinated, and aggressive behaviour by the police (name tags were blued out, not standard practice or policy. Either not proud of what they were about to do or wanting to make sure that they got away with it). I heard the security guard give the direction to the people wearing the HRP uniform to go ahead Tuesday afternoon. Excessive force on our unsuspecting residents was traumatic: in Canada, and here in Halifax. Not a proud moment or HRM. Viral video of a white haired senior woman being hit in the back of her head by the police cyclist goes unanswered even to today. Not a sound from you, Mayor. In appearances, the developer owns and controls not only the police force, the Mayor, HRM, and the province with its Housing Task Force. Does this uncorrected behaviour from the police force, the police chief, and the Mayor make residents sleep well at night? I ask you that question.

The HRM website states that wetlands are important and lists their benefits: that they need protection and to be "preserved". Wetlands have a sensitive ecosystem that is carefully balanced. Disturbing it can have dire results to the wetland. Yet there is the ability for the municipality's 20 m buffer (a bare minimum) to have roads, driveways, and more built in it. How is that protection or preservation? The size of the very large wetland (to quote HRM) differs in size from the developer's 9.3 hectares to the province's 12.3 hectares; the Water Commission had 23 hectares and, recently, another size, 14.3 hectares was found. 4 vary different sizes. So a proper delineation with the municipality's buffer is essential. The buffer that is to grow when there is a slope. And the Eisner's Cove Wetland is encircled like a bowl. So the never changing 20 m buffer in the reports? This would impact the development.

In one of the reports suggests that the wetland be transferred to the municipality in the process. Doesn't seem like that is happening. Why wasn't the wetland purchased in the first place? Proper buffer, water management, and more! It is important, at least on your website.

That brings me to the sale of the land. Done so very quietly. The property value plummeted 70% when housing was on the upswing for the transaction. That's concerning and suspicious. What about lost tax revenues?

There are traffic report questions. Such little traffic from an expected 3,600+ people: No impact. Reports excluding the high traffic time around Dartmouth South Academy (listed as

being 0.5 km , from the development, a misleading but a vital determining factor for families, just not which development), when traffic numbers soar. Done without mentioning COVID behaviour (working from home or schools closed for example), or just before a long weekend. The reports, yes, are for just the one development. But there are 2 developments at Southdale and another at Penhorn that will affect traffic on Prince Arthur and also Portland. Traffic to take the nearly 800(? , projected, could be more due tot the stats used in the water comm. reports) students will take traffic down along Lynn Drive to Fenwick. Not considered in the reports.

There is currently no other access than Mount Hope Drive; Contrary to the slides that were presented to the public. Their slides had trails going to private property and Highway 111; basically to no where. Truly, the access could have gone in through 82 Gaston Road and used part of the \$22 million from the province and saved the wetland from alteration. That is out of the box thinking, but then it could not be called Mount Hope Village.

The dedicated park areas. One park is listed as 1.713 sm. WOW. Hope that it's another typo. You have to give 2m for COVID. Does that give you an idea how big the park is for 973 units or 2200 people? I also mentioned that the developer has a park described and drawn as 15 acres. The wetland is described as being 19 acres by the developer, and 2 acres for the alteration. So where is the other 2 acres? These developments lacks green space other than the wetland. The many trails mentioned are only through the wetland and its buffer. Will they be maintained? And that would have its own set of issues.

The alteration to the wetland - first a bridge, then a road, then a causeway. Thru the deepest part of the wetland. What part does the city play once this is built? Will it be sanding only for the development, as salt and other road oils will harm the wetland? There is sanding along Kearney Lake, so it can be done. But no word from the city.

So check my first letter for anything else I might have missed. I see a lack of consultation, the acceptance of poor quality planning reports, no seeming over sight to missing data/reports or to inconsistencies, acceptance of developers info without questioning, stronger wording around the wetlands and water is needed, more than lip service to climate or environment issues, a lack of public park open spaces and community facilities, lack of conservation of energy, lack of management of storm water, lack of transport network connected to surrounding communities, failure to Identify and preserve significant environment and cultural factors, and much more.

The most disturbing outcome for me has been the appearance of 2 levels of government and HRP being in the employ of the developers. I have always respected, worked with, and felt safe in the presence of the HRP before these incidents. This has drastically changed. I no longer feel safe. If no action is taken regarding the bluing out of name tags while carrying out their duties, I ask that the charges against the 4 protesters be dismissed. This holds for the officers, Duty Sergeant up to the Chief. That is how it appears from the curb side of a Southdale resident.

167. Hi I am a homeowner [REDACTED] in Dartmouth so directly affected by this set of developments. i believe that there should be some development in this area but do not agree with the size of the developments and how much of the green spaces are being removed. i also think that the change to not building a bridge over the wetland and infilling is not fully discussed and thought through. as i am backing onto the wetlands and downhill slightly from the only development which has put forward any information i am worried about flooding that may happen now that there will be less wetland and forest/greenspace to absorb the water and more impermeable surfaces which will cause this area which from talking with neighbors has not flooded in their recollection.

I also think that there has been a lot of it is not my problem from the government as it has been designated provincially as a FGN. but just because this is the case does not mean that it should be automatically approved. the law does not state that it just states that there should be more thought and made it somewhat easier to expedite the process. which can be done by just putting these developments as the applications as highest priority. i also find it insulting that the same government says that they cant do much to stop certain parts of the development as it is now private lands. i know that the previous land owners were crown corporations who then sold the land so this whole process should have been decided when

	they put it up for sale, and because they put it up for sale and sold it for low money they probably already have a deal with the developer to help them out. my final point that i do not agree with is we are being told this is the final time for us to talk on the development when 2 of the 3 developers have not even put in their plans. so how can we give good feedback on the ones not completed. these two will also affect me personally as they will overlook my end of the wetlands and seem to be trying to push them through without consult.
168.	The wetlands development (I can't say proposed because destruction has already started) should be stopped. (Asking what we think while trees are being cut down? Really??) The land should never have been sold, it should have stayed with the province and been protected. There's housing, lots of units available. These new units will be in the same range as current available units so not affordable. Also, lots of underutilized space around the city...parking lots, car dealerships (just how many F-150's need to just sit on a lot?) and above every shopping centre! Russell Lake, Tacoma, Forest Hills, Penhorn...and that's just Dartmouth! Developing virgin land should be an absolute last resort. But this is Nova Scotia...planners and politicians with decades old thinking...and not a progressive thinker in the lot. You're making all the same irreversible mistakes other cities have made. Congratulations....
169.	Wetlands should be preserved. There are other more suitable locations, and give more protection to the wetlands. The beauty of living in Dartmouth is that it is not a concrete environment like for example, large cities, Toronto. I feel that this particular project favors the greed of financial investors. Police interference has been embarrassing and I am ashamed. Please keep in mind the value of our natural habitats rather than cower to big business greed !!!! Sincerely Debbie Reynolds.
170.	I disagree with the proposed alteration of Eisner Cove wetland. There are better sites for the construction of affordable housing. Steven Peters [REDACTED]
171.	Natural wetlands are too ecologically important to be destroyed for more housing.
172.	I feel that we should protect our wetlands and wild places within the city. There are many empty places in Dartmouth that are already bereft of trees etc, why not develop these? In the future it will be a better city if there are more walking and protected natural spaces. Wetlands are of supreme importance for the world.
173.	Unconscionable
174.	According to the 2022 United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Mitigation report, protecting and restoring – forests, coastal wetlands, grasslands and such - is key to the health and well-being of all life. It: - Reduces GHG emissions, - Mitigates the impacts of climate change, - Stops mass species extinction, - Supports and advances Indigenous rights, - Improves mental and emotional health, and - Strengthens our resilience to extreme weather. The Eisner Cove Wetland is a critical habitat for a robust and vibrant array of plant and animal species, a vital carbon sink that helps keep carbon out of our atmosphere, and a place where residents gather in community, hike, collect medicines, and more. There is clearly a critical need for appropriate housing for residents of Dartmouth and the

	HRM, but surely there are more suitable sites. It is not right to destroy the woodlands and wetlands and to build roads and other infrastructure through this area. There are other areas that would not be so destructive to one of the last natural wetlands of the HRM - that cannot be replaced. It was not right for the provincial government to sell this Crown land without public knowledge and Indigenous consultation.
175.	As a physician I am deeply concerned about the climate crisis, and its effects on human health; and keenly aware of the beneficial effect of green spaces on human health, and the critical role of wetlands in the ecosystem.
176.	I believe this site is completely inappropriate for this kind of use. I have seen all destruction already carried out there and it is appalling. I urge you not to sell our wetlands to developers for quick profit. This project will benefit no one in the community but the developer himself
177.	Please think long term.. Find better spot than last wetlands
178.	I have prepared a letter dated September 18, 2022 and am emailing it to Ross Grant directly because I am unable to post it here. Peter Lund
179.	As I understand it a road is planned to go through the wetlands and cutting has begun and a buffer (setback) has not been kept. It boggles my mind that anyone in this day and age does not understand the importance that wetlands play in our world. From everything I have heard and seen there is enough reason to stop the work which by the way already started before the public consultation is finished. There are so many people who are against this who are experts that I feel the project relating to the wetlands needs to be halted now and other ideas considered. Include the people who are fighting this. They probably do have solutions which may work much better. I do realize that affordable housing is extremely important and I hope something will work out but not at the expense of the wetlands. I do live in the HRM by the way. DA MacDonald [REDACTED]
180.	Totally against it. The old Shannon Park site should be utilized. Already cleared and ready to develop. It should be developed as a community based family site with mixed senior and lower income families. Save the wetlands to continue to be the lungs of the earth.
181.	Protect wetlands
182.	Stop the clear cutting and allow the municipality the authority to protect the wetland.
183.	I am concerned that the development is slated to intrude on a wetlands site. Regardless of whether or not it is deemed "ecologically significant", the HRM should be actively avoiding any development on wetlands, as they serve valuable functions to control water runoff, carbon sequestration, provide a habitat for wildlife in our urban environment, and contribute green space for local residents. I am also concerned at the metrics that the province seems to be using to calculate what counts as "affordable" or "attainable" housing. Having gone through the housing market recently, partnered and with two good incomes, most new "attainable" housing units would be pushing our budget, let alone those of our friends who find themselves priced out. The metrics of what counts as "affordable" housing is laughable on it's face. By throwing the lowest earners and highest earners out of the calculation, the price is actively skewed away from the groups of people who need access to safe, affordable housing the very most.
184.	This development is unacceptable in every possible way. The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods. The use of the land footprint is inefficient. The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection. The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school. The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.

A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential.
 There was no consideration of local school capacity.
 There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.
 The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.
 Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.
 Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.
 HRM will lose a critical carbon sink.
 There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.
 There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.
 The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.
 It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.
 It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret.
 It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved.
 Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc.
 The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds.
 Utterly shameful. Shame on everyone associated with this.

185. Developing on or near the last substantial wetland on the Halifax Peninsula is irresponsible, will work against provincial and federal climate justice goals, and will follow through on a development plan that has made no sincere attempt to consult with the public. Additionally, the sale of crown land for this purpose - again without significant public consultation or - to my knowledge - consideration of the rights of, and obligation to, Mi'kmaq people, breaks trust with people and works against any attempts at reconciliation. The archeological assessment completed on behalf of Clayton Developments notes that there was unlikely to be any Mi'kmaq use of the area in the pre/early settlement era, but that conclusion ignores the fact that the use of land by the Mi'kmaq has changed in the last three centuries as settler development and appropriation of the lands that they did use occurred. When the Halifax Peninsula was covered in 18% wetlands, this area may have been less commonly used. Now that Eisner Cove is one of the last wetlands - and possibly the last in-tact wetland, on the peninsula, its importance for harvesting medicines, communing with nature, and doing its job as a climate modifier is much more important.

The province's choice to conduct environmental assessments based on the acreage of the wetlands is also problematic. Wetlands are not exclusively wet - they are frontier regions where the aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems meet and mutually support one another. The forested region surrounding the waterways at Eisner Cove ARE part of the wetlands. The trees of the forest help to keep the waters in check by holding water in their root systems. They prevent flooding and erosion, that provide habitat for wildlife that is born in, and that continues to hunt/forage in the wetter parts of the region. They provide shade, block wind, and provide many other benefits to the ecosystem. Allowing the forest belt of the wetland to be clear cut - especially in advance of this (one of the only) public consultations on the project demonstrates that this public consultation process is unlikely to sway your decision.

Finally, the government's choice to pit affordable housing against environmental responsibility is reprehensible. There are many sites on the Halifax Peninsula that are already to some

degree developed. Housing could have been planned for any number of those sites without devastating an ecological powerhouse and in the process areas that have seen better days could have been revitalized. Affordable housing can and should be built without further damaging the natural world. Affordable housing should also be affordable - not attainable. Those words are not synonymous. The reason that public consultation, environmental (and other) assessments, and procedural transparency are so important is so that the best possible plan can be put forward using all of the information available. The government's choice of process (especially in terms of the future growth node developments) prioritizes debate (considerations of who is right/empowered) over discourse (discussion of ideas to get to the best option for everyone). It is your job, as government to balance housing and the environment, development and protection of natural resources, by considering information and ideas from as many sources as possible. That is democracy in action. And no government should bypass that process (i.e. existing municipal checks and balances) in the name of expediency - especially when the end result will move forward with none of your government's stated goals (i.e. more affordable housing, meeting climate targets, Indigenous reconciliation).

