**Table 1**
**Email Correspondence**

| Email No. | Email |
|---|---|
| 1 | Hello, and Happy Holidays.<br>I write to you today as a concerned citizen reading and hearing about the special planning area. I find it disgusting that it is even being considered to be developed. Halifax should be trying to protect as much of that area as possible, a shining example of some of the best nature in Nova Scotia. Some of my best memories of fishing, hiking, and canoeing have been in the proposed area. My family, friends, and their families all have used the area in question and appreciate it as is. My first hike with my goddaughter was up and around that side of Charlies Lake. Here are a few more things of concern outside of direct impacts to me: Wildlife corridors cut off Historic canoe and portage routes removed/affected Permanent loss of green space Major traffic congestion & longer commutes (we know that the minimal transit plan wouldn't be sufficient based off of the dismal traffic in the city already) Please, we don't need a well used area like that so close in to the city being destroyed by developers looking to create more sprawl. Thanks,<br>[redacted] |
| 2 | Dear Ross,<br>I have tried 3x to answer the survey and every time at comment 4 it will not progress. I do not feel such a high density development is appropriate here. The proposed urban wilderness park is a prime asset for our developing city. If development happens I hope the access is closer to Kearney Lake than the 102, to help traffic flow. I would suggest that some of the land closer to Kent and Susie Lake be given to the wilderness area. This would be a valuable asset for them. Development a retraction. Definitely a more modest development, either townhouses or low rise apartments, definitely not the very high apt. These should not be all over the city , only some areas. They create wind tunnels, a lot of traffic and whatever goes with increased numbers of people. Please keep some of this land as a more peaceful, natural environment for the mental a health benefits and its adjacency to the very special wilderness<br>Thank you. Your sincerely, [redacted] |
| 3 | On November 19, I attended an information session about plans for a major housing development abutting Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. I strongly object to this plan to destroy a pristine piece of wilderness in HRM. I was extremely happy to hear that the Federal Government planned to create a National Urban Park in Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes, yet it was later decided to do this only on the part that was already protected. The National Urban Park should encompass the boundaries |

| | |
|---|---|
| | set out by Friends of Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes. I, like many others, enjoy the area for its peaceful beauty. My daughter and I love to hike along the gorgeous Charlie's Lake trail. With HRM growing so quickly, it is important that we protect our natural environment. We need to save more of our beautiful forests and lakes for the enjoyment of generations to come. As early as 1971, the Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes area was identified by a federal-provincial-municipal joint park planning exercise ( The Metropolitan Area Planning Committee). The Special Planning Area overlaps directly with the 2014 conceptual park area. Unfortunately, only part of Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes was protected. Now, the province has declared a Special Planning Area for development. With developments on the table for both Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes and Sandy Lake, we are going to be looking at a huge increase in traffic in the area. Then the next step will be using more of our pristine wilderness (that was supposed to be protected) to build more highways to handle the extra traffic. The boundary is very close to Charlie's Lake. Despite what developers promise, there are always issues of siltation in the waters adjacent to construction areas. There will be noise pollution. Habitat for many species will be destroyed. We have learned that conservation can't wait, especially with a growing population. The more people who live and work in HRM, the more important and in-demand wild spaces are. But these wild spaces are also facing increased development pressures. Once they are gone, we will never be able to bring them back. Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 4 | Good morning, I am emailing today to express my disappointment and concern over the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. One of the concerns I see with the development is that homes regardless of size ie. single dwelling or multi-unit, given the location will command high rent/cost for purchase. These types of developments do not change the demographic for those most impacted in the city housing crisis. These developments do not allow an individual facing homelessness to find an affordable unit. Individuals are not leaving units that cost $1,000 and moving to units that rent for $2,500. This development is tone deaf in this regard. Traffic congestion continues to grow. Many workers in Nova Scotia have not returned to working full-time on location of their employment. There is also on going construction in the west Bedford area. The volume of cars on the road has already lead to an increase in the number of accidents which regularly occur on the 102 highway. The construction and infrastructure requirements to create a development as proposed would be the responsibility of the taxpayers. Taxpayers who do not wish to see this development move forward. Taxpayers who do not have access to proper medical care. Taxpayers who fund over crowded schools. This development is an irresponsible way to promote growth in HRM while allowing necessary infrastructure to fall behind. Furthermore, this proposed development directly overlaps with the ideal boundaries for our future national urban park. Development will impact water quality, disrupt critical wildlife corridors, and alter our daily lives in profound ways. I find it disappointing |

| | |
|---|---|
| | that the survey to obtain feedback was biased to obtain an answer to accept development. These types of surveys demonstrate a lack of confidence in what HRM residents actually want aligning with what is being pushed forward. True surveys obtain unbiased, unfiltered results and are generally representative of the respondents wishes. This survey cannot and will not produce those results. I hope the concerns I have identified above are considered. Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I hope you have a nice day and look forward to a response, Thank you, [redacted] |
| 5 | Initial Comments and Recommendations Proposed Development Concept(s) Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area<br><br>Special Planning Area overlaps proposed BMBCL 'Conceptual Park Area' Coordination of Park Planning and Development Planning is Critical<br>Submitted by: Canadian Association of Retired Persons, Nova Scotia Chapter (CARP NS), December 9, 2025<br><br>Introduction and Context<br>The following submission is forwarded in reference to the proposed development concepts (by Stevens and Annapolis) for the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area, with a particular focus on the relationship of the combined development proposals to the potential future environmental integrity and management viability of the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes (BMBCL) Candidate National Urban Park. These comments/recommendations are referenced as initial, as they are based on information provided via the recent public open house sessions held in St. Peter's Anglican Church Hall on November 19th and are subject to more in-depth follow-up review.<br>Problem Statement – Proposed Development Overlaps with Candidate National Urban Park<br>The Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area overlaps directly with the eastern margin of the BMBCL 'conceptual park area', as set out initially in HRM's 2006 regional plan and reaffirmed in the 2014 regional plan update. The area of overlap includes the Birch Cove Lakes (primarily Susies and Quarry lakes) and their southern and eastern shorelines and associated backshore areas. The major intensive residential development (almost 19,000 housing units to accommodate an estimated population of 40,000 people1) of this area, as proposed, would impact dramatically on and reduce the natural quality and integrity of the proposed park area and, effectively, challenge the future viability of this area as manageable park unit – especially in the context of the expectations and standards associated with a national urban park. Another way to highlight this concern is to emphasize that these namesake lakes (i.e. the Birch Cove Lakes) occupy perhaps 10-20% of the conceptual park area while contributing in the order |

| | |
|---|---|