Stop development and swap the site to a more responsible - and beneficial - location. Please.

186. My name is Shanni Bale, and I was a resident of HRM for eight years (until, as it happens, the housing crisis forced me out). I am also a landscape ecologist & conservation GIS specialist, and I would like to voice my strong opposition to the development of the Eisner Cove Wetland area. Moreover, I call for an immediate injunction on further clearcutting at Eisner Cove until a thorough and credible environmental impact assessment (EIA) can be conducted. The government's stated position that Eisner Cove is not a wetland of special significance and thus no EIA is needed prior to clearcutting and development. This position demonstrates a (likely willful) ignorance of scientific facts and the reality on the ground for reasons described in detail below.

(1) *Irreversible loss of old forest & the biodiversity that depends on it, including declining species and migratory birds.* Publicly available GIS data suggest that ~40% of the forest at Eisner Cove is comprised of old stands (I have mapped this myself.). Fieldwork conducted by Dr. David Graham Patriquin of Dalhousie University, put that number at 50%. Old forest, which tends to be more diverse, resilient, and complex, is now rare in Mi'kma'ki/Nova Scotia due to ongoing, intensive forestry practices.

An exhaustive 2019 study by the Audubon Study found that that 25% of all birds in North America have disappeared since 1970. These losses are pervasive across nearly all taxa, including bird species typically considered common. Birds that depend on old-forest are particularly vulnerable to extirpation & extinction. A 2022 study that used Maritime Breeding Bird Atlas data found that "Forest degradation has led to habitat declines for the majority of forest bird species with negative consequences for bird populations, particularly species associated with older forest" (Betts et al., 2022)

Further, field surveys conducted by the Protect Eisner Cove Wetland Group identified 46 different bird species at Eisner Cove, including 35 migratory species and four species that Betts et al. (2022) said were declining in the Maritimes due to old-forest loss. If these species, which are protected under the Migratory Bird Convention Act, were observed at ECW, it is highly likely that many of them breed there as well. Therefore, the municipality and province are obliged to protect Eisner Cove Wetland under the "Migratory Breeding Bird Convention Act."

(2) *Repeated and flagrant violations of the 20m watercourse buffer.* The development plans for Eisner Cove egregiously violate the 20m watercourse buffer typically mandated by both provincial & municipal governments. (I have also mapped this myself). This is absolutely outrageous. The 20 m watercourse buffer is already grossly insufficient to support the ecological functions (connectivity, habitat maintenance, water filtration, carbon sequestration) it is intended to protect. It is also considerably smaller than what many other Canadian jurisdictions mandate. Further, one of the key recommendations of the Lahey Report, which

multiple governments have pledged to implement, dictates that the provincial watercourse buffer width must increase. Instead, here we see it being ignored entirely. To add insult to injury, Clayton Developments has also been given permission to alter the wetland itself.

(3) *An ongoing mass kill event*. Mass-kill events. The Eisner Cove Wetland area is surrounded by city and highway. Where do you think that biodiversity will go when the forest is razed? They will run onto the roads and be killed. Possibly by the thousands. I wonder how this sits on the consciences of those involved. I wonder what the children of those involved would think if they knew what their parents were enabling.

In conclusion, I again emphasize that an immediate injunction against further clearcutting and development of Eisner Cove must be put in place until a thorough & meaningful EIA is completed by a credible third party. If HRM's position is that no EIA is needed to develop Eisner Cove, please explain how you maintain that position despite (1) the loss of old forest and resulting impacts on biodiversity, including vulnerable species and migratory bird species; (2) egregious & widespread violations of the 20m watercourse buffer; and (3) mass-kills that will occur as terrestrial species are forced onto highways and into urban areas.

I have struggled with housing insecurity at several points in my life. I absolutely believe that safe, secure housing is a human right. But I also believe there is no good reason we can't have both stable & secure housing for all and healthy natural spaces that are left untouched to protect non-human creatures from extinction. The government, along with Clayton Developments and LE Shaw, should be ashamed for pushing the lie that these goals are at odds with each other. It's not a zero-sum game. Solutions to both the housing crisis and the environmental crisis can be found if we get creative and are willing to do the work.

Please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED] should you wish to follow up on this submission.

187. The Research Dr/Fenwick St proposal does not seem to be planned well. Specifically, the 3 buildings closest to the parkland are not serviced by a street at all - instead, a corridor of parking lots seems to form the entry/exit to the buildings. These buildings need to be serviced by a proper street.

188. I have many opinions on the site, though they have already cut deep into the wetland! It is a space where nature once thrived and naturally filtered carbon emissions. I live on Fenwick and since Clayton development got in there there is a faint sulphur smell in the neighborhood off and on as they cut. There is no regard for the community or the wildlife, let alone the emissions long stored in the wetlands. It has been a space where the school takes class trips to learn about the wetlands, it has been a space my 3 children explore and get off devices, it has been a space where we can connect to nature and our Mi'kmaq roots. We can walk to the end of our street and go for a hike, breathe fresh air and appreciate the beauty in nature. All things aside the idea of this being a solution to affordable housing is outrageous. There may be a few units close to affordable but by no means a definition of what is affordable in HRM. On top of that there are many other available sites in HRM to build affordable housing that do not require demolishing a protected wetland that adds in pollution control, has many beautiful species that should be protected and helps the community from flooding. Now let's look at the community amenities, we have a school that's already near full and had to send the grade 9's to Dartmouth high and the pre primary to a school that was shut down! We have a gap in affordable food availability, there are no available doctors in the community... The list goes on, with none of which is addressed in the planning. It feels like a poor thought out rush job that is lining pockets rather than creating affordable living solutions.

189. The area is a wetland that needs to be protected. Wetlands are an essential natural water filtration system with endangered plant species that are exclusive to wetlands. Wetlands are disappearing at an exponential rate and need to be valued as the priceless part of our environment they are. Developing this area would also displace a lot of other living species some of which are engineers in combating pollution such as the beaver. The beaver constructs his own habitat and its dams are also filtration devices that help keep out pollution

from polluted water sources, therefore always providing safe water to drink for its family and other animal families. None of the proposed apartment buildings are affordable living let alone low-income housing which is the crisis we are in. There is no justification to engage in any current development offers.

190. This development is unacceptable in every possible way.
The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods.
The use of the land footprint is inefficient.
The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection.
The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school.
The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.
A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential.
There was no consideration of local school capacity.
There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.
The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.
Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.
Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.
HRM will lose a critical carbon sink.
There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.
There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.
The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.
It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.
It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret.
It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved.
Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc.
The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds.
Utterly shameful. Shame on everyone associated with this.

191. Thank you for taking the time to review feedback from the public. I would like to make not of how much information and documents there are on the website for the southdale future growth node, and that in order to provide feedback I need to spend hours going through these documents (some of which are incredibly dense and not easy to ready). the general public needs to receive this information in a much more digestible and easy to access format.

my biggest concern is the destruction of a wetland and disturbance of an ecosystem for which once it is done, there is no way to get it back.

i'm also really concerned about traffic flow, there are multiple units and both high and low rise buildings and from what I can read not many entry/exit points. i'm concerned it will create bottle necks and so much traffic here. Also, will there be adequate public transit or options for those who don't have vehicles? I would really like to see that there are options for bus, cycling, and even car sharing.

lastly, will there be any amenities added to this area? (groceries, corner stores, pharmacy, etc). I live on Chadwick St. and there is currently no where within a 30 minute walk to get

groceries, I would again like to see that there are more accessible options that don't involve getting in a car to one of the large shopping areas on portland st. if we are damaging a wetland, lets try not to add more to it my congesting the streets with cars.

192. What does saving the Wetlands mean to us?

From an ecological point of view it means protecting biodiversity and not adding to the destruction of an existing man made climate crisis. It also means protecting the Natural World, our precious ecosystem and wildlife...the survival of our planet.

Not only are we holding on to our last slice of lush wetland...we are holding on to our last slice of democracy as well. We are experiencing the heartless actions of corrupt government, heavy handed policing, shady backroom deals, a government created housing crisis, corporate greed and once again disregard for indigenous rights and human rights.

The Natural World is there to give to us and nurture us in many ways. Many of us thrive in nature, forage in nature, heal in nature. As children our best memories are in the forests, the water. It is what sustains us and fills us with such life. I grew up in Nova Scotia and when my first child was born I moved to Toronto for 18 years.

In 1996 I was in a serious car accident. A family member passed away. My 13 month old baby sustained a serious head injury and my 3 year old had neurological issues, ptsd, anxiety. I had fractures of my pelvis, lower back, and emotional trauma as well. I developed autoimmune sensitivities and asthma. Three of my children developed asthma as well. I experienced hell trying to get help for me and my family with our insurance company, their schools and the health care system for all of us. My condition worsened as each year passed and there were days when I would lie with my face to the window three days at a time gasping for fresh air out of a Toronto window. In 2006 I moved back home to Nova Scotia. I was surrounded by trees, wetland and not concrete and my asthma started to heal and within a few years I was asthma-inhaler free for 12 years with no sign of asthma. I contribute this to the beautiful trees and wetlands of Nova Scotia and our fresh air.

There are members of my community who know the importance of our trees and wetlands and I've seen some overwhelming examples of this over the past few months. Young and old people...little children, teens, their parents protesting the active destruction of Eisner Cove Wetland. I saw people put their lives on the line for the Natural World. They Literally almost died at the hands of greedy contractors and corporate greed. I remember seeing a brave, young woman in China on the news run over and killed by a steam roller. I remember being so grateful to live in a democratic country like Canada where this would never happen. I am sad to see as the trees and the wetlands are being destroyed so is our democracy.

There are people who are working on saving Eisner Cove Wetland from sun up to sundown... with no pay, selflessly trying to find a way. I have seen parents bring their children out hoping that maybe it may have an effect. The developers, the contractors still look in the face of a child... our future generation as the child witnesses the ruthlessness of this process with tears in their eyes...the contractors continue their day business as usual.

All of us here have a need to be in and connect with nature. When I was 5 years old I had a game and it was called Don't Break The Ice. I remember sitting and taking the plastic nail from the game and trying to cut my vein open in my wrist at this young age. I grew up in 111 Pinecrest Drive. There were woods behind the apartments across the street where I lived. I spend every waking moment of my life in those woods when I wasn't playing at Albro Lake or in school. Those woods saved my life. I spent so much time in them that I got a hernia because I wouldn't come home to pee, They were an escape from a toxic environment. Also as an adult I went to hypnotherapy with George MacaDoo and the first place I went under

hypnosis were those very same woods. They were where I went as an adult when I was doing relaxation and mediation exercises in Toronto. Those woods meant everything to me. The woods are now gone and the area is now known as Highfield Park.

There is so much existing land that is being unused and being wasted where the trees have already been cleared away. There are so many empty lots, abandoned buildings. buildings are already standing and existing that can be built up as we see on Spring Garden, Road, Quinpool, Young & Robie. If there is an existing KFC...build a condo with mixed units above it or if you have such powers to make a law make a law that every new condo has to have one unit of each and every floor that is rent "geared to income". That way children do not have the stigmatization of growing up in ghettos. Make a law that every house on every street has one house rent"geared to income home" or even better let the family or individual pay their way to ownership but at a lower rate. As we saw during the plandemic many people became displaced and underhoused. Why do we not make a law that before any more trees are cut to make developments we use every bit of wasted space that has already been cleared to make "real" affordable housing.

We could make an eco centre and teach children about the environment and sustainability where the trees have been cut at Eisner Cove Wetland and as of today leave the rest of the Wetlands untouched. That Wetland means the world to human beings, the wildlife, the ecosystem and so much more. Coming out of the plandemic we need these precious spaces. Many feel scattered. These wetlands, these trees give us the connection...the respite...the oxygen we need to fill our lungs with healthy, deep breaths that are life giving.

As we become more and more detached from nature the current mental health crisis grows. Researchers from Denmark's University of Aarhus found that citizens who grew up with the least green space nearby had as much as a 55 percent increased risk of developing psychiatric disorders such as depression, anxiety, and substance abuse in later years. They found that childhood exposure to green space was especially critical, note Eisner cove wetland borders on an elementary and Junior High School and has long been used as a place of play for these children.

If this development goes through, the city will be adding close to 1900 units to the area (Fenwick development included here, which hasn't commenced yet). This number rises quickly with surrounding developments such as the Vista on Pleasant, Penhorn Mall Lands with 950 units, and the ever growing Baker Drive developments.

The city and government are looking at adding tens of thousands of people to the area within a few years. It is also going to demolish the last large urban forest and wetland within the city centre limits when there are many other less ecologically sensitive areas available to develop. All while there are no plans of creating more green space nearby, only taking it away, along with the chance for urban kids to experience nature, connect with it, and eventually become advocates for climate change.

Eisner Cove Wetland has been protected throughout this time. It is already been deemed unsuitable land for development. The Federal Government has gone above the law of HRM with no honour, dignity, compassion, respect or regard for law or due process. It has been stated that if the Wetlands were destroyed there would be tremendous amounts of flooding that would affect the new homes, destroy the neighbouring homes and mobile homes. That will only be one of the many results of that destruction which will include huge lawsuits. I have lived through a law suit and I would not wish this on any human being.

We are a time in our world where we are at a crossroads. We just came out of a huge plandemic which many suffered. Many of us have learned the true value of life, our families..our loved ones. We have found solace in the midst of isolation, anxiety, depression, ptsd in the protective veil of the Natural World...the ocean, the forest, the wetland. The

ecosystem has a conscious and it is always working hard for us...for our highest and best good. I Have learned the only way to have balance is for there to be an exchange of give and receive. The Wetland, The Ecosystem, Biodiversity, Trees, Water...they are all life giving...life force. They do not ask for much back from us. Just our protection, our respect, to leave them the way we found them.

193. This is a truly awful planning decision. There are other sites in Dartmouth that could be utilised instead of this area. For example, the strange orientation of 80 Holtwood Court means that there is enough space for another 90 unit block on the site. There are other such spaces around Dartmouth if you only look. Sure, that can require more thought than to build on an untouched site but where is the commitment to tackling climate change? It is stated that just under one hectare of the wetland will be impacted, but what about tree felling and impacts from introducing impervious materials to a natural environment? There is a far greater impact to this environment than you are alluding to. It makes me wonder whether the HRM planning department talks with the HRM Energy and Environment Department. Canada is warming at a greater rate than most other areas of the globe and the HaliFACT 2050 project is an excellent and ambitious approach. No development should go anywhere near Eisner Cove in order to preserve this natural carbon sink. If this development proceeds, please do not insult my intelligence by offering free trees, telling me you are going to dig up grass and plant shrubs for better carbon dioxide uptake, revelling in new bike lanes etc. This is a seriously bad look for Halifax and Nova Scotia.

194. Did the Government of Nova Scotia sell publicly held Nova Scotia property to private owners?
Was this sale arrangement done in an open and transparent public manner?
Did the Government of Nova Scotia hold a well advertised, public consultation on this potential development before selling the land?
Did the Government of Nova Scotia include a proper consultation with appropriate and affected Indigenous peoples as per our Province's obligations to the Peace and Friendship Treaties with the Mi'kmaq, Passamaquoddy and Maliseet?
Does the disruption to the wetlands in question (known locally as Eisner Cove Wetlands) regardless of so-called stated percentage effected and Ducks Unlimited compensation offerings honestly square with all existing requirements in the Department of Environment and Climate Change's Wetlands Conservation Policy?
Has that "detailed review" been made available to the public before any activity on the land was undertaken?
Can The Honourable John Lohr and The Honourable Timothy Halman honestly answer "Yes" to all these questions?

If not, this development should be halted until all of these concerns can be properly met, in the best interests of the community at large and all Nova Scotians in general.

Transparency is a requirement of a well functioning democracy. Can this be said about the Government of Nova Scotia's action in this instance?

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this haphazard online consultation.

195. I cannot believe you are destroying the wetlands in the Eisner Cove wetlands!! All for the sake of money??! Just make the affordable housing complex in downtown Dartmouth bigger??!! This will be a decision Dartmouth will regret.

196.	Backroom hidden deals, no proper wetland studies, assessment value dropped 70% just prior to purchase. Criminal, criminal, criminal
197.	Finally put in my input on the Southdale Future Growth Node. Today is the last day. Here it is: This development is unacceptable in every possible way. The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods. The use of the land footprint is inefficient. The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection. The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school. The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets. A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential. There was no consideration of local school capacity. There was no true environmental impact assessment performed. The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer. Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives. Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road. HRM will lose a critical carbon sink. There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release. There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway. The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis. It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions. It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret. It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved. Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc. The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds. Utterly shameful. Shame on everyone associated with this.
198.	since the province and developers have ruined the wetland,the developer should and MUST put in a good drainage system to protect the surrounding community from flooding which will happen since the wetland is damaged or destroyed
199.	I have grave concerns on the damage being done to the wetland.
200.	I feel that this housing development is a huge mistake, tearing up a carbon-sequestering wetland/habitat so that a wealthy developer can make even more money off Nova Scotia taxpayers. He hasn't even promised affordable housing, just 'attainable' whatever that means in developer-speak. Our government gave him \$22 millions, money that should have been spent on real affordable housing. And this should be built within the city, as there are already places that could be used. This is our government, in bed with big business, so that the rich get richer and the poor desperately hunt for a place to live.

201. I have concerns on the increased traffic and the ability for the surrounding area to handle 900 new homes not counting the development where penhorn mall was. That development makes sense. The land was already used for the mall in the past. I

Will another school be built? The new school will not be able to handle the increase.

I have concerns of the impacts of where the water is going to go once it's been disrupted and displaced.

And what is the difference between a bridge or causeway over the wetland? It's still going to have potentially a negative impact.

What happen to the city one plan that community consultation is required.

The noise impact will also be considerable as the majority of the trees will be gone and with it the peaceful forest in busy area close by (baker drive).

Is there a need for housing Yes! Should we really destroy a wetland that has provided benefits to the community especially since baker drive has been populated. There where other sites that could have been chosen.

I find it hard to believe that any of these dwellings will be "affordable" or benefit low income or homeless.

I support growth but it shouldn't be at such a high cost. The cost is not only financial, environmental but also on the faith of city planning.

Discouraged resident.

202. Finally put in my input on the Southdale Future Growth Node. Today is the last day. Here it is:

This development is unacceptable in every possible way.

The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods.

The use of the land footprint is inefficient.

The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection.

The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school.

The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.

A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential.

There was no consideration of local school capacity.

There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.

The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.

Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.

Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.

HRM will lose a critical carbon sink.

There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.

There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.

The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.

It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.

It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-

	making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret. It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved. Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc. The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds. Utterly shameful. Shame on everyone associated with this.
203.	I am submitting these comments as a private citizen, however, I would like to set out from the beginning that I have considerable experience of the environmental assessment process for projects such as housing developments and a doctorate in environmental chemistry. The Eisner Cove area is a carbon sink comprising of established woodland and wetland. The development of this area will lead to the degradation of the residual environment resulting in the release of carbon dioxide stored within this environment. This release will not be offset by creating wetlands elsewhere as these areas develop over many decades. Additionally, the development as it is set out, will expose residents to high levels of noise and air pollution from Highway 111. This is a concern for mental and physical health, particularly for vulnerable groups including children. I am stunned that HRM feel that this is an appropriate site for development given the concerns outlined above, and HRM's purported commitment to tackling climate change.
204.	This development is unacceptable in every possible way. The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods. The use of the land footprint is inefficient. The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection. The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school. The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets. A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential. There was no consideration of local school capacity. There was no true environmental impact assessment performed. The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer. Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives. Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road. HRM will lose a critical carbon sink. There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release. There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway. The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis. It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions. It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret. It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved. Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc. The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as

the project proceeds.

Utterly shameful. Shame on everyone associated with this.

205. Walk 'n Roll Hfx Submission to Southdale Future Growth Node Public Engagement Disappointment. That is the reaction when examining the applicant's attempt to plan a Complete Streets, greenfield development for these lands. We are very curious how the applicant has considered the Integrated Mobility Plan (IMP) in this work. The Complete Streets concept is a fundamental component of the IMP. Complete Streets reflect a multi-disciplinary and multi-modal approach to mobility that aims to embed the IMP pillars into street design.

We don't think it is too much to ask to have the applicant describe how they have used the principles of the IMP Pillars to create this plan. Please do.

Context and Granularity

The beauty of a Development Agreement (DA) for a greenfield site is the ability to apply a contextual approach to planning the lands. The Regional Centre Plan and By-law is more broad-brush, save the attention paid to Special Areas. On this site, we have a defined special area with the opportunity for the applicant to propose planning and development requirements to manage growth contextually.

However, the DA is inconsistent. It contains dimensions to two decimal places for some design requirements and completely ignores others (of stated higher priority). Granted, it makes reference to Municipal Design Guidelines for some requirements; however, these are also broad-brush for the whole of HRM and similarly do not consider context in the same detail as the Development Agreement. As a simple example, the Municipal Design Guidelines guideline for a multi use pathway varies between 3 and 4 metres. The Development Agreement provides the opportunity to prescribe the maximum width (or greater) on slopes (to account for potentially faster (downhill) and slower (uphill) movement) and the minimum (or greater) on flatter sections. Further, the applicant could have proposed:

- The location, size and facilities for transit shelters;
- The pedestrian priority signalization principles of the intersection with Mount Hope Avenue;
- The location of curb extensions and other traffic calming and pedestrian safety infrastructure;
- Design or infrastructure to consider the needs of the blind and partially sighted in this context; and,
- The location of raised crosswalks (pending their adoption for use post-pilot).

While there is still the opportunity to consider these safety features during the subdivision process, the correct time to do it is now, so that the applicant will be well aware of its responsibilities and the HRM project team is assembled and focused on the project. The context and granularity may be lost as the project moves to the administrative phase.

Multi Use Path

The applicant's proposed Regional Centre Plan policy clearly emphasizes the vision of a walkable residential community that prioritizes pedestrians. How does sacrificing the safety and comfort of a separated sidewalk for people to walk and roll on by proposing a combined multi use pathway for people cycling, perhaps e-scootering, etc. square with the purported prioritization of pedestrians. Mobility planning for a complete street / community need be done from the outside in (street right of way to street centreline) and from the top (of the 'inverted triangle') down. We can only imagine that this sacrifice of the assured safety and comfort of a separated sidewalk is being done to preserve street space for transit, private automobile drivers, deliveries, etc. We find it difficult to believe that on a greenfield site, and with the established mobility design priorities, there cannot be room for separated sidewalks. If the applicant is proposing the sacrifice to enable free storage of private vehicles on public lands (i.e. parking), that is unacceptable.

Another thing about the multi use path. At the 19:38 minute mark of the Public Presentation

video recording, the script states "...there are sidewalks on both sides of the street in all streets in the development." If this is the case, please ignore the comment above. If safe and comfortable sidewalks are provided on both sides of all streets in the development, the addition of a multi use path, it is assumed for people cycling, e-scootering and the like, is a reasonable option.

Affordable Housing

Another stated intent of the applicant's plan is to provide affordable housing. Two thoughts come to mind:

1) This is a direct nexus with the IMP Pillars, requiring consideration of those who do not own a private vehicle, choose not to own a private vehicle, cannot afford a private vehicle or cannot drive a private vehicle. The mobility network described by the Pillars is perfectly compatible with the provision of affordable housing.

2) There can be no justification for the sacrifice of a proper safe and comfortable mobility network for people walking and rolling as a trade-off to the provision of affordable housing. The two are tied together. There can be no consideration of trading off the safety and comfort of people walking and rolling for the provision of private vehicle storage on public streets. If that is what the applicant is proposing, we would like to understand the applicant's justification.

Commercial Land Use

It's good to see the applicant included commercial land use integrated with residential to give people the option to do out-of-home activities without using a private vehicle. However, we can see nothing in the applicant's Development Agreement which will ensure that the commercial development occurs. Please describe where the DA requires the establishment of commercial uses to serve the needs of the community to carry out the relevant policy.

Multi Persona Level of Service

Did the applicant consider the needs of a variety of potential residents of the community and their mobility needs? We would think that this would be an obvious exercise to perform to confirm the principles of the IMP Pillars are being followed for a person not using a private vehicle. For example:

- Student going to NSCC Waterfront campus;
- Person going to nearest transit stop;
- Person going to get groceries; and,
- Person going to Woodside Industrial Park employment.

We'd be interested to see the outcome of this analysis.

Women's Safety Assessment

Did the applicant work with the Public Safety Office to conduct a Women's Safety Assessment of the planned street network or is this planned? We think that this is an important analysis to conduct and the results should be woven into the applicant's DA. In particular, the trail would benefit from this assessment to ensure it is safe and comfortable for all people using it at all times.

Trail

In addition to the design requirements which would flow from the Women's Safety Assessment, the applicant should more fully describe the trail infrastructure requirements in the DA. A 'non-permeable' surface is scant information. It should describe minimum width, the ability to support the safe and comfortable movement of wheelchairs, walkers, strollers, etc., location of benches, pedestrian-scale lighting, maximum slopes, maintenance of washouts and snow and ice clearing, etc. We understand that the trail(s) may be subject to flooding from time to time. The DA should include the service standards for repair of a flooded or washed-out trail segment to return it to active transportation use.

The inclusion of trail head information panels and interpretive panels are welcome. Will walkway head panels be included in the walkway to Campbell Ave and Neptune Crescent to describe where the trails lead? These information signs may not be included in the Municipal Design Guidelines but would be of value to people walking, rolling or cycling between neighbourhoods.

Please confirm that the trails are maintained for year-round use. I don't believe the applicant would have planned for less than that in a pedestrian priority plan.

MMLOS

Was a Multi Modal Level of Service analysis conducted for the site? What were the target levels of service which the applicant used for each mode? Is a copy of the analysis available for posting on the website? At which intersections or segment was the pedestrian level of service less than the ideal?

Building Design

We're glad to see that the applicant is continuing and extending the urban design parameters of the Regional Centre By-law in the DA. However, because this is a detailed plan for a small area, and has a pedestrian priority focus to provide interesting streetscapes to walk and roll, did the applicant consider a supplementary set of design controls to be used? Was the applicant thinking of something along the lines of the East Hants Kiln Creek design criteria which was included as a 'Schedule' to that applicant's DA. The July 2022 concept plan suggests long streets with repeated building faces / setbacks which may not be as interesting to walk as the Kiln Creek option or similar (citing applicant's Policy F-12 2(iv)).