| | of 80-90% of the park's potential natural value and public outdoor recreational appeal. CARP NS's recommendations are highlighted on Page 6.<br><br>CARP NS's Interest and Approach<br>CARP NS has long advocated for the creation of the proposed BMBCL park, initially as a major regional park within HRM and then, following the establishment of the National Urban Park Program in 2021 and the confirmation of the BMBCL area's candidacy for designation in 2023, as a national urban park. CARP, nationally, has endorsed the National Urban Park Program as well as the efforts of our Nova Scotia chapter, in our advocacy for the early establishment of the BMBCL candidate. The core objectives of national urban parks include conserving nature, connecting people with nature and advancing reconciliation with Indigenous peoples. In this context, the BMBCL proposal is a nationally-significant initiative that stands out as the only viable candidate east of Toronto for national urban park status. CARP NS, as an organization known for its advocacy of interests typically associated with seniors, also recognizes that environmental integrity and sustainability is in the interest not only of seniors but of all Nova Scotians. The BMBCL candidate national park, beyond its potential environmental significance, offers an iconic opportunity to support active and healthy lifestyles through access to and participation in outdoor recreation in a near-urban wilderness setting. As such, the BMBCL candidate is a nationally-significant asset unmatched in other Canadian cities.<br><br>CARP NS also recognizes and understands that Halifax, as a vibrant and fast-growing urban centre, is challenged by urban growth and development pressures, including the need for housing. It is clear that this challenge, with the approval of the Highway 102 West Corridor special planning area process, has now arrived at the front doorstep of the BMBCL candidate national urban park.<br><br>The CARP NS approach is to promote collaboration and coordination of interests and efforts in order to find practical and pragmatic solutions to problems and associated challenges. In the case of competing efforts to establish the BMBCL national urban park and of those focused on urban development in surrounding areas, including the Highway 102 West Corridor Area, CARP NS recognizes that collaboration and coordination have not been a priority practice to date. This recognition has been highlighted by CARP NS in discussions with relevant political leaders and senior staff at various levels of government, with other stakeholders and with developers, and we expect to continue these efforts. The benefit of the recent open house sessions on November 19 is that the players involved have put their |

| | |
|---|---|
| | respective cards on the table, and there is now opportunity to work toward resolution of priority issues that must be addressed.<br><br>The BMBCL Park Establishment Process has been Challenging and Slow<br>Following the initial HRM regional park proposal in 2006 through to the current national urban park candidacy (as confirmed in 2023), progress toward formal park establishment unfortunately has been discouragingly and frustratingly slow from the perspective of external stakeholders and supporters of the park. Even so, it must be acknowledged that significant progress, albeit on an ad hoc and opportunistic basis, nonetheless has been made – including the formal designation of associated Crown land as wilderness by the Province, the acquisition of several available properties by HRM (supported by federal funding and negotiated with adjoining landowners through the development approval process) and the securement of three additional properties by the Nova Scotia Nature Trust (through acquisition, donation and conservation easement agreement). In total, more than 5,500 acres of land have been assembled in the area of for park and/or conservation purposes.<br>This said, substantial acreages with significant potential and desirability for inclusion in the proposed park area remain in private hands, including those within the Highway 102 West Corridor area that overlap with the conceptual park area and are currently proposed for development.<br><br>Disconnection of Park Planning and Development Planning<br>As noted, the assembly of park and conservation lands in the BMBCL area has occurred opportunistically, on an ad hoc basis and without benefit of a park vision, concept or plan. Consequently, there is an absence of clarity regarding the commitment toward the aspirational park boundary and corresponding acquisition priorities as needed to complete the assemblage of a coherent park management unit. In the absence of such a commitment, the Partnership Group2 responsible for park planning and park establishment have focused on the lands owned by one or other of the partnership members. Park planning efforts to date therefore have been directed inwardly, while ignoring pursuit of land acquisition priorities and options relating to the balance of the conceptual park area.<br>At the same time, private land within the conceptual park area is being treated both by HRM (Planning and Development Department) and by respective adjoining land owners/developers as if the proposed park area is neither real nor relevant. This disconnect is made clear by material released at the recent public open house sessions for the Highway 102 West Corridor area, where the development planning process and development concepts as presented respectively by HRM planning and development staff |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and by developers essentially make no reference to the overlap with the conceptual park area associated with the national urban park candidate.<br>This is a classic case of the left hand and the right hand not knowing what the other is up to – not only not knowing but also seemingly not recognizing the relevancy of taking into account the interests, plans and future actions of the other.<br><br>Supporting Maps Available<br>The following series of maps is germane to the preceding discussion of the overlap between the conceptual park area and the Highway 102 West Corridor planning area, and to the recommendations that follow. As this level of detail is challenging to integrate into a relatively brief submission, the indicated maps are simply listed to advise of their availability and relevance as references in support of anticipated presentations at future meetings and discussions. Note that Map 10 is highlighted on the cover page.<br>1. The EDM Consultant Study Recommendation (2006)<br>2. Conceptual Park Area (2006 Regional Plan)<br>3. Conceptual Park Plan (2014 Regional Plan)<br>4.Development Pressures (illustration)<br>5. Partnership Lands (May, 2024)<br>6. Partnership Lands compared to Conceptual Park Area<br>7. Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area (May, 2025)<br>8. Special Planning Area compared to Partnership Lands<br>9. Special Planning Area overlapping Conceptual Park Area (broad view)<br>10. Special Planning Area overlapping Conceptual Park Area (closer view, included on cover page)<br>11. Stevens Group Development Proposal (November, 2025)<br>12. Annapolis Group Development Proposal (November, 2025<br>13. Stevens and Annapolis Development Proposals Combined<br><br>CARP NS's Position re Planning for the Highway 102 West Corridor and BMBCL National Urban Park<br>Recommendations to advance the establishment of the BMBCL National Urban Park are appropriately directed to the members of the Partnership Group (as identified previously) that is mandated to lead efforts toward the planning and establishment of BMBCL National Urban Park. Although not advanced in this document, such recommendations relate to the recognition of the iconic status of the BMBCL national urban park initiative, commitment to the provision of effective leadership and the establishment of an effective governance model, initiation of a comprehensive park planning process, provision for stakeholder |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and public engagement and, in relationship to adjacent development, the integration of park planning interests with development initiatives on surrounding lands.<br>The recommendations that follow focus on the areas of overlap and interface between the conceptual park area and the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area. In regard to addressing this area over overlap or interface between proposed park area and proposed development, CARP NS recognizes four primary scenarios, as follow:<br>1. Remove the special planning area designation from the Highway 102 West Corridor Area.<br>2. Defer the secondary planning process for the Highway 102 West Corridor Area until a park vision, concept or plan has been prepared (that can serve as a basis for identifying and addressing land use conflicts deriving from above-reference competing and/or conflicting objectives.<br>3. Establish a coordinated joint-planning effort in order to integrate planning of the candidate park and of the Highway 102 corridor area, with the dual objectives of (1) establishing a viable park management unit that ensures the integrity of the natural environment and the quality of the park user experience, and (2) preparing a residential development concept that is supportive of and enhanced by the adjacency of the park area and thereby benefits the overall development.<br>4. Proceed with park planning and development planning, essentially as if each is a separate and unrelated process, with little or no influence on or relevance to the other.<br><br>It is understood that some comments/recommendations that have been (or will be) submitted advocate along the lines the first and/or second scenarios above. Should either of these be adopted, CARP NS would be supportive, as the time-sensitive element created by development pressures would be reduced and opportunity to advance a park vision, concept or plan would be enhanced. However, given the commitment to proceeding with the Highway 102 Special Planning Area (on the parts of both the provincial and the municipal government and the apparent development interests/priorities of the landowners/developers involved), removal or deferral of the development planning priority for this area is presumed to be a ‘long shot’.<br><br>On the other hand, if the process continues along the lines of Scenario 4, which is the current situation, significant negative and irreversible impacts on the national urban ark opportunity are inevitable.<br><br>All of the above being considered, CARP NS recommends a coordinated joint-planning initiative as referenced in Scenario 3. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | CARP NS's Recommended Approach<br>In short, CARP NS's recommended approach is to establish a coordinated joint-planning effort as a strategy for integrating the planning of the candidate park and the Highway 102 corridor areas, with the dual objectives of: (1) establishing a viable park management unit that can assure the integrity of the natural environment and the quality of the park user experience; and (2) working toward a residential development concept that is enhanced by and thereby benefits from the adjacency of a national urban park. To be effective, the recommended joint planning process must emphasize openness and transparency, and include ample provision for effective and impactful stakeholder engagement and informed public input. Specific park-related criteria to guide planning for compatibility along the interface of the proposed ark and adjoining Highway 102 West Corridor development area, include:<br>• protection of the integrity of the water quality and quantity in the Birch Cove Lakes (which, among other things, brings into question aspects of the proposal relating the infilling of wetlands and re-shaping of the associated terrain to accommodate development);<br>• protection of the natural condition of the shorelines and associated backshore areas of the Birch Cove Lakes (including Susies, Quarry and Washmill lakes) as public parkland, through negotiation of site-specific criteria to ensure sufficient private development setback;<br>• provision for the establishment of a primary national urban park access corridor and of essential land base to support associated park infrastructure;<br>• identification of options for securement of priority lands for park purposes, through the following, singly or in combination, including:<br>o open space allocation as part of the subdivision planning and approval process,<br>o utilization of a development agreement approach,<br>o land trade(s), potentially considering peripheral lands assembled by members of the Partnership Group and/or other lands held by members of the Partnership,<br>o landowner donations, with associated taxation benefits to the landowner(s) and other considerations (e.g. partnership options, recognition as city-builders/patrons),<br>o involvement of land trusts (Nature Trust, Nature Conservancy), and/or<br>o direct acquisition of priority areas to serve as parkland.<br>• establishment/maintenance of an open and transparent outreach program to inform, encourage and enable public input and to effectively engage committed stakeholder organizations.<br><br>CARP NS Initiative and Activity Going Forward |

| | |
|---|---|
| | CARP NS will continue to advocate for openness and transparency, including provision for the dissemination of information and provision for public input and effective stakeholder engagement. Meetings and discussions with responsible political players, senior staff within all three levels of government, other stakeholders and relevant land owners/developers to make the case for successful park establishment.<br>December 9, 2025 [redacted], Board Chair, [redacted] NS |
| 6 | Dear Ross, I am pleading with you as a long term resident near Birch Mountain Cove, to please consider developing elsewhere. This area is precious. There are wetlands here that are invaluable to our air and water quality. These are wetlands that cannot be replaced, nor can we build in such a way as to minimize impact. Developers will always push (& likely win) to exceed that protected space. This is raw and untouched land. Homes to bears, coyotes, deer and endangered species. As a Nova Scotian, I am proud of our green spaces. Not many cities in Canada have green spaces the way we do. We need to protect and preserve these areas from the developer greed. My children love to swim at Kearney Lake, and use the boat club. I like to camp in the woods of Birch MTN. We cannot replant trees the way nature has planted these beautiful giants. We cannot recreate habitat. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. I want something left for my children and their children. Haligonians are tired of watching the spaces we grew up in, being stripped and torn down, destroyed for developer greed. Yes we need housing, but to fast track urban sprawl without proper consulting, without proper environmental impacts studies, this is unfair to the people and their futures. We need to look at this green space like carbon credits. The carbon this area has sequestered is immense. And when those trees are cut down, they release all the carbon they've ever stored. We are in a time we cannot do that. Please, I am begging you, there are many other places we could look at for development that makes much more sense. Please do not destroy the trails, the lakes, the streams, the trees that are so immensely beautiful and serve a purpose to the people. Thank you for reading my email, and considering that as a resident, who also needs housing, knows that this area holds more value as an untouched and preserved land than it does to demolish and erect over priced housing.<br>[redacted] |
| 7 | Mr. Grant; Having lived in Halifax, both in Bridgeview and on the peninsula, for the past fifty years, it is very disappointing to see the direction that Halifax is going in term of growth and transportation. I have not known anyone, including keen cyclists, that can make any sense of the recent changes to roads throughout the city. I am particularly concerned with the development along the Bicentennial Drive next to the Birch Cove Lakes. I believe this would be big loss for the city that could never be recovered. I ask that you remove this site from the Special Planning Areas list for the following reasons: The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of |

| | |
|---|---|
| | the park. The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made. Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public. Release the "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas. Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary to save cost on roads, water, sewer, busing, etc.I hope you can do your homework on this area and come to a good decision for the people of Halifax. |
| 8 | Good morning, I am emailing today to express my disappointment and concern over the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. One of the concerns I see with the development is that homes regardless of size ie. single dwelling or multi-unit, given the location will command high rent/cost for purchase. These types of developments do not change the demographic for those most impacted in the city housing crisis. These developments do not allow an individual facing homelessness to find an affordable unit. Individuals are not leaving units that cost $1,000 and moving to units that rent for $2,500. This development is tone deaf in this regard. Traffic congestion continues to grow. Many workers in Nova Scotia have not returned to working full-time on location of their employment. There is also on going construction in the west Bedford area. The volume of cars on the road has already lead to an increase in the number of accidents which regularly occur on the 102 highway. The construction and infrastructure requirements to create a development as proposed would be the responsibility of the taxpayers. Taxpayers who do not wish to see this development move forward. Taxpayers who do not have access to proper medical care. Taxpayers who fund over crowded schools. This development is an irresponsible way to promote growth in HRM while allowing necessary infrastructure to fall behind. Furthermore, this proposed development directly overlaps with the ideal boundaries for our future national urban park. Development will impact water quality, disrupt critical wildlife corridors, and alter our daily lives in profound ways. I find it disappointing that the survey to obtain feedback was biased to obtain an answer to accept development. These types of surveys demonstrate a lack of confidence in what HRM residents actually want aligning with what is being pushed forward. True surveys obtain unbiased, unfiltered results and are generally representative of the respondents wishes. This survey cannot and will not produce those results. I hope the concerns I have identified above are considered. Thank you for taking the time to read this email.