Street Lighting

Will the street lighting for the site (street, walkway, trails) be required to meet the Street Light Design of Section 7.2 of the Municipal Design Guidelines (latest edition)? Is this explicit in the administrative phase of the development?

Street Design

The August 25 2022 public presentation materials discussed "On-street parking alternates to provide a "chicane" effect". There does not appear to be a mention of this in the applicant's DA. How will this be realized if it's not documented in the DA? Does the applicant intend to achieve the chicane effect through signs (not recommended) or by physical changes to the curb line? This design could potentially be paired with rain gardens for storm water management and additional open space.

Plan Policy Amendments

Area 2

The applicant's draft Plan policy amendments states: "pedestrian and cyclist safety will be considered as a priority in the design of Mount Hope street crossing". This is good, considering that the existing Mount Hope multi use pathway is on the opposite side of Mount Hope from the site. Is there any reason why additional detail about the design parameters or the design itself could not be included in the DA now. The applicant is fully capable of proposing a design for review. Pedestrian safety is a priority. This is a major, critical intersection in the pedestrian mobility network providing access to Mount Hope and out-of-home activities beyond. Could it even be put on a priority list for intersection redesign to align with the build out of early phases of the development? It seems like too important a mobility connection to leave to an administrative process via the subdivision.

Open Space

Policy F-12 3 states: "New parks and public spaces which enhance the public realm and provide access to recreational opportunities and open space by:

- i) locating parks and open spaces as focal points for the community, to support the retention of natural space adjacent to the wetland, and as generally shown on Map 25;
- ii) ii) providing space for a mix of programmed and passive activities, naturalized areas that support stormwater objectives, and connections to existing active transportation networks and the wetland via paths and trails."

I don't think it is a stretch to ask if the applicant suggested the use of rain gardens or similar in the public street space in conjunction with this policy. Did the applicant consider locations for rain gardens or similar? I fear that if the applicant has not considered them at this stage and they are not included in the DA, they may be overlooked as an option at the administrative level. Please ask the applicant to add them as a possible storm water management tool to partially satisfy this policy.

And, do we understand correctly that the applicant is classifying the wetland as open space for use by people? Is it the intention of the applicant or HRM to provide programmed or passive activities in the wetland, i.e. use the space for recreation for people?

Area 1 – Surface Parking

Section 6. v) states: "...manages surface parking and driveways to prioritize pedestrian movement and safety;". How will this be done? Would it not be simpler for the applicant to reference Section 445 of the Regional Centre Land Use By-law? Or, are there additional measures the applicant plans to use to implement the policy?

Section 3.8.4 (1) – Paired Driveways

How will the applicant's plan for paired driveways advance the principles of pedestrian safety in the development. Or, does the applicant propose them to provide access to more free private vehicle storage on the public street?

Area 2 – Manage Surface Parking

Why did the applicant not include: "(v) manages surface parking and driveways to prioritize pedestrian movement and safety;" in Area 2? It appears to have surface parking as shown on the July 2022 Concept Plan. Again, reference to section 445 is suggested.

Area 3 – Commercial Uses

Further to the commercial uses comment above, why is the requirement "provides neighbourhood-supportive uses to increase walkability, provide goods and services to residents and offer employment opportunities by permitting a mix of uses in all multi-unit buildings;" not in Areas 1 and 2? The applicant proposes multi-unit buildings in Areas 1 and 2, correct? Is there a reason why this requirement would not extend to Areas 1 and 2?

Draft DA Schedules

Schedule E

Why does the applicant not show sidewalks on Schedule E? They are an essential part of the AT network.

Development Agreement

Clause 3.3.6

This clause appears to be inconsistent with the applicant's Policy 6iii (commercial uses in Area 3, not Area 2). Or, perhaps vice versa.

Clause 3.3.8

Will the applicant's proposed PA zone include trails and shelters as permitted uses?

Clauses 3.8.5 to 3.8.7

Did the applicant intend to add provisions for pedestrian priority (section 445 from the Regional Centre Plan Land Use By-law) in accessory parking lots? If not, they should.

Clause 3.8.8

Why did the applicant not include a requirement for bicycle parking spaces for the ER-3 multi unit developments? The provision of parking spaces would be a benefit to AT users.

Clause 3.13.2 – AT Facilities

The clause states: "Active transportation facilities shall substantially conform with the locations, dimensions, site improvements and site preparation areas illustrated on the Schedules and identified in this agreement".

There does not appear to be a single dimension on the applicant's relevant Schedules; did the applicant intend to add some dimensions? And, as noted above, the lack of detail with respect to AT facilities is stark and the applicant should be asked to provide additional details to reflect the context of the site and stipulations / variances from the Municipal Design Guidelines.

Clause 3.16

Spelling of Suites

Clause 4.5.3

Clause 4.5.3 states: "The design of the street shall satisfy the most current edition of the Municipal Design Guidelines unless varied by the Development Engineer."

What type of street is the applicant proposing. What are the AT components? Does the applicant intend to extend the multi use path? See multi use path comments above.

Clause 5.2.4

Clause 5.2.4 states: "In addition to the requirements for the full development site in 5.2.1 (b), individual MICI sites, when constructed, must meet the requirements of By-Law G-200 Respecting Grading and Stormwater Management Associated with Land Development, and

Administrative Order 2020-01- OP Respecting Stormwater Management Standards for Development Activities.”.

What does the applicant mean by MICI sites?

Bike Rail

A bike rail is mentioned in the presentation slides but the applicant has not included it in the DA. Will it be included?

206. How many trees will be cut down as a result of this development compared with the 1000 trees HRM was giving away? What is the net change in carbon dioxide/biodiversity as a result of this 'trade off'? Can you guarantee that all of the trees indicated on the plan will be in place in the final development? Can you guarantee that each of those trees will be a tree that is currently in the site and that it will remain in situ? If you really feel that this development is appropriate for this site (given that there are other areas in Dartmouth that could be developed without such environmental destruction), you should present an assessment of the environmental impact, and demonstrate (if you can) that there is no environmental loss. Saying that new wetland will be developed at a rate of 2:1 is not sufficient - there should be calculations presented by an independent agent and made available for scrutiny. I appreciate that you are not required to do this, but it is an important aspect with respect to transparency in this planning process.

207. Absolutely disgusting, 0 consultAtion and ruining the wetlands

208. We have made this mistake many times over, and we simply can't afford to do it again - developing on or near ecologically significant areas is one reason why we are now facing severe environmental crises. As a researcher and biologist, this plan terrifies me.

(1) By altering the wetland and clear cutting the forest buffer around it, we will be destroying a riparian area, which I'm sure you know are incredibly ecologically significant (<https://extension.oregonstate.edu/water/riparian-areas/overview-riparian-systems-potential-problems>). To think that the forest around the wetland can be demolished without consequence, and that the wetland will not be harmed by the construction and human activity so close to it, is ignorant.

(2) You may not care about the plethora of birds and other wildlife that inhabit these lands; but I'm guessing you care about yourself, your family, and your community. It may not seem obvious, but you and the ones you love rely indirectly on wildlife – these abundant species, and the land they inhabit, are integral parts of food chains that all come back to benefit your health and your dinner plate.

(3) Climate change is in full swing. You know that wetlands store vast amounts of carbon, I assume (<https://boreal.ducks.ca/estimating-carbon-sequestration-wetlands/>), and how much carbon will be released as it is altered and the trees around it cut down. "Off-setting" the wetland alteration by constructing a wetland is not a solution – it can take decades for a constructed ecosystem to mimic the roles of the original (<https://water.usgs.gov/nwsum/WSP2425/restoration.html>). We cannot afford to lose the climate mitigation - and resiliency – this wetland offers.

(4) Major economists are predicting a global recession – or more likely, depression (<https://news.un.org/en/story/2022/07/1123342>). If you look at historical data, it seems inevitable. We may need housing now, as the wealthy from Ontario buy up summer homes in Nova Scotia, but this demand will slow as the economy falls. With this development, Nova Scotia will be left in even more debt, and more vulnerable to the economic depression.

The indirect impacts of this development are disastrous for humans and for Nova Scotians. Please, for the love of humanity, reconsider.

Natalie Weder


209. This is unceded Mi'kma'ki territory and there has NOT been proper consultation with the mikmaq..

1752 Peace and Friendship Treaty is still valid.

Not honouring these treatys is violating international law.

I'm well aware of the many connections with regards to the numerous old boys club back handed deals when it comes to destroying mother Earth to exploit her for resources so that those in the old boys club are able to make profit while everyone else suffers losing the connection with nature and mother Earth.

You cannot continue to destroy the earth that destroys all life here. We must live in balance and respect with mother Earth.

The animals who live in those woods have been crying so have the trees and mother Earth is calling on those land defenders to stand up and stop the destruction of that beautiful land. Which is exactly what's happening.

The fact these notices for public comment only went out recently after these corporate governmental structures have already begun clear cutting the forest is disgusting and an obvious attempt to back peddle and cover their tracks of those involved. However many are seeing exactly what's happening therefore joining together to stop this destruction of mother Earth.

There's been peaceful people who have experienced violence at the hands of the police as well as those operating the machines ... Why's that? Oh that's right because it's a bunch of old boys club back room deals. How much was the land sold for to Clayton developments and AJ legrow? How exactly did innovacorp a crown corporation branch of the Nova Scotia government who look for "ventures" to make "capital" sell the land to private corporations? That's exactly what innovacorp does isn't it? Finds ways for their buddy's in the old boys club to make money? Yes I'm well aware that Clayton developments is also shaw group which is also connected to numerous corporations ran by a few at the top those same few who are connected to pharmaceutical companies biotech Shipping companies as well as universitys thru donations. Yeah takes a minute but it's easy to research and connect the dots of what's going on. This is NOT OKAY.

I could write a book on what I see and know that's going on however for now I'll end this with one of the first posts I shared in the PROTECT EISNER WETLANDS group.

.....

Many of you know I go out into the woods with my drum n medicine often sending love kindness and compassion to everyone who accepts it 🌹💜 across all space n time

Many of you also know I've been on many front lines protecting the water and mother Earth 💙

Many of you know I study natural medicine including plant medicine 💚 and I'm always out in nature grounding with my barefeet on earth

Well awhile back I was told they wanna build a housing complex back in the woods I go all the time. Right away I said oh fckk no they're not destroying that area. It's not about housing people it's about greed control n destroying the earth.

I've been out there pretty much every night doing my thing connecting to mother Earth talking to the ancestors trees birds squirrels sasquatch and everything nature out there pushing that energy back off the area .. some nights I hear the crickets n some nights I hear trucks in the distance in the middle of the night. I can tell ya mother Earth and all life there don't want to lose their home.

There's plant medicines like winter green, gold thread, sarsaparilla, false lilly of the valley etc There's trees birch maple oak spruce fir n many others.

This is the same woods I was chilling with my tea one night n had a vision of a shaman dressed in a golden colour who handed me a white sacred pipe some tobacco n told me to put it in my heart I'll know what to do with it and as I breathed in I could feel the energy all around me be pulled in n breathed it back out

Lately I've had a feeling to be out there more often n find myself out there till like 4 or 5am

Last night I had an intense spiritual experience where the energy of mother Earth pulsed thru me up thru my body opening n aligning my chakras bursting thru my heart throat n 3rd eye area .. I was also tuning into the trees vibration

Today My drum made noises twice as it hung on my wall so I knew I'll be going drumming tonight ..

Then today two water protector sisters showed up n let us know what's going on with the area an that there's people fighting to protect the wetlands from the other side 🌱

Nobody really knew I was doing spiritual work on this side to protect the area besides a few

Gotta love when you call on spirit to help protect mother Earth n the nature and spirit delivers the fire 🔥

210. The Eisner Cove Wetland is a vital ecosystem that has to be protected. Not only does it provide critical habitat for plants, animals, and insects, the Wetland is a natural carbon sink that helps keep carbon out of the atmosphere. There are other, more suitable sites for a housing development in Dartmouth. Please protect what remains of our urban wilderness.

211. I am very concerned that the development that has already begun in this area will damage a significant amount of the forest and wetland. Although the area affected may seem small in the site plans, the destruction of forest that has already taken place to create roads, and the likelihood of wetland destruction caused by runoff, are significant. The wetland in particular is an important carbon sink, and can never be restored or replaced once it is damaged or destroyed. The decision of the provincial government to fast track this development, and collapse the municipal consultation process, is fundamentally anti-democratic. The residential development itself will not solve the housing crisis for those most in need, as the rental rates will be tied to market amounts, not income. Very disappointed in this agreement and action on the part of the Province.

212. To start with...

All environmental experts agree that marshes, bogs, and wetlands are essential to mitigating floods. In the late 1950s to 1960 the wetland was bisected by the development of Highway 111. Immediately following this, the surrounding area experienced more flooding than ever seen before. It took over a decade to return to 'normal' levels. In 1971 after HRM was devastated from flooding caused by Hurricane Beth, the N.S. Government decided Eisner Cove Wetland would become a protected area, as it was key to mitigating floodwaters in the surrounding area. In 1971 they made the decision to protect the wetland from future development, clearcutting, etc. They even added berms to increase its efficiency. Why have you not taken this in to account? Why have you not studied the potential damage you will do to the surrounding area, by causing flooding? Do you plan to reimburse homeowners for property damage if/when it occurs as a result of this development? Do you plan to relocate the trailer homes in Maple Ridge Estates, if the land becomes unlivable due to damage caused by the development?

This development is unacceptable in every possible way:

- Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc. How can this project be trusted if even this basic info is contradictory?

- The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighborhoods.
- The use of the land footprint is inefficient.
- The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection.
- The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school.
- The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.
- A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential. Nor did you take in to account the previous findings and decisions made regarding Eisner Cove.
- There was no consideration of local school capacity.
- There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.
- The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.

- Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.
- Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.
- HRM will lose a critical carbon sink. The last wetland in Dartmouth.
- There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.
- There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.
- The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.
- It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.
- It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret.
- It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved.

The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds.

213. I wanted to add, as a nearby resident whom lives on Campbell Ave. I am quite frankly disgusted that you chose to allow this development to go forward, before even consulting the public first! What is the point of this consultation if you've allowed half the place to be clear-cut before this comment period even ends?

You sold public Crown land, without any consultation first, in a sketchy backroom deal. You allowed a development to go forward without any consultation from real experts. Why did the property assessment drop from over 1.4 million, down to nearly \$400k right before the sale? This entire ordeal is extremely suspect. What happened to doing something different Mr. Houston!?!?

214. 'All environmental experts agree that marshes, bogs, and wetlands are essential to mitigating floods. In the late 1950s to 1960 the wetland was bisected by the development of Highway 111. Immediately following this, the surrounding area experienced more flooding than ever seen before. It took over a decade to return to 'normal' levels. In 1971 after HRM was devastated from flooding caused by Hurricane Beth, the N.S. Government decided Eisner Cove Wetland would become a protected area, as it was key to mitigating floodwaters in the surrounding area. In 1971 they made the decision to protect the wetland from future development, clearcutting, etc. They even added berms to increase its efficiency. Why have you not taken this in to account? Why have you not studied the potential damage you will do to the surrounding area, by causing flooding? Do you plan to reimburse homeowners for property damage if/when it occurs as a result of this development? Do you plan to relocate the trailer homes in Maple Ridge Estates, if the land becomes unlivable due to damage caused by the development?

This development is unacceptable in every possible way:

- Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc. How can this project be trusted if even this basic info is contradictory?
- The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighborhoods.
- The use of the land footprint is inefficient.
- The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection.
- The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school.
- The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.
- A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential. Nor did you take in to account the previous findings and decisions made regarding Eisner Cove.

- There was no consideration of local school capacity.
- There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.
- The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.
- Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.
- Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.
- HRM will lose a critical carbon sink. The last wetland in Dartmouth.
- There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.
- There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.
- The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.
- It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.
- It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret.
- It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved.

The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds.

215. Eisner cove Wetland must be preserved in its entirety .

216. While recognizing the development largely meets existing municipal regulations, I'm concerned that the buffer around the wetland isn't sufficient given the topography of the site. The wetland sits at the bottom of bowl that drains into it. If the vegetation is stripped from the site that will put more pressure on the wetland.

Also, I don't believe the housing is truly low income/affordable housing for those most displaced due to the current housing crisis. I had thought this accelerated provincial process was supposed to address that need.

217. I'm concerned about displaced wildlife. Since the clear cutting has begun, I have regularly seen deer on my street [REDACTED] which I'd never seen before. After the area is completely cleared, I'm not sure where existing wildlife are supposed to go and have not heard of a plan to address that issue.

218. Affordable + Accessible Homes

Nova Scotia has the highest rate of disability in Canada with 30% (it's 43% for seniors) according to Stats Canada. Finding an affordable + accessible home in HRM is nearly impossible! Ask me, I have tried on numerous occasions.

Aging-in-Place is the buzz, but unless new housing units are accessible many seniors will struggle and will live in unsafe housing.

Let's ensure that all homes are at least VISIBLE & ADAPTABLE for accessibility and that all multiple housing over 4 units are fully accessible in accordance with the Built Environment Standards proposed by the Province of Nova Scotia <https://novascotia.ca/accessibility/built-environment/Built-Environment-Recommendations-Phase-1.pdf>

Visible, means that a person with a disability can enter the housing unit independently and go to the bathroom. e.g. the minimum front and bathroom door width of 36".

Adaptable, means that the housing unit can easily and affordably be adapted to meet full accessibility standards. e.g. blocking of studs so that grab bars can easily be installed.

We suggest the proponent contact us to consult with the disability community. Call me!

Respectfully Submitted

Gerry Post

219. Please listen to the people who have the interests of housing AND wetlands at heart. The wetlands at Eisner Cove are not a good choice for a housing development. The process is flawed. The sale was basically sneaky. There are other choices. Preserve the land, the water, and your dignity by refusing to approve this sale and development.

220. Southdale Future Growth Node.

This development is unacceptable in every possible way.

The density is misaligned with the surrounding neighbourhoods.

The use of the land footprint is inefficient.

The units are not climate-conscious. No solar, heat pumps or water collection.

The traffic study appears to grossly underestimate the traffic that will be generated, as all residents will need to leave the area in order to shop, work or go to school.

The traffic study does not assess the impact to traffic in surrounding streets.

A thorough study was not performed on water runoff and flood potential.

There was no consideration of local school capacity.

There was no true environmental impact assessment performed.

The buffers around the wetland are insufficient to keep it alive, especially given the slope of the land and the fact that infrastructure is permitted within buffer.

Dartmouth will lose a valuable urban green space, even though abundant brownfield locations exist as usable alternatives.

Infilling the wetland and building a road across it is unnecessary, as there are exits to Gaston Road.

HRM will lose a critical carbon sink.

There has been no accounting done for the carbon that the wetland will release.

There has been no plan or accommodation for the animals that will be displaced. No safe passage corridors. They will die on the highway.

The housing created is largely targeted towards middle income, and will not have a discernable affect on the affordable housing crisis.

It is unconscionable that the developer has received a \$22M forgivable loan when that money could be used towards much better affordable housing solutions.

It is beyond belief that the Housing Task Force and Minister Lohr have absolute decision-making power and can bypass any protocol they choose, that they accept no public input, and keep their deliberations secret.

It is abhorrent that approval was given to clear cut the property before the project was even approved.

Submitted documents pertaining to this development contain so many inconsistencies that it appears no one actually knows the basic info: number of units, size of property, size of the wetland, etc.

The fast-tracking approach has allowed all of the above challenges to remain unanswered as the project proceeds.

221.	The design of the development is beautifully done; however where it is located at in Eisner Cove Wetlands should not be disturbed. There will be run off from road salt, car exhaust, pollution from pets and of course pollution from people residing there. There has been talk the houses and apartments are attainable or even affordable. The newly constructed apartments that are close to the area off of Basswood Run are hardly affordable. They rent at approximately \$2,195.00 for a 2 bedroom 2 bath apartment a month. What will the apartments rent for and what will the asking price be for the the places for sale? While housing is needed, this land is needed more. If it dug up for housing, carbons will be released rather than absorbed. What will happen to the surrounding areas like Maple Ridge Park? It could start flooding and endanger the tenants living there or displace them. What about the people living on Lynn Drive or Fenwick St? It could cause flooding as well, cause more traffic. What about Dartmouth South Academy? It can hold up to 730 students. In 2021 there were 651 students. With the nearby school almost at compacity it is concerning for over crowding if the new development does happen at Eisner Cove Wetlands. There are countless animals living there that will have to migrate and may get hit by the traffic. There are many different floral and fauna there. They provide food, and shelter to the animals living there, migrating birds, butterflies and bees etc. I would really like the city to reconsider this land being destroyed as I believe there is too much to lose compared to what will be gained. Thank you for reading this and please reconsider the destruction of this wonderful place.
222.	Plans for development on the Eisner Wetland site need to be halted immediately. Wetlands are a critical environment. Not only do they provide a unique & irreplaceable environment for countless important species, they also play a key role in filtering toxins out of freshwater — which we eventually drink. The current development agreement is hasty and does not consider the ecological ramifications of habitat destruction. As a Nova Scotia citizen I ask that these plans be abandoned or halted until a comprehensive and independent review of the environmental implications of such a project can be identified.
223.	Please reconsider this area for development. It's to important to be wasted on housing for the well off.
224.	I realize that affordable housing is critical for the city, but I don't accept that the only plan housing can be built is in the Eisner Cove Wetland. There have to be sites in HRM where building will not compromise the few urban wetlands that are left. Based on the actions of the company earlier this summer I don't believe that Clayton Developments has any intention of preserving the wetland in Eisner Cove. It seems to be an issue of saying whatever is needed to get the project approved, doing whatever they want to the property and then saying sorry after the damage is done. Not trustworthy corporate citizens. The Province, along with HRM needs to step up here, to find a solution that will work, destroying an urban wetland is not the answer.
225.	We do need affordable housing. But housing is pointless if we don't protect the environment first. Creating wetland else where as a replacement still is destructive and doesn't negate the environmental damage. Wetlands protect our water supply and act as a carbon sink. Destroying it releases more stored carbon into the atmosphere. The "replacement" wetland would take decades to store the same amount of carbon. And with the excessive amount of algae blooms in Halifax why would we want to destroy an area that can clean and protect our water supplies? There must be other areas that housing can be built.
226.	Wetlands are very important as a carbon sink and managing flood zones. Destroying this one will do more harm than good. Please do not harm the wetlands. Build around them if you must, but please for the love of Mother Earth, don't destroy the wetlands. They're too important.

227.	Stop the destruction of Dartmouth's last wetland at Eisner Cove, it amazes me how you say planting trees, bike lanes etc. is good for the environment yet you let de-forestation continue. Wetlands help regulate the supply of water by nature, wetlands are nature's water purifiers. Wetlands are where diverse animals find protection and forage. Forests provide oxygen for all of us. I also find it funny how the value assessments on this land has dropped 70% after holding steady for 5 years, just in time for development, sleazy move HRM. Protect Eisner Wetland...
228.	I think the wetland should be left alone, we have so few left. There is plenty of other areas in Halifax/Dartmouth where this development could be done
229.	I do not support this proposal. There are many already developed areas in the HRM that could be redeveloped for increased density and serve as a "growth node". This proposal infringes on an important wetland and should not be allowed to continue.
230.	I believe that wetlands are important and should be protected. There are many places within the HRM that are not green spaces that can be used for affordable housing
231.	Today is Sept 6th, I just saw a post that nine hours ago Clayton Developments is moving heavy machinery into place to continue clearing the trees at Eisner Cove. Why are asking for public consultation? The city is not stopping the clearing of the land? This is just ticking the box to say you had consultations, when HRM has either no will or ability to stop the destruction.
232.	It is truly preposterous that the government is planning to destroy ANY portion of a wetland. We have so few of these ecosystems left and we are in the middle of a catastrophic climate crisis. We are seeing the very nature of our destruction before our eyes and you want to destroy even more?
233.	For city planning initiatives and provincial climate initiatives that separately claim to pride themselves on conservation and climate action, it seems extremely relevant and totally counterproductive to give up wetlands vital to our native climate. Not to mention these wetlands were sold to developers for a CONSIDERABLY less amount than they have been appraised for in the past, which raises questions that the community absolutely deserve a response to from the Houston government. Anything but transparency in this situation indicates deplorable governing practices that are wholly unacceptable given the magnitude of the crises our province finds itself in. The affordable housing crisis is an immediate crisis, as is the climate crisis, both deserve and absolutely require our URGENT attention, but we cannot solve one if it comes at a complete detriment to the other. That is simply NOT an appropriate or acceptable solution for the people of this province. We deserve. Our wetlands and our piece of the earth deserve better. Do better.
234.	This is the largest remaining plot of unprotected forested habitat. You can not develop here. You need to listen to the water protectors. I stand in solidarity with Protect Eisner Cove Wetland.
235.	I don't see a detailed list of species at risk within the area , the only species mentioned were snapping and painted turtle, what about the large number of birds that are at risk in the area and the invertebrates including several species of bumble bees and also the plants at risk in the area. I didn't see any mitigation measures for how you will reduce the projects impact of the species and environment. Overall it seem like a significant amount of information was not provided for this project that should be for a project of this scale.