<br>I hope you have a nice day and look forward to a response, Thank you, [redacted] |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 | Dear Mr. Grant, and other concerned representatives who I've copied. My name is [redacted], a resident of Halifax ([redacted]) and I am writing to provide feedback on the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. The Highway 102 Special Planning Area is also part of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. I have enjoyed the Blue Mountain wilderness area for more than 10 years, enjoying the trails in all seasons, typically several times a week and swimming in the lakes throughout the summer. This is a special place located in the heart of our city and it's protection is extremely important for us and the flora and fauna that call it home. As someone who works in commercial real estate finance I am by no means against development in Halifax. However I felt the need to reach out and share my thoughts on this development and would urge that we take a balanced approach and long term view of the potential impacts of this development. At a minimum any development should take into account the existing wildlife, their corridors and any potential environmental impacts on the nearby protected lands. My understanding is that there has been minimal investigations into the broad ranging impacts of what is being proposed. 11,400 units and a population more than double that in this environmentally sensitive area seems shortsighted and feels like development for the sake of development. Having high density housing on the edge of the lakes and waterways also seems like a poor choice that will inevitably lead to water quality issues in the surrounding areas. Why can the project not be scaled back slightly and be designed to accentuate the local environment rather than replace it entirely with roads, lawns and dense housing? The developer will be able to easily turn a profit with half the planned density, allowing for less impact on the environment and more buffer to water ways and the park. If we assume a very low baseline value of $10,000 per unit (based on my experience it is likely at least $25,000) the value of the land, with the development scaled back to half would still be $57 Million. A huge paper gain for the land owners who bought the land for less than 1% of that. They would be able to get financing to service the entire area with minimal to no cash in. I say this having financed similar sized projects elsewhere in the province. This is a great location within the city and therefore a desirable area for people to live however this level of density will further strain resources and further threaten the park with pollution, damaging the ecosystems and higher potential for fires. The park is an area enjoyed by thousands of people every year and the city and province have an opportunity to work with both the Blue Mountain groups and the developer to create a strategy that wins for all. Expand and protect the park, while still allowing a long term profitable development for the land owner. The area will only become more desirable for most residents with a thriving urban park next door. Once the land is gone we cannot get it back. There are 12,000 units under development in the city today, we don't need to rush the decision to add 11,000 more while our population growth has slowed considerably. A few months won't significantly impact the housing market, so let's take a step back and find a winning solution for all. Thank you, [redacted] |

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 | Hi Ross,<br>Please find attached a letter from Public Health regarding the Highway 102 SPA. [name] and I are happy to meet and discuss if you have any questions or concern. Hope you have a great holiday season!<br>Best,<br>[redacted]<br><br>Dear Mr. Grant,<br>Nova Scotia Health Public Health acknowledges the provincial direction requiring Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) to proceed with secondary planning for the Highway 102 West Corridor Lands Special Planning Area (SPA). Evidence from health and healthy built environment research identifies key considerations related to complete community design and sustainability. We hope you will consider the following points and recommendations as you move forward.<br><br>Complete Community<br>Evidence from population health and urban design literature indicates that walkable, high-density, transit-oriented communities can reduce rates of obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease.1,2,3 Research has also shown associations between compact, amenity rich neighbourhoods and improved maternal health outcomes, including a lower risk of gestational diabetes and promotion of social connection. Social connection is an important protective factor against loneliness and social isolation, both of which are associated with increased risk of coronary heart disease and stroke.4,5 To support physical, mental, and social wellbeing, high-density residential areas benefit from access to diverse and convenient amenities beyond housing, including parks, recreation centres, libraries, employment opportunities, shops, and essential services. Evidence also indicates that high-density development without sufficient public transit and active transportation infrastructure may be associated with increased traffic congestion, stress, emissions, and higher rates of pedestrian and motor vehicle injuries and fatalities.3,6,7 As such, the integration of robust public transit and well-connected active transportation infrastructure is important to supporting population health.Existing neighbourhoods adjacent to the SPA have limited access to active transportation routes and public transit, contributing to current traffic congestion. In absence of planned rapid transit integration at the outset of development, mitigation strategies will be important to manage transportation demands and reduce car dependence as the area is developed.<br><br>Environmental Sustainability |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Public Health evidence increasingly recognizes the role of natural environments in supporting population health, including through air and water regulation, stormwater management, heat mitigation and opportunities for physical activity and recreation.8 These considerations align with One Health 2 principles, which emphasize the interconnectedness of human health, animal health and ecosystem health.9,10 The Highway 102 West Corridor lands abut the biodiverse forests and lakes of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area, which is a candidate site for a National Urban Park. While a large part of this SPA is former quarry land, a significant portion remains forested. Changes to land use within the SPA may influence ecosystem functions that support population health, including the capacity of natural landscapes to filter water, manage runoff, and improve local air quality.<br>Recommendations<br>From a Public Health perspective, planning of the Highway 102 SPA would benefit from the following:<br>- Adherence to evidence-informed practices for consideration of ecosystem-related health supports;<br>-Integration of findings from the HWY 102 Future Serviced Community Study to inform the planning policies submitted to the province;<br>- Substantive incorporation of healthy community principles, including access to a comprehensive range of community amenities; and,<br>- Alignment of development phasing with an extension of rapid transit routes and well-connected active transportation infrastructure serving the SPA.<br><br>Public Health recognizes the complex challenges associated with population growth and the increasing demand for housing and acknowledges HRM Planning and Development and Regional Council in responding to these pressures within the current policy and legislative context. We continue to support HRM's ongoing efforts toward thoughtful, equitable planning and consultation processes that advance public policy objectives for community wellbeing and environmental sustainability. We look forward to ongoing collaboration in creating a more equitable, resilient, and healthy HRM. Sincerely, |
| 11 | Grant,<br>I would like to add my vote to the leaving the area as wilderness side. Suburban sprawl is not a sustainable<br>growth model and having Mother Nature right at the cities edge for all to enjoy would be a huge asset, setting Halifax apart from any other Canadian city. It can readily be viewed as an investment in physical and mental health through connecting with nature.<br>Respectfully, [redacted] |
| 12 | *Email forwarded to Planned Growth Staff through city hall clerical staff* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Ms, Morse, I attended the information session that took place at St. Peter's Church regarding the proposed development off the 102. I am not against development but feel this area is already beyond it's capacity with respect to traffic, schools, recreational facilities, etc . We have an amazing wilderness area and I wonder if we are willing to take the risk of losing this due to water flow changes, high density resulting in pollution to lakes (people and pets), erosion due to increased usage, etc? Although it sounds nice to have 11,400 housing units, will these units really be affordable to the average person, not to mention the unhoused. The plan states there will be two entrances/exits for this area, is this enough? I recall this being an issue with the wildfires a couple of summers ago. Do we have the ability to cover this area with first responders, buses, etc. What are the costs for blasting the rock and putting in necessary utilities? This will definitely result in an increase in taxes, will people be able to afford this? As mentioned, I am not against development but wish developers had an obligation to provide "support" for building schools, recreational facilities, etc. Would this pocket of land not be better suited to more scaled back housing, larger recreational facilities both indoor and outdoor, and maybe the site for a new school that is definitely needed. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concern, [redacted] |