236.	we don't need more developments for 'attainable housing,' we need real solutions to afford the housing that already exists. not to mention, developing in wetlands is a nightmare for nearby homeowners because it can cause flooding (mold) & creates unstable ground which leads to structural problems in the existing houses. there is no need to destroy a wetland which is home to so many plant, animal, & insect species. wetlands help purify our water systems, manage air quality, moderate extreme heat, provide sanctuary for migratory birds, & provide safe green spaces for humans. it's destruction will only aggravate climate change more as the carbon from the Eisner Wetlands' soils will be released during the development process. you cannot solve the housing crisis by fuelling the climate crisis; society, economy, & the environment are woven together, the destruction of one means the destruction of all. we need the Eisner Wetlands to be public & protected property.
237.	Housing is important but we cannot be building on protected Wetlands
238.	Development looks great, most of my concerns are around traffic, one concern is the industrial traffic being stopped at the lights in the winter months trying to get going on the incline side of the lights. Also looking at the planning not sure if there is a cross walk planned to access the mount hope multi use trail.
239.	Is there any guarantee the land being developed will be affordable housing? If not i see no purpose in disturbing a fragile ecosystem that could be left alone. We need wetlands. They are keeping us breathing. I don't believe you can have a construction site around wetlands and not disturb and damage them. Halifax needs affordable housing but why does it have to come at the cost of our natural spaces? We are watching our world flood and burn all at the same time but continue to destroy it. If you think this development isn't part of the problem you are mistaken. We can all choose to do better for this planet and I would choose to build on land that has already been developed and is not currently a wetland.
240.	Very speculative on the actual added value this development will provide to our community - will it remain affordable - is it worth the destruction of the wetland?
241.	Please do not develop this area. This wetland and green space is important for preventing flooding, and to preserve biodiversity. The homes constructed in this area will not meaningfully act as solutions to the housing crisis.
242.	The main problem I see is that BEFORE we get a chance to thoroughly study the draft policies and submitted plans is that the housing minister has already approved clearcutting of the Eisner Cove Wetland. So they are clearcutting, HRP is arresting LAWFUL and peaceful protesters, and we are nowhere near the deadline of Sept 19 that supposed consultation is taking place! THIS MUST STOP. Is nothing important but money to this city and this province?
243.	It is interesting that this project is already going ahead, before public consultation is complete. This indicates that there is no real value to be held for the public's view on this. There is an innate need for housing in the region, but that does not mean building housing at the expense of some of the last remaining wetlands in this area. Especially with the uptick in global climate disasters, and unprecedented weather relating to climate change. Wetlands, all of the wetlands, are needed more than ever before. More over, this project should be done with Mi'kmaq leaders who have been sustainably and responsibly keeping this land for millennia.
244.	I am delighted to tell you what I think! But firstly, what are YOU thinking?!?!? Destroying wetlands and much valued and needed ecosystems for some property development? Wake up! We are nearing the end of 2022, we are on the brink of countless climate disasters and you have decided, without real public consultation (chat chats with rapacious developers does not count) and without intelligent consideration for the precariousness of our non-renewable world to be a contributing factor?!?!? I'm shocked and disgusted....

245. I support the initiative for affordable housing; however @nsgov and HRM has used the housing crisis and their political power to remove almost all public consultation and involvement in the decision of where this housing is place! In 2022, with the climate crisis in full bore, we cannot afford to lose this urban ecological asset!

I want environmental accountability.

Please stop the “attainable housing” development at this beautiful urban wetland! I want REAL solutions that don’t destroy our environment for future generations!

Though wetlands often escape the notice of most people, they command the attention of frogs, salamanders and ducks. Wetlands are transition zones between water and land. Wetlands help keep the environment clean and in balance; they also supply some of nature's most biologically productive habitats. They are home to a high diversity of wildlife, including many species at risk, such as blanding's turtle and thread-leaved sundew.

Why promote the below agenda when you’re not going to follow it:

“More landowner are now practising sustainable land uses on adjoining lands to help conserve wetland habitats. People with wetland habitat on their property, instead of in-filling these areas, are electing to maintain them for the benefit of wildlife. Many community groups are adopting a local wetland or restoring an abused wetland and transforming it into productive, healthy wildlife habitat; some people are even creating new wetland habitat in their neighbourhood. We all benefit.

Attitudes towards wetlands are improving. Efforts in Nova Scotia and around the world are helping to keep wetlands working for the good of nature. Wetlands are now receiving the recognition and care they rightfully deserve.

Respecting Wetlands...

observe 'Forest/Wildlife Guidelines and Standards' for Nova Scotia when working near wetlands
minimise disturbance to the zone surrounding a wetland, including inflows and outflows
build around wetlands; don't drain or in-fill
travel around wetlands, rather than through
employ land use planning that respects the integrity of wetlands
keep solid and chemical wastes out of and away from wetlands
minimise human activities in wetlands
consult your local planning office if you plan to alter a wetland
take time to visit and discover more about wetland habitats”

246. This should be more transparent - the work shouldn’t have started already and this is not an appropriate place for this housing, which isn’t affordable anyway.. the province should use the research provided showing the prioritized need for affordable housing

247. I think the submitted plans and development agreement are flawed because it involves destroying a portion of the wetland. Furthermore, development has already begun when this development is still in the public consultation phase, which is a serious issue as the developer could be causing serious harm to the wetland. Additionally to this the oversight from the city and province is severely lacking for something like this to happen

248.	'This development should not exist. The location is not appropriate for a number of reasons: - it is far from everything with poor transit links - there is not yet any proof that the housing will actually be affordable - the development harms an important habitat by skirting past environmental assessment requirements - indigenous voices are being ignored as we continue to steal land and ignore those who have been stewards for generations
249.	I am very concerned with traffic on lower Lynn Drive so is there anyway this project cannot open up Lynn Drive?
250.	I think this is great. Finally some progress on the Dartmouth side. We have such an abundant amount of land that is underutilized and could offer shelter for so many people. Our young people and older population (myself included) need housing more than ever and especially one level living. I hope it continues and allows for those looking for affordable homes to obtain one. Keep up the good work.
251.	Don't use these wetlands for private developers. Stop forcing indigenous people to fight for their land. Come up with a better way to densify in existing developed land in HRM for all levels of income. The planning and selling of this land for development is the laziest way of doing business. There are better, more inclusive solutions compared to destroying sacred land while forcing low income people out of HRM.
252.	I am opposed to this development as it will significantly impact the associated wetland. This in an area where there is thought to be several species at risk and should therefore be being considered for preservation and not development. Additionally wetlands are an important carbon sink and buffer pollutants which may get into ground water. Wetlands can not be replaced easily and this area should be left to store carbon and absorb water, acting as an important natural tool for both mitigation and adaptation locally. There are many brownfield development sites locally which could be used for affordable housing development. A greenfield wetland site which has important carbon sequestration potential and is an important local habitat should not be being considered for development let alone cleared in advance of proper assessment as is currently occurring.
253.	Stop it all now.
254.	I think it's terrible that we are using what we all think was protected land to build. There are so many other areas that could be used like Shannon Park or even Penhorn area. There is so much wildlife now roaming on Lynn Drive scared with nowhere to go it's heartbreaking
255.	I am very happy to see the site is being fast-tracked for development in response to the housing crisis we are experiencing.
256.	I live in Southdale, and I'm excited to see a dense housing development near us. The design itself is very car-centric. Pleasant Street is super dangerous already due to fast traffic and pedestrians mixing.
257.	There needs to be an alternative site, building this project is killing many killing or sentencing them to their death.

258.	Why are we using so much of the small number of larger green spaces in this city? We're not Toronto, Vancouver or any other large city. Nor do we want to be, that'd be taking away the charm Halifax/Dartmouth has. There is enough land already disturbed by humans that can be used for housing. Empty buildings that could be renovated for affordable housing. Why alter the wetland at all? I have a strong feeling it'll get screwed up like a lot of other things. Leave the wetland alone and let it keep doing its job. Which its "job" benefits humans and wildlife, leave it alone! No altering!
259.	What are the rent prices for these units? Are they actually affordable? Also- why not put these units anywhere else? Wetlands are crucial for water and carbon retention! Mi'kmaq folks have not given consent to this project and are being arrested and hurt by police for protecting this land. It's shameful that the municipality would develop here when there are so many other empty lots or land in the HRM. Please stop this. Every effort is needed now to preserve natural areas to mitigate climate change!!
260.	While it's good that Ducks Unlimited will construct wetlands to offset the destruction of the Southdale wetlands, it doesn't address the habitat removal that wild animals currently live in. As well, this area is a wetland for a reason. Construction of housing units will result in runoff to wetlands, likely destroying them beyond the planned 6% destruction.
261.	We need all of the wetlands we have, to clean our water and maintain essential biodiversity. Build up rather than out.
262.	It is completely inappropriate to destroy an older forest/wetland ecosystem - it's our last one in Metro. A back room process that excludes the public is terribly wrong. Bargain basement prices that ensure profits for the developer are wrong. This whole thing is wrong. Use a land swap and make Eisner Cove a park.
263.	As much as we need housing, we do not need to build housing on or near wetlands. We do not need large developers building unaffordable housing, we need government owned housing that is truly affordable
264.	Dear Mr. Grant and staff, I would like to share that I am disappointed in how the The Eisener Cove wetland has been handled by AJ Legrow holdings up to this point, before the public comment period is over. In the Phase 1 Community Engagement Summary, a significant portion of respondents expressed their opposition to any development on the site at all. Section 7 b of the Approval granted by the province to AJ Legrow holdings reads: "Once the soils in the approved area of alteration have been exposed, the approved activity shall commence immediately". Given this, the presence of heavy machinery on-site and removal of vegetation before the end of the public comment period demonstrates that the developers do not intend to alter or halt their course of action in response to public feedback. Also in the Phase 1 Community Engagement Summary, it is noted that "many respondents suggested that a balance between development and environmental protection is possible or desirable". I would like to push back against the notion that a balance between development and environmental protection can be viewed within the bounds of the Eisener Cove Wetland site alone. The site is dwarfed by surrounding areas of previous urban and industrial development. Its presence as a balance for these built-up areas would be significantly compromised by the proposed developments. Though it is noted in the proposal that only 6% of the wetland area would be built over, the overall habitat/wilderness space provided by this area would be irreversibly reduced to less than half of its former size. I hope that you will consider the wider importance of this area and choose to direct your efforts to create "attainable housing" towards areas that are not some of the last remaining untouched

	wilderness areas in HRM. Lastly and most importantly, I would like to add that this project takes place on the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq People. Any development on this land that is not planned and carried out in collaboration with and for the benefit of the Mi'kmaq people is neocolonialism. The land as it exists now holds cultural importance for the Mi'kmaq that cannot be understated. The arrest of a Mi'kmaq elder and land defender engaging in peaceful protest at the site this week highlights the government's and developer's complete lack of respect for their sovereignty on this land. I hope you can do better, Sincerely, Madeleine Putnam
265.	Please leave the wetland intact, it is important for the environment
266.	In my opinion, if wetland has to be CREATED to offset this development, then the development should not be allowed to move forward. This development will clearly have a negative impact on the wetland. Wetlands are important habitats for hundreds of animals. There's already more dead animals on highway 111. We don't need anymore. The province needs affordable housing, the city needs to stop allowing high-end condo development.
267.	I believe development in this area is a good idea and needed IF the wetlands are deemed valuable habitat and properly protected. The proposed alterations sound good on paper but an independent, properly certified environmental assessment is needed to understand the impacts those alterations will have on the rest of the wetlands. What will the additional development around the wetlands do to alter the rest? In addition, the development needs appropriate infrastructure to go with it. Additional housing is not helpful if there isn't supporting grocery stores (walkable distance on proper sidewalks), regular and frequent bus service, and other amenities. We need to stop looking at just building more big apartments and actually create full, walkable neighbourhoods. This is an opportunity to start a fresh neighbourhood properly. If you just plunk more apartments down like in Bedford West/Larry Uteck or much of Clayton park's new development, it's just a traffic/congestion nightmare that doesn't serve the populations it needs to (lower income, single or no car households). We are in both a housing and a climate crisis. We need to start balancing these as we look for solutions. Help people get out of their cars more by letting them do their shopping, etc. close by and protect our environment so it can start working with us again and not against us.
268.	I'm with the protesters - we need to protect the wetland!
269.	Please reconsider this plan. Affordable housing and wetland preservation are both crucial. The plan should be revised to avoid damaging wetland
270.	I believe it is criminal the way this is proceeding without full consultation. The lack of response from our elected officials to this date is also inexcusable. As well as the recent action of selected police officers while on site. We all believe housing is required but at a proper availability and not hidden. This complete project is being improperly handled and people need to step back and approach this openly

271.	The submitted plans should not include wetland space. There are many areas of land available that don't house species at risk.
272.	The Province's Executive Panel on Housing is rubber-stamping inappropriate developments across HRM—including Eisner Cove—under the guise of "affordable housing." By steamrolling sensitive ecosystems and local communities, what the Panel has really done is proven itself a threat to the democratic process. The Nova Scotia government offered Eisner Cove Wetland and the adjacent forest up to Clayton Developments on a silver platter. This is the first fast-tracked site to see devastation on the ground (before this public consultation even began—which is a whole other issue). It wasn't long ago that Nova Scotians fought—and won—against the Liberal government's secret delisting of Owls Head Provincial Park, where the government at the time put private interests ahead of the public good. Yet we're once again seeing a lack of transparency, fairness, and public consultation, this time from Premier Houston's government. It's time for Nova Scotia to support real affordable housing in a way that benefits local communities, the environment, and the residents who need it most—not just the developers looking to cash in on the housing crisis.
273.	I am appalled by this plan. To think that we are considering destroying our precious wetlands over a false choice: affordable housing or conservation. What a sham. There are far better alternatives for affordable housing than destroying sensitive ecological areas. What a joke and a complete travesty that work has already begun prior to public consultation. Honestly, why bother to ask if it's just going forward anyway? Its a good way for politicians to show just how little they care for the people they are elected by. It's disrespectful to voting citizens that we can only have our say after the developer has moved in machines and begun destroying the wetland. I am against development of this area for a litany of reasons, the top ones being that it's environmentally irresponsible and that other, better affordable housing options are available. How awful that the province doesn't actually care what voters think. It's absolutely disgraceful that our input is only being accepted after the fact. It's as though a doctor is seeking consent for surgery only after the operation is underway. It's a gross way to operate and grosser still to frame this environmental disaster as an option for affordable housing. Further to that, this "affordable" housing as something most average Nova Scotians would still struggle to afford. I am left shaking my head at the audacity, carelessness, and disregard of the developer and elected officials when it comes to this project.
274.	Very in favour of development in this area. I think there is room to keep the wetland viable while also building desperately needed housing for the area.
275.	The Province's Executive Panel on Housing is rubber-stamping inappropriate developments across HRM—including Eisner Cove—under the guise of "affordable housing." By steamrolling sensitive ecosystems and local communities, what the Panel has really done is proven itself a threat to the democratic process. The Nova Scotia government offered Eisner Cove Wetland and the adjacent forest up to Clayton Developments on a silver platter. This is the first fast-tracked site to see devastation on the ground (before this public consultation even began—which is a whole other issue). It wasn't long ago that Nova Scotians fought—and won—against the Liberal government's secret delisting of Owls Head Provincial Park, where the government at the time put private interests ahead of the public good. Yet we're once again seeing a lack of transparency, fairness, and public consultation, this time from Premier Houston's government.

	It's time for Nova Scotia to support real affordable housing in a way that benefits local communities, the environment, and the residents who need it most—not just the developers looking to cash in on the housing crisis.
276.	The entire forested area should be left undisturbed for the future of our province and planet. ANY development will jeopardize the health and safety of this precious land and resource. Tree removal, construction, noise, pollution, and salt run off from future development will put this wetland at risk. It's 2022, the writing is on the wall for global climate catastrophe, we can not play money games with our wild lands any longer. Those games are what got us here in the first place.
277.	I think the development being proposed is unnecessary. Not only will this development result in more unaffordable housing but also impact the wetland environment, even if it is just 6.1% of that environment.
278.	Perhaps we should build housing in a more suitable area. Such as an abandoned building or two.
279.	The government should know better than to allow for a housing development on a wetland. We have just gone through this with Owl's Head. How could the city be so tone deaf about people's concern for the environment, especially after a summer during which we've seen heatwaves across the world? If the Housing Minister has such power, why doesn't he expropriate the land on the peninsula that is used for car dealerships. There is no reason for those dealerships to be on the peninsula, on land that would be perfect for housing. This seriously damages whatever faith I had left in our municipal and provincial governments.
280.	Sustainability needs to be at the center of all urban planning and development to prevent the worst possible outcomes of a changing climate and to ensure the ongoing liveability of the HRM into the future. Building on and drastically altering wetlands is not the way. Did you know that the heat dome in BC last year directly caused the deaths of over 600 residents (https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/birth-adoption-death-marriage-and-divorce/deaths/coroners-service/death-review-panel/extreme_heat_death_review_panel_report.pdf)? Unlivable cities is what comes from this kind of decision making.
281.	I do not believe that any construction should take place on this patch of land. It is now glaringly obvious that humans must do everything possible to mitigate our destructive effects on the climate of the planet, and wetlands are a crucial part of this. Other cities around the world are actively working to restore wetlands that they damaged or destroyed in the past. It is beyond understanding that we would be so backwards as to squander the remnant of our wetland in this city, a treasure we should be guarding. Perhaps a land swap can be arranged with the developer. Their development looks well-planned (although far from affordable for housing the poor and the homeless) so it would be nice to see it actually improving an area of the city, rather than destroying the habitat of creatures which also have a right to life, and an ecosystem which contributes to our own quality of life and to actually maintaining living systems on the planet.
282.	I think the fact that this is being passed off as an affordable housing project is deplorable. This is on Mi'kmaq unceded territory which never should have been sold to a private company, let alone what you're doing to it now. This is shameful and anyone involved in this "development" is urged to reconsider their actions and the subsequent consequences of the same. There is no agreement until Mi'kmaq elders and the rightful owners of this land are not only in agreement, but directing the project (or conservation plan), as well as a non-biased environmental impact study has been completed by an organization that is not affiliated with, or profiting from, the corporations behind the destruction.

283.	I think the fact that this is being passed off as an affordable housing project is deplorable. This is on Mi'kmaq unceded territory which never should have been sold to a private company, let alone what you're doing to it now. This is shameful and anyone involved in this "development" is urged to reconsider their actions and the subsequent consequences of the same. There is no agreement until Mi'kmaq elders and the rightful owners of this land are not only in agreement, but directing the project (or conservation plan), as well as a non-biased environmental impact study has been completed by an organization that is not affiliated with, or profiting from, the corporations behind the destruction.
284.	While I'm sure this is nothing more than a cynical attempt to legitimize what has been a corrupt and illegitimate process from the start, I will give you my feedback anyway. Beyond the irreversible, unnecessary environmental damage to a rare urban wetland when we can least afford to lose these precious areas, a development of this size will devastate this community. Adding thousands of units and thus hundreds of vehicles to small quiet neighborhoods that already have very poor roads, will lead to dangerous conditions and even worse air quality (especially in addition to the environmental destruction). Much of the traffic will be drawn through these small neighborhoods as these new residents bring their children to school. The school, just recently built (with no ventilation or air conditioning), will have no where near the capacity to support hundreds of new students. But you'll pack them in anyway. Because that's how things work in this city. In recent summers we've been asked to conserve water due to low levels during hot spells. Once you add thousands of more residents, between this development and the penhorn development, on that same limited water supply, what is your plan for that? I doubt that there is one. Putting in place "special" rules for large developers, giving them secret bargain basements deals, allowing destruction in advance of any legitimate approval, and gaslighting and attacking residents for asking for answers and a legitimate process and erodes community trust and confidence in all levels of government. But this is a relatively poor area so we aren't given the consideration that Bedford or the South End of Halifax get to take for granted. We don't get to "Shape our City" because it's not "our" city. It's the city of the developers and the "friends" in high places. We are not stupid or naive. No matter how much you try to spin this, we see the corruption. I have never been more disgusted, enraged, and ashamed of our government representatives at all levels. I will save the rest if my "feedback" for the ballot box.
285.	There are viable construction sites in many other areas that would interfere dramatically less with the future livability of the HRM. It is extremely important to protect forested areas. Right now the consequences of habitat destruction are very apparent: air pollution and rising temperatures are particularly felt within cities, and this is exactly what the destruction of the wetland will contribute to. In a neighborhood with many schools, the effect of air pollution on children could be felt for their entire lives and have a dramatic effect on their development. Last year, 600 BC citizens died due to an unprecedented heat dome, and many of those citizens were seniors. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-nearly-600-people-died-in-bc-summer-heat-wave-vast-majority-seniors/ The significance of destroying a natural ecosystem is being severely and deliberately downplayed.
286.	Please halt all development in this area immediately!! Any development should be under the municipality's authority, with proper process and controls and adequate public consultation. There is no role for autocratic provincial intervention here. Did the Owl's Head debacle teach you nothing?? Stop cutting corners to destroy our natural world. Yes, affordable and attainable housing is required, but it must be created thoughtfully, respectfully and responsibility - not hastily by unelected officials.

287.	We already know that they are not meaningfully committed to not destroying the wetland they are already doing so thoughtlessly and possibly illegally.
288.	I live on [REDACTED] and have a stake in this area. I came here because it was the only green belt that was both in the city and close to my work location. I have seen fox, osprey, deer, great blue heron, muskrat, rabbit and more on and near my property. It will be sad to see them go. But go they will for I fear that it is already too late for all of those animals. Too sad! I drove by the site today and noticed that the developer has hired guards to watch over the area. Perhaps they are feeling a little remorse but I think not. They are probably trying to protect that big pile of logs there at the road side. I do not think that I will stay here for long, there is not much to look forward to. It is also difficult to support a council that could allow such a thing to happen. Grieving Resident, TAP.
289.	I have no problem with this development.
290.	I do not think this development should be going ahead and the fact that trees are already being cut during the public consultation period is shameful!!
291.	This consultation period is an absurd piece of theatre as the site is already being clear cut?!?! We see right through this sham.
292.	On behalf of the trees: OOOOOOOOUCH!! OWWWWWWW!! Your blades are sharp, your heavy machines are hurting my roots. I help clean the air that you breathe, please stop!
293.	I think affordable housing is important (whether this is affordable or not is another question) but there are plenty of empty parking lots and other locations that it could be built. This planning process which allows for development to start before the end of the comment period is a farce.
294.	The project has an intent of creating affordable housing. While the intent is commendable, the outcome is not affordable: 60% - 80% of market rate is not equal to 30% of household income. The planned development is occurring during a climate crisis. There is not a single green roof planned. That is unacceptable.
295.	I believe that construction should continue. This community needs more housing.
296.	It's a great development
297.	This is housing that's desperately needed, and it will be a good fit for the area.
298.	We are in dire need of housing. Affordable housing is desperately needed, and the only way to make that happen is to create the housing. Otherwise we will wind up with continued growing homelessness and heightened violence and theft within the community. This has felt like a safe community for years up until the last two. Increase housing can help stabilize everything listed above.
299.	Protect this wetland and do not develop it.
300.	Don't we have enough development? Can't we leave the wetlands alone so we still have animals in the years to come?
301.	I believe the wetlands should be UNTOUCHED. It could be for an access road, or for an entire community, neither reason is good enough to disrupt an ecosystem. Humans have destroyed everything on this planet, animals have no place to go. Shameful.

302.	I don't think this development plan was well thought out....why destroy part of it and then have Ducks Unlimited create another space? I also don't think that this property should have been sold to this development company in the manner and price in which it was done. There are many places that housing could go....such as abandoned industrial areas...rather than use up what little bit of nature we have left.
303.	There is a great deal of confusion with regard to the type of units being built on this site. The terms "affordable" and "attainable" appear to be interchangeable throughout all communications and reporting. According to off-market housing companies, the CMHC and affordable housing advocates, affordable housing is dependent upon total income before taxes. CMHC claims that no more than 30% of total income before taxes can be paid towards rent / mortgage payments. A single parent earning minimum wage working 40-hours per week has a yearly income of approximately 27,000. 30% of that is 8,330 which leaves a monthly sum of \$690 available for rent / mortgage payments. Approx 330 units being built on this property will be approximately 80% of market value to make them more affordable for 20 years. Company communications have placed these units at \$1850 to \$2250 per month, which puts them between \$1450 and \$1800 per month. How will this help the affordable housing and homeless crisis in HRM? What happens after that 20 years? How can you (the City / Task Force and Clayton Development) resolve this discrepancy?
304.	That wetland should be completely protected and not used. There are so many other potential spots for growth that are not on one of our few remaining wetlands!!!
305.	It's important to me that we preserve this land that isn't ours, demolition is and unnecessary violence and I would rather nature than more destruction and construction.
306.	Preparing a second letter to be sent separately via email.
307.	This is not good and you should not do it.
308.	As a resident of Dartmouth/Southdale I am extremely concerned about the development of the Eisner Cove Wetland. While housing is very important our environment and impact on the environment and carbon footprint is of even greater concern. I am very much opposed to the development Eisner Cove Wetland and urge you to stop.
309.	They are bullshit ... There are SO MANY other EMPTY, WASTED lots all across Dartmouth that wouldn't even need to be cleared that this city could actually build some AFFORDABLE and ATTAINABLE housing on.
310.	Do not destroy this wetland.
311.	While I understand the outrage around what is being done to a wetland, I personally believe the crucial need for affordable housing trumps the environmental impact at this point. Inflationary pressures and a critical housing shortage means action needs to be taken now to ensure more Nova Scotians aren't at risk. Stopping this development to do impact studies, at this point, would prolong the development of critical housing infrastructure.
312.	It should be illegal to use any part of a wetland in Nova Scotia for development. I do not agree to anything being constructed on this property known as Eisner Cove Wetlands. There is a better way to do this!
313.	Don't. We need trees and wet land, oxygen is important and animals have no where to go. It's literally the only green space in that area

314.	I do not believe a plans have been submitted for the Southdale site that can be viewed by the public. Why is this development being overseen by a provincial committee with no expertise and that operates in secret? Should there not be some HRM planning involvement.
315.	This should never have been started , and now you want opinions , well you are working backwards but we never expected anything else from government .
316.	This land should not be cleared. The people involved should be ashamed of themselves
317.	I have not seen any documents related to an environmental assessment and the long-term impacts of developing what should be protected land. Seems as though the project is being fast-tracked, and the developers have the "clear land now, deal with potential environmental issues / fines later" mentality. 'Constructing' new wetlands, while destroying ones that exist naturally seems like a terrible idea, and I am very disappointed to see this project so rushed, without proper environmental consideration.
318.	Bad news --should remain a natural wetland in totality, not sectioned off or parcelled out for development.
319.	I don't understand how wetlands can be used for building. If it's such a small amount to build then look at other areas like the old Irving land or the land by the auto port. There are other options. The city as usual does everything backwards and not really for the people by for the pocket book of friends.
320.	This is horrific. Please put a stop to the senseless and appalling attacks and destruction right now. Any future developments should go through a public consultation, as well as proper environmental and urban planning review process, taking into account the climate and ecological crises and the affordable housing crisis. It boggles the mind that a wealthy developer can destroy an ecosystem for private profit, while creating zero affordable housing and worsening urban sprawl. Please stop!
321.	After seeing that the developer went ahead and cut trees before final approval given, and that some protestors were arrested, I feel discouraged and convinced that the city does not listen to the public, nor do they work to find creative solutions. We especially need to protect wetlands. The city is growing and becoming a mess of concrete. 20 years from now, we would be so grateful to have more greenspace. It sounds like the development also will not really be affordable housing. it will probably be middle class housing, not affordable for the many struggling families. Overall, I feel that the developers in this city control the council. This is not good at all. Let's have some vision that includes ecology, climate change and good living.
322.	The public has been very vocal about their disagreement with this project. We deserve a voice over the government, when it affects our community in negative ways; such as this. It is not a project we want to continue, & that alone should ve considered!
323.	Why not develop low density low rise areas for mixed commercial and residential creating vibrant walkable communities... Like bayers lake or Dartmouth crossing - where no ground needs to be broken and 0% of wetlands need to be altered. We simply cannot keep developing this way. It may be 6.1% this year but it will just continue until there is nothing left.
324.	The available information does not make it clear why wetland needs to be impacted, nor does it seem consistent with what has been shared on social media. A development that only uses previously developed land is ideal. Nothing here presented helps me understand why that isn't possible.
325.	The traffic study has totally ignored the traffic potential through Lynne Drive. They assigned all traffic to mount Hope Ave. yet lynne drive is the direction to the Downtown and more importantly to the schools. Parents, for safety reasons, often drive their kids to school which would generate 4 trips per day for a portion of the population to the school area at Prince Arthur drive. This traffic study is not adequate and should not be accepted.