| 13 | Hello I am writing, not as a resident of the area but as someone whose frequents the area. My children have been attending Maskwa Aquatic club for years and the beauty of that area has always been noticeable. They have enjoyed hikes through the woods and the pristine water conditions of the lake, unlike some of the Dartmouth lakes that have struggled with closures; likely due to their proximity to additional houses and run off. Over the last number of years I have noticed how busy the area has become, not only getting to the area, but also around the beach itself, and this is without development. The area of Bayer's Lake was once an quick and easy location to shop and enjoy a meal; however, the traffic in and out of that area is horrible and any visits to that area are timed carefully or I have decided to go elsewhere and not spend my money in that area. The traffic on the highways is horrible and adding more houses into an area already stretched to its limits, while demolishing an urban nature area, where significant infrastructure will need to be established, is irresponsible. I hope that you consider what adding such a development would do to a such a gem as the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove areas as well as with the proposed development on Kearney Lake itself. Kind regards [redacted] |
| 14 | Dear Mr. Ross,<br>Yesterday, I was hiking through the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes area using one of the lesser-known entry points that, for years, have allowed me to enjoy this wilderness area effectively as a "personal playground" for hiking, swimming, canoeing, portaging, camping, skating, and snowshoeing. Deep in the woods, my mind wandered to the task with which I had been struggling for the past several months, since HRM's public open house on the "Highway 102 West Corridor Lands Special Planning Area." The fact that |

| | |
|---|---|
| | a large portion of the public, both in attendance that day and at large, opposes the SPA both in process and in scope, should come to you as no surprise. What more could I write to you that you and your colleagues haven't already been pressed upon to consider? What I realized was that, if I were to be fully, brutally honest, there's a quiet part that those like me don't like to say out loud. The proposed regional / national urban park at BMBCL has long been framed as a struggle between developers and privileged nature lovers, the latter of whom just want to "keep things the way they are" for their own pleasures while ignoring other pressing needs of the larger community. This is not strictly the case. As I made fresh tracks in newly fallen snow along a trail that sees only a handful of visitors during the winter months, I fought with the notion that a robustly developed urban park — one that improves front country trails, opens and publicizes new access points, and creates and maintains amenities for the benefit of all users — isn't my vision of BMBCL either. I prefer my solitude in the woods; I'm the kind of person who, seeing a couple of other humans on a trail, would consider it effectively "overrun". If I had it my way, this incredible piece of scenery would remain daunting to access for the average, uninitiated resident. If the SPA development was permitted to go forward — at the cost of watershed damage and other environmental harm, and to the detriment of all HRM residents to whom a visionary benefit had long been promised — I would nonetheless not be the first one to feel the pain. I know how to get to the farthest, wildest corners of this land; I'm prepared to enjoy the party while it lasts. If the proponents of a regional / national urban park at BMBCL "win" their case, it would not be a victory for a small minority of radicals at the expense of our community's needs; rather, a park that benefits all users by increasing access is a compromise in the eyes of those who love and use this area the most. It is one that we willingly concede to secure the future of the Blue Mountain Birch-Cove Lakes as a place of nature.<br>I am not an expert on the complex processes that make up municipal and provincial politics; Idon't know what decisions are ahead of you, what precise role you play, and what needs you must balance. I simply ask you to take it from the people who know the Blue Mountain- Birch Cove Lakes area best, perhaps well enough that, in a perfect world, we'd rather keep it a secret: the preservation of the BMBCL and development into a full-fledged urban park is thoroughly and completely in the public good — as much a good as any that impacts the wellbeing of Halifax's citizens. Advocates of the BMBCL are not shouting from our soapboxes because we want to keep things "our way." We are sounding the alarm that, chosen wrongly, the next decisions you make stand to do irreversible and permanent harm to all residents of our city and destroy the shared vision of Halifax as one of the best, most unique places in the world to live. Make no mistake about it — there is no side that isn't sacrificing. I wish you the strength to make the right ones.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |

| | |
|---|---|
| 15 | Dear Minister White,<br>I am writing on behalf of the Board and members of Hike Nova Scotia to express our strong opposition to any development within the Highway 102 Special Planning Area (SPA) and lands adjacent to the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. Please see the attached letter. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, [redacted], Executive Director (she/her) Hike Nova Scotia<br><br>Re: Stop the Highway 102 Special Planning Area (SPA)<br>Dear Minister White, I am writing on behalf of the Board and members of Hike Nova Scotia to express our strong opposition to any development within the Highway 102 Special Planning Area (SPA) and lands adjacent to the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. Hike Nova Scotia encourages and promotes hiking, walking and snowshoeing throughout Nova Scotia. We are the voice of the hiking community with a membership representing over 2,400. Our reach extends further on social media with almost 50,000 followers on Instagram, Facebook and X. Hiking and walking are Nova Scotians' top physical activities. The tourism industry is heavily reliant on hiking, as one of the top three outdoor tourist activities. Outdoor enthusiasts stay longer and spend more than most other types of tourists. Wilderness areas are crucial for supporting all of this. Our members and followers value its protection and access to it immensely. We are not against development but there are serviced areas, ready for affordable housing, awaiting development now in HRM already. Please remove the 102 West Corridor lands from the SPA inventory. This area has long been identified in municipal plans as part of the preferred boundary for the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park. Ideally, it would be incorporated into a national urban park. A park planning process is already well underway with stakeholders including the province, HRM, Nova Scotia Nature Trust and Mi'kmaw groups. Parks Canada anticipates designation in 2026. It was promised to the public as a protected wilderness, not as a site for high-density housing or commercial use. The conceptual boundary of the national urban park, which Friends of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes advocate for, is based on sound environmental research and park planning principles. It reflects decades of work by citizens, environmental groups and numerous government staff at all levels. The development of the proposed 18,000 units (approximately 40,000 people) would burden existing services including schools, transit and traffic on the 102 and beyond. Egress is an important challenge for safety. In addition, allowing development in this area would:<br>● Fragment vital wildlife corridors and damage sensitive ecosystems where several Species at Risk have been noted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ● Damage the sensitive, integrated waterways in the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes wilderness area, which clean our water and prevent flooding, including Kearney Lake, which is an international paddling and recreation lake.<br>● Undermine accessibility to the wilderness area for outdoor recreation and education for all ages, including incoming new residents, future businesses and ongoing research for academics and citizen scientists of today and tomorrow.<br>● Continue to undermine public trust in the government's commitment to protecting the environment and preserving sensitive, unique urban and wilderness areas.<br>Over many years residents have spoken in support of protecting this landscape as a part of the HRM Regional Planning process. We urge the Province of Nova Scotia to uphold that vision of protecting the integrity of this wilderness and seeing it become a national urban park, restore the public planning process and ensure that the Highway 102 Special Planning Area remains undeveloped. Hike Nova Scotia, in partnership with the Friends of Blue Mountain, trained leaders so they could lead guided, interpretive hikes in the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. Guided hikes are regularly offered year-round to help residents learn about this special place. Our members as well as the public, including visitors from beyond Nova Scotia, have enjoyed safe access to these wildlands with the guidance and stewardship of many volunteers over the years. Please take this opportunity to stand with your colleagues in safeguarding one of Halifax's most important natural areas for generations to come. Your constituents will be grateful. The general public are responding as well; they will be grateful. Please remove the 102 West Corridor lands from the SPA inventory. Thank you for your commitment. |