326.	Why hasn't the developer considered the opportunity to connect to Gaston road though [REDACTED] as a means to avoid crossing the wetland and improving transportation links to existing Bus routes. NSECC policy places avoidance as the highest objective yet there is no discussion of avoidance and the potential link to Gaston Road..
327.	The statement that only 6.1 % or about .8 hectares of wetland will be disturbed ignores the ramp at Mount Hope interchange which has already consumed 1 hectare. Together these two projects have nibbled away a significant portio of the wetland and how much more will be lost because we only approach planning on a case by case basis. If this was a single project it would nearly qualify for and EIA but dividing it up allows the destruction of the wetland in pieces. NSECC policy indicates that the wetland should be considered a complex not just a part.
328.	Clearly there are other developments proposed for the area at the end of fenwichk street and Research drive. these will have traffic impacts in southdale. Why isn't a traffic study being done for the whole area and all the connections to predict the traffic needs and impacts of the entire FGN on existing roads and services. Do we have capacity for the children in schools, what about recreational facilities and libraries. The entire development is much larger than the parts. Planning should be about looking at the whole not just the parts.
329.	The developer should have to enhance the eisner Cove wetland as well as pay to develop wetland elsewhere. Wetlands are not transportable. Building a DU wetland in Tantramar marsh doesn't compensate for the destruction of locally important wetlands in Dartmouth. We can't walk to Tantramar and a marsh elsewhere doesn't perform any function in Dartmouth.
330.	non of the documents addresses storm water management. stormwater is a significant service adn should be addressed with teh water supply and sanitary services. This is a significant ommission. Given the conversion from pervious to substantially impervious surfaces. how will the storm water be managed so as not to impact the wetland. What type of storm water controls will be in place to manage the rate and quantity of runoff and what assurances are in place to protect the wetland from radical changes in water level which will irrevocably alter the wetland type and function.
331.	Comments on a development already in progress and destroying nature.
332.	I am not okay with the plans for this site. The destruction of wetlands, and integral natural sites is deeply upsetting and truly unacceptable. There has been inappropriate financial leeway allowed for these developers. It will not actually help people in need of affordable housing. The violence being executed on peaceful protesters is aggregious. I am deeply saddened and disappointed by Nova Scotia government's lack of foresight and neglect of its unbelievably beautiful paradise. If the people in charge and those with money are not thinking of citizens who actually live here, of how important it is to preserve nature around us, there won't be any beauty left. This is a short-sighted interest in money and profit. Get it together! Think of the Earth. Think of the future. Think of right now. I care about protecting this wetland. There are plenty of other vacant lots that are available in the city. Please use those instead.
333.	Developing the wetland is a disastrous plan. Displacing wildlife, killing plant, and destroying an ecosystem that supports the city will be a mistake that you will all regret for generations to come. Get it right, Halifax. You're better than the greedy developers.
334.	You have missed the point on this one. Yes, housing is important but do is our environment. A good environment equals a good future. Once those beautiful trees and wetlands are gone, they can't be replaced. Air quality goes with them.

335.	Sad that this is happening. It is insane to be developing a wetland during the climate crisis. Halifax needs this to stay green space.
336.	My business and family are in Dartmouth. I chose Dartmouth, NS, above any other city in the world for my business because of the high quality of life — which is tied to intact nature, ocean access, and protection from climate change. I knew these features could help me to attract talent. Eisner's Cove Wetland and Forest is the most important local asset — it is our Public Gardens and our only breath of nature downtown. Properties of equal size and much less value in the area: golf course, old oil refinery, and, frankly, any of the lakes. There is more ecological and nature value in Eisner wetland and forest than in Lake Banook — give that a thought! Do you plan on infilling Banook too, and just leaving a little path through the middle for water to flow? It's hard to believe that more consultation was given to a 10 km speed limit change in the flower streets than destroying this essential wetland/forest and our quality of life. If we can expect decisions to continue along this trajectory that will diminish our quality of life, then moving to another city with better business opportunities would be a prudent decision for entrepreneurs and innovators. You have a city full of universities and smart, forward thinking people! Why no use them to plan for growth and stop this madness that other Canadian cities have followed with low quality sprawl.
337.	Disagree on the developments to remove an important wetland.
338.	Leave this precious and pristine wetland and all the flora and fauna dependent upon it alone! Please!!! This project is ecocidal and it also reeks of corruption. SHAME on anyone who stands behind the destruction of such a valuable and precious wetland!! Wetlands are protected for a reason! Hard to fathom the complete and utter ignorance of both these developers and any politicians standing behind this idea. Entirely shameful, and especially so when it's a well known fact now how preserving wetlands is of vital importance in our battle to help to try to mitigate this climate change that affects us all!
339.	After reading the plans for this area I am still disappointed. ANY alterations to the wetlands will have severe environmental impacts. Nova Scotia's nature is by far its best quality. Our government should be protecting wildlife, wetlands and Nova Scotians not pushing all of this to the side to prioritize non-Nova Scotians. This development will not end the housing crisis.
340.	I am an environmental specialist with experience working with wetlands. I have numerous concerns about the draft policies and development agreement/plans. First and foremost - this site is an inappropriate place to put a new development. This area should be designated/zoned as a protected area/park. This area (wetland and surrounding woods) is a great opportunity for nature education within the HRM. If the municipality is considering appropriating the wetland, why not the woods as well? The wetland without the woods and with a road across it, will quickly become degraded. There are plenty of already developed/cleared areas in HRM that could be used for new housing. Second - what is the point of this comment period by HRM? The development has already begun. Why was early land clearing/grading permitted prior to approval of the development agreement/plans? This suggests the approval is a foregone conclusion and thus this comment period is a farce. If no, what happens if the development is not approved - just say OOPS sorry

we destroyed the forest for no reason?

Third - infilling (for the road) and clearcutting around a wetland will undoubtedly impact the function and benefits of the entire wetland. The wetland without the woods, with a road across it and surrounded by dense development and hard surfaces will quickly become degraded to the point of losing most of its wetland values, including drainage, water quality, wildlife and carbon storage. The only way to maintain and protect it - would be to not develop it.

4. I question the validity and accuracy of the site information provided by the developer (it would be nice if we could see the Wetland Delineation and WESP). There are many inaccuracies and errors in the Land Suitability Analysis Report done by Englobe.

a) I question how much effort was put in to the wetland delineation (and even if they went on site). Based on onsite observations by numerous experts, it is clear that the wetland boundaries exceeds that indicated in the report. A PROPER INDEPENDENT DELINEATION IS REQUIRED. this is necessary to determine the protected area zone and buffer

b) description of the hydrology and watercourses - errors on the amount of flow and even the direction of the water flow - again did they even go on site???

5. there is no mention of wildlife in the policy, agreement or plans. This development will destroy an important forested area and wildlife corridor supporting numerous wildlife, including deer, bear, foxes, otters, migratory and resident birds, turtles.... Where are the animals going to go? We have destroyed most of their habitat already.

6. wetland and watercourse buffers - what is the point of the buffer if you allow infrastructure such as roads etc. in it? also as previously mentioned without an accurate delineation (and consideration of slope), I question whether the indicated buffer zone in the plan meets the minimum requirements all around.

In fact, the planned development already encroaches on the 20 m buffer in many areas, as well as the current tree clearing. SO I AM NOT CONFIDENT THIS DEVELOPMENT WILL ADEQUATELY BUFFER/PROTECT THE WETLAND.

7. Where is the promised affordable housing? This development will do nothing to solve the housing crisis for vulnerable people. Please do not use 'affordable housing' as an excuse for this injustice. Even if it were, there are plenty of other places to build - housing and environment do not need to be mutually exclusive.

I sincerely hope that you as HRM and the province reconsider this development and protect the wetland and surrounding woods for the benefit of HRM and all Nova Scotia.

341. The southdale neighborhood is already saturated with residential units, not to mention the units going in at the old Penhorn mall.

342. I think we have enough large over bearing housing in that area. To remove even more animals from their habitat is ridiculous. We need to maintain some sort of preservation of animals who help to keep our land and world one of calm and beauty and they help do so much to the environment. Much more then we do.

343. This entire "proposed plan" was handled terribly from the beginning, without much transparency and with very shady dealings it seems. There is absolutely no reason why demolition crews should have received the green light to disturb the wetlands and surrounding forrest area if the deal has not even been approved.

344. My feeling is that the proposed buffer size of 20-71 m is not sufficient for the Eisner Cove wetland.

The following document provides some interesting guidance regarding buffers zones.

Setbacks & Vegetated Buffers in Nova Scotia

A review and analysis of current practices and management options

<https://diffusion.mern.gouv.qc.ca/public/Biblio/Dossiers/ArticlesBaretteJaballah/Rideout%20-%202012%20-%20Setbacks%20and%20vegetated%20buffers%20in%20Nova%20Scotia.pdf>

some extracts from the above document follow:

Buffer zones (Various authors)

- Water Quality consideration (Sediment, Nitrate, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, bacteria, herbicides, fecal coliform, etc)

Width (m) Reported Reductions (%)

30	sediment 75-80% with forest covered buffer
61	sediment 80% with forest covered buffer
25	sediment 80%
60	Nitrogen 80%
85	Phosphorus 80%
90	sediment 90%
150	nitrogen 90%
250	phosphorus 90%
550	phosphorus 99%
20	herbicides 8-100%
23	fecal coliform 30%

- Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat

Width (M) Wildlife Habitat Value

5	poor, supports only temporary wildlife activities
30	may have use as a wildlife travel corridor & avian habitat
100	good wildlife habitat value; may protect significant wildlife habitat
200	excellent wildlife habitat value; may support a diverse community
600	excellent wildlife habitat value; will support a diverse community; protection of significant wildlife habitat

- Reptile &/or Amphibian habitat

Width (m) Ecosystem impacts

75-100 Western Oregon, reptiles & amphibians dependent on buffer may require 75-100m

165 To maintain viable populations and communities of ambystomatid salamanders, attention must be directed to the terrestrial areas peripheral to all wetlands; maintaining the connection between wetlands and terrestrial habitats will be necessary to preserve the remaining biodiversity of our remaining wetlands.

- Bird Habitat

Width (M) Ecosystem impacts

40 Threshold effect found with 40m Buffers

≥60 forested buffer strips required for forest dwelling birds

≥500 Although narrow hardwood strips can support an abundant & diverse avifauna, buffer zones at least 500m wide are necessary to maintain the complete avian community

- Plant Habitat

40 90% of plant species surveyed were represented within 10-30 m of the high water mark and that. On average, an additional 5-10 m was required to increase the included species to 95%.

The question that needs to be addressed is "What is the purpose of the buffer; What function or functions is the buffer to provide?"

With respect to Water Quality, phosphorus is one of the limiting nutrients for aquatic systems; controlling phosphorus may need up to 250m buffer. (we see that total P is a suspect in the water quality issues of Lake Banook. the lack of sufficient buffer zone around our Dartmouth Lakes is likely a prime cause. A substantial buffer zone must be implemented for Eisner cove Wetland)

With respect to Terrestrial Wildlife; we should be reaching for an excellent habitat, that supports a divers community; 600m

With respect to Reptile &/or Amphibian Habitat; we should strive to preserve biodiversity; 165m

With respect to Bird Habitat; we should strive to maintain a complete avian community; ≥500m

With respect to Terrestrial Plant Habitat; 40m

Separately from the above tables I offer the following:

With respect to Aquatic Plant Habitat; this buffer requirement is connected to the surface permeability of the surrounding buffer, combined with the water "refresh" rate (which is climate dependant). 150m recommended.