| 16 | Good afternoon, please see the attached correspondence received by the Municipal Clerk's Office during the noted date range, which is being forwarded for your information. Please note that correspondence has been distributed separately to Mayor, Council, CAO, Municipal Solicitor, Corporate Communications, Public Affairs, and Government Relations.<br><br>To whom it may concern, I am writing today to offer my concerns and opinions about the Highway 102 Special Planning Area, specifically any potential developments within the original preferred park boundary for the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lake Wilderness Area. The first point is anecdotal. I lived in Calgary in 2017 when Canada turned 150. Having grown up in the mountains, I frequently made day trips from the city to the mountains. It was common to drive up to two hours each way to get to a hike, but the trip was well worth it for the positive effects on my mental health. In fact those trips helped get me through some of the darkest days of my early adult life. Part of those 150 year celebrations included free passes to national parks. As a result of those passes, foot traffic both in Banff National Park and spilling over into the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | surrounding group of provincial parks and protected areas collectively known as Kananskis dramatically increased. For those of us who had been using those trails for years, the change was immediately obvious. It's no exaggeration to say a trail once so faint I had gotten lost on it became so heavily trafficked it became like walking in a (very steep and unpaved) city park. This scene played out over dozens, perhaps hundreds, of trails as people who previously had no idea how valuable these trails could be to them began taking advantage of the immense natural resources at their disposal. This was all before the pandemic made permanent changes to our society, increasing stress and anxiety for many. (That resulted in a second, even greater explosion in popularity). Having places to get into nature, get away from the city, move your body, and relax will not lower the cost of living or bring certainty in the uncertain times we live in, but it will absolutely counter some of the worst effects of the stress of modern life. This is true not only for those who already enjoy the outdoors but also for those who are yet to discover the potential it holds for them . The second point has simply to do with timing. No doubt you have heard many concerns about this potential development and there would be of course some benefits too. However while there are many places in HRM that new communities can be build, there is only one place that can become a national park. There is no reason that this site needs to be developed now. The downside to beginning development before the National Park can be established and come to fruition is potentially immense. The downside to re-considering this project in 5 or 10 years and continuing the city's growth in other communities in the meantime is not. The third and last point concerns the way this potential development is being framed. I saw the survey on this topic and noted that questions were worded as though respondent were in favour of this development. A question might ask "what do you want this area to look like" and there were many options for how it could be developed but none for leaving space for the National Park. While there are no doubt powerful, well funded, and well connected voices in favour of making money off of this land, there are (aside from yourselves) no voices equally powerful, well funded, and well connected advocating for the physical and mental wellbeing of Haligonians, the plant and animal life of the proposed park, and the ability of the planet in it's natural state to absorb and adapt to the impacts of shifting weather patterns. It is incumbent upon each elected official to carefully consider the benefits to their constituents that could uniquely be offered by a National Park unrestrained by human development. Respectfully, [redacted] |
| 17 | Grant,<br>I would like to add my vote to the leaving the area as wilderness side. Suburban sprawl is not a sustainable |

| | |
|---|---|
| | growth model and having Mother Nature right at the cities edge for all to enjoy would be a huge asset, setting Halifax apart from any other Canadian city. It can readily be viewed as an investment in physical and mental health through connecting with nature.<br>Respectfully, [redacted] |
| 18 | Hello,<br>I am writing to express my support for protecting and preserving the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness area on the edge of Halifax. I feel strongly that:<br>Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>• The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>• The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary.<br>• Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors.<br>• All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>• Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>• The "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas should be released.<br>• Development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary should be prioritized. |
| 19 | Dear Mr. Grant, and other representatives who I've copied,<br>My name is [redacted] a resident of Halifax (B3K postal code zone), and I am writing to provide feedback on the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. The Highway 102 Special Planning Area is also part of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area.<br>If you have not had the pleasure of spending time there, I absolutely encourage you to - it is a place near and dear to my heart, and to hundreds of Halifax residents who find reprieve from the stress and bustle of urban life among its trails and waterways. It is an ecological treasure tucked in what seems like the most unlikely place - beside a highway, bordered by business parks. Yet, you need only walk a few minutes into the trails to be embraced by a world where you can intimately connect with nature and discover the innumerable non-human lifeforms that call this place home. I attended the open house for BMBCL in November, and was shocked to see the extent of the proposed plans for development. In its proposed |

| | |
|---|---|
| | state, the impacts on wildlife and waterways would be significant. Corridors used by bobcats, bears and moose will be damaged, lessened, or even eliminated. Water quality will also be impacted, with blasting and redirecting water having significant implications for the water table and the area's lakes. Moreover, the scale of development screams “sprawl” as it is firmly outside of the current Urban Service Boundary. As summarized in a 2013 report on Halifax’s own website, urban sprawl in Halifax costs taxpayers significantly more for infrastructure and services (roads, transit, water, sewers, waste collection, law enforcement, emergency services and more), with estimates suggesting concentrated growth could save hundreds of millions by reducing service provision expenses.<br>This area is outside of existing transit areas, thereby ensuring people are dependent on vehicles, adding to the growing traffic congestion in Halifax. The infrastructure costs will be enormous and will become the burden of all taxpayers. This area and other wilderness areas, like Sandy Lake, are not the appropriate places to start with large-scale housing developments. For all of these reasons, I urge you to remove Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list. There is no doubt Halifax needs housing. Instead of targeting sensitive wilderness areas and encouraging more sprawl, we should prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary, and utilize brownfield sites in Halifax that are ripe for development. Halifax has an opportunity to protect a special place for generations to come, and save those same generations the costs of sprawl by making smart decisions today. It is my sincere hope that we leave them this legacy.<br>Thank you for doing the right thing, [redacted] |
| 20 | Dear Councillor John Young and Council Colleagues<br>I am writing in strong opposition to the Special Planning Area Hwy 102 West Corridor on the Birch Cove Lakes.<br>On June 2016 Tim Bousquet describes it in the Halifax Examiner:<br>I’ve hiked Blue Mountain a few times — the summit provides a panoramic view of the Halifax Harbour, Bedford Basin, and on clear days St. Margaret’s Bay — but the jewel of the wilderness is a canoe loop composed of five lakes — Susies Lake, Quarry Lake, Fox Lake, Ash Lake, Cranberry Lake, and back to Susies Lake — connected by ridiculously short portages. …. I’m always amazed that such an incredible wild spot exists just a 15-minute drive from downtown Halifax….<br>I remember city staffer Peter Bigelow telling Halifax council that the park planners envisioned a complete wilderness experience … The wilderness park boundaries, Bigelow told council, would be on the encircling<br>ridge tops. In other words, you could sit in a canoe on Quarry Lake and look around and see nothing but wilderness. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Any urban development would be on the other side of the ridge.<br>This means not just a pleasing visual experience, but also that oil and antifreeze from cars, dog poop, yard<br>chemicals and the other pollutants typical of subdivisions would run off away from the wilderness, protecting<br>the water quality of the lakes.<br>My vision for a National Urban Park that has been in the making in our community for over 50 years. The Birch Cove Lakes area was recognized by the City of Halifax as an important natural area, rich in ecological<br>features worth protecting. The Metropolitan Area Planning Committee study of 1971 identified the area as a<br>high priority for conservation. Many very notable studies have been done over the years indicating the same. Picture it. Drive along highway 102 into Halifax and see a welcome sign to Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National Park - Our Mini Keji! Take the Kearney Lake Road off ramp or take a bus to the entrance where there will be parking, a welcome interpretive centre with public park and picnic areas in the front country and protected wilderness canoe routes and hiking trails and more in the back country. National park should be off a major highway, not hidden.<br>City councillors have confirmed repeatedly that we want our Mini Keji in Halifax. Constituents from across HRM and beyond have been consistent in their message. When the June 2014 Facilitator's Report was released, we responded and so did council.<br>These are my main points:<br>Remove the special planning areas 102 west corridor and Sandy Lake from the Special Planning Areas fast<br>tracked to give time to better integrate the HRM Green Plan and the National Urban Park boundaries.<br>The proposed hwy 102 west corridor development undermines the full beauty and immersive experience of a national park. It disregards all efforts made over the past 20 years to protect this vital wilderness in the heart of HRM effectively. It also ignores the previous regional plan intentions of protecting the area. Plans that were put in place and have been eroded over time, each time reinforcing that city planning has not followed through on its promise to preserve the environment.<br>This important watershed already requires remediation. See HRM North West Community Council Oct. 7, 2024 Item No. Info Item 2 https://cdn.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/communitycouncils/<br>241007nwccinfo2.pdf. Do not allow development on this highly vulnerable watershed. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • The proposed National Urban Park (NUP) in fact, is not properly covered by the proposed fast track development. The opportunity to plan for an appropriate park boundary will be lost by adjacent and overlapping development proposals being created in the absence of negotiations with the governing body for the NUP. That takes time.<br>• The science based approach to the Conceptual Park Boundary and Park Plan that was presented to the public in 2012, jointly by HRM and the Province took 3 years to develop and that boundary has been shown in all versions of the Regional Plan since 2006. It is a huge error to remove that science-based boundary from the current Regional Plan and leave out the requirement for some serious discussions on appropriate park protection for any adjacent or overlapping development.<br>• removal of language from the Regional Plan that allows for overriding of buffer zones to accommodate developers<br>• stronger language regarding the city's approach to collaborating with ALL interested parties<br>Examples of Recreation, Education and Training Opportunities at Risk but that could grow with the National Urban Park. We need the Birch Cove Lakes to be public, not private; wilderness, not city streets.<br>For more than 50 years, Maskwa on Kearney Lake has been Halifax's home for paddling! Maskwa is Canada's premier canoe club, winning the National Championships in 2016, 2017, 2023, 2024 & 2025. Tucked between two ridges on an undeveloped watershed, it is an internationally recognized competitive and training location for olympic paddling.<br>Halifax Search and Rescue's Eco-Endurance Challenge (E2C): https://discoverhalifaxns.com/event/halifaxsearch-and-rescues-eco-endurance-challenge-e2c/<br>Wild Lakes 10K Wilderness Trail Race: https://raceroster.com/events/2025/96588/wild-lakes-10k<br>Canoe Kayak NS Wilderness Route: https://ckns.ca/paddling-routes/inland-paddle-routes/<br>Forest Schools accessible to inner city students and so much more for future generations.<br>Paper Mill Lake Watershed Graphic<br>Thank you for the opportunity for citizen comment. [redacted] |
| 21 | Dear Members of the Provincial Housing Taskforce,<br>I attended the open house for the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area on November 19th. I met with HRM representatives, reviewed study data and asked the developers questions about their proposed developments. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I'm writing to you today to express my concern with the designation of this area as a Special Planning Area for fast tracking development. I strongly disagree with any development in this area for a number of reasons<br>including; the high ecological value of the area, impacts on traffic congestion and the cost of expanding infrastructure outside of the serviced area of HRM. I also strongly disagree with the provincial government's<br>overstep by taking decisions about planning and development away from HRM council and question the transparency of the decision making process.<br>First and foremost, I am strongly opposed to any development in this area before the establishment of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National Urban Park. This SPA overlaps with the ideal boundaries for this future park and fast-tacked development here will bring irreversible damage. Development in this area could cut off wildlife corridors, increase flood risk for nearby communities and lead to the permanent loss of protected green spaces.<br>Secondly, the 102 is already experiencing terrible traffic congestion. Upgrades to the 102 and connector roads as well as investing in improved transit options should be a priority before any additional development is planned. Another pressing concern is the cost of expanding infrastructure such as water and sewer outside of the service areas of HRM. I'm concerned about who will pay for these upgrades and how these costs will impact HRM taxpayers.<br>Finally, I question how the decisions were made to make certain areas "Special Planning Areas" as well as to why the provincial government felt the need to overstep and take over the decision making process. What<br>criteria was used to choose the areas? Why was the process not made public? Why were less ecologically<br>sensitive areas that were already within the service boundary of HRM not chosen?<br>I agree that housing is needed, but more houses alone will not solve the housing crisis. What we need is well researched affordable development connected to well run transit and other services. We need to prioritize spaces within the serviced areas in HRM and focus on sites that are less ecologically important.<br>I call on the provincial government to remove the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area from the SPA list and instead give the area the protection it deserves. You and your colleagues are in a position to make decisions that will impact our shared natural environment for all future generations. Please make<br>protecting our environment a priority instead of prioritizing economic gains for developers. If you have not |

| | |
|---|---|
| | done so, I urge you to join a hike organized by the group Friends of Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes to better appreciate the amazing area that would be impacted by this development. I am calling on all branches of government to come together and make the establishment of this National Urban Park a reality.<br>Thank you for your time, I will be watching this issue closely. Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 22 | Dear Mr. Grant<br>I am writing in strong opposition to the Special Planning Area Hwy 102 West Corridor on the Birch Cove Lakes.<br>On June 2016 Tim Bousquet describes it in the Halifax Examiner: I've hiked Blue Mountain a few times — the summit provides a panoramic view of the Halifax Harbour, Bedford Basin, and on clear days St. Margaret's Bay — but the jewel of the wilderness is a canoe loop composed of five lakes — Susies Lake, Quarry Lake, Fox Lake, Ash Lake, Cranberry Lake, and back to Susies Lake — connected by ridiculously short portages. …. I'm always amazed that such an incredible wild spot exists just a 15-minute drive from downtown Halifax…. I remember city staffer Peter Bigelow telling Halifax council that the park planners envisioned a complete wilderness experience … The wilderness park boundaries, Bigelow told council, would be on the encircling ridge tops. In other words, you could sit in a canoe on Quarry Lake and look around and see nothing but wilderness. Any urban development would be on the other side of the ridge. This means not just a pleasing visual experience, but also that oil and antifreeze from cars, dog poop, yard chemicals and the other pollutants typical of subdivisions would run off away from the wilderness, protecting the water quality of the lakes.<br>My vision for a National Urban Park that has been in the making in our community for over 50 years. The Birch Cove Lakes area was recognized by the City of Halifax as an important natural area, rich in ecological features worth protecting. The Metropolitan Area Planning Committee study of 1971 identified the area as a high priority for conservation. Many very notable studies have been done over the years indicating the same.<br>Picture it. Drive along highway 102 into Halifax and see a welcome sign to Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National Park - Our Mini Keji! Take the Kearney Lake Road off ramp or take a bus to the entrance where there will be parking, a welcome interpretive centre with public park and picnic areas in the front country and protected wilderness canoe routes and hiking trails and more in the back country. National park should be off a major highway, not hidden. City councillors have confirmed repeatedly that we want our Mini Keji in Halifax. Constituents from across HRM and beyond have been consistent in their message. When the<br>June 2014 Facilitator's Report was released, we responded and so did council. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | These are my main points:<br>Remove the special planning areas 102 west corridor and Sandy Lake from the Special Planning Areas fast tracked to give time to better integrate the HRM Green Plan and the National Urban Park boundaries. The proposed hwy 102 west corridor development undermines the full beauty and immersive experience of a national park. It disregards all efforts made over the past 20 years to protect this vital wilderness in the heart of HRM effectively. It also ignores the previous regional plan intentions of protecting the area. Plans that were put in place and have been eroded over time, each time reinforcing that city planning has not followed through on its promise to preserve the environment. This important watershed already requires remediation. See HRM North West Community Council Oct. 7, 2024 Item No. Info Item 2 https://cdn.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/communitycouncils/241007nwccinfo2.pdf. Do not allow development on this highly vulnerable watershed. The proposed National Urban Park (NUP) in fact, is not properly covered by the proposed fast track development. The opportunity to plan for an appropriate park boundary will be lost by adjacent and overlapping development proposals being created in the absence of negotiations with the governing body for the NUP. That takes time. The science based approach to the Conceptual Park Boundary and Park Plan that was presented to the public in 2012, jointly by HRM and the Province took 3 years to develop and that boundary has been shown in all versions of the Regional Plan since 2006. It is a huge error to remove that science-based boundary from the current Regional Plan and leave out the requirement for some serious discussions on appropriate park protection for any adjacent or overlapping development. removal of language from the Regional Plan that allows for overriding of buffer zones to accommodate developers stronger language regarding the city's approach to collaborating with ALL interested parties Examples of Recreation, Education and Training Opportunities at Risk but that could grow with the National Urban Park. We need the Birch Cove Lakes to be public, not private; wilderness - not city streets.<br>For more than 50 years, Maskwa on Kearney Lake has been Halifax's home for paddling! Maskwa is Canada's premier canoe club, winning the National Championships in 2016, 2017, 2023, 2024 & 2025. Tucked between two ridges on an undeveloped watershed, it is an internationally recognized competitive and training location for olympic paddling.<br>Halifax Search and Rescue's Eco-Endurance Challenge (E2C): https://discoverhalifaxns.com/event/halifax-search-and-rescues-eco-endurance-challenge-e2c/ Wild Lakes 10K Wilderness Trail Race: https://raceroster.com/events/2025/96588/wild-lakes-10k Canoe Kayak NS Wilderness Route: https://ckns.ca/paddling-routes/inland-paddle-routes/ Forest Schools accessible to inner city students and so much more for future generations. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Paper Mill Lake Watershed Graphic<br>Thank you for the opportunity for citizen comment. [redacted] |
| 23 | Dear Ross Grant,<br>I attended the open house for the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area on November 19th. I met with HRM representatives, reviewed study data and asked the developers questions about their proposed developments. I'm writing to you today to express my concern with the designation of this area as a Special Planning Area for fast tracking development. I strongly disagree with any development in this area for a number of reasons including; the high ecological value of the area, impacts on traffic congestion and the cost of expanding infrastructure outside of the serviced area of HRM. I also strongly disagree with the provincial government's overstep by taking decisions about planning and development away from HRM council and question the transparency of the decision making process. First and foremost, I am strongly opposed to any development in this area before the establishment of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National Urban Park. This SPA overlaps with the ideal boundaries for this future park and fast-tacked development here will bring irreversible damage. Development in this area could cut off wildlife corridors, increase flood risk for nearby communities and lead to the permanent loss of protected green spaces. Secondly, the 102 is already experiencing terrible traffic congestion. Upgrades to the 102 and connector roads as well as investing in improved transit options should be a priority before any additional development is planned. Another pressing concern is the cost of expanding infrastructure such as water and sewer outside of the service areas of HRM. I'm concerned about who will pay for these upgrades<br>and how these costs will impact HRM taxpayers. Finally, I question how the decisions were made to make certain areas "Special Planning Areas" as well as to why the provincial government felt the need to overstep and take over the decision making process. What criteria was used to choose the areas? Why was the<br>process not made public? Why were less ecologically sensitive areas that were already within the service boundary of HRM not chosen? I agree that housing is needed, but more houses alone will not solve the housing crisis. What we need is well researched affordable development connected to well run transit and other services. We need to prioritize spaces within the serviced areas in HRM and focus on sites that are less ecologically important. I call on the provincial government to remove the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area from the SPA list and instead give the area the protection it deserves. You and your colleagues are in a position to make decisions that will impact our shared natural environment for all future generations. Please make protecting our environment a priority instead of prioritizing economic gains for developers. If you have not done so, I urge you to join a hike organized by the group Friends of |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes to better appreciate the amazing area that would be impacted by this development. I am calling on all branches of government to come together and make the establishment of this National Urban Park a reality. Thank you for your time, I will be watching this issue closely. [redacted] |
| 24 | Hello,<br>I am writing to express my support for protecting and preserving the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness area on the edge of Halifax. I feel strongly that: Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list. The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park. The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary. Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made. Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public. The "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas should be released. Development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary should be prioritized.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 25 | Good morning,<br>We need park areas in HRM. Parks help to provide some many things including beauty, oxygen, home for other species, flood control, carbon sequestration, temperature control, and hope. We are losing who we are as people as we degrade places. We need balance. Developing BMBCL is not something we need to do. I hope it is preserved and supported with wildlife corridors. [redacted] |
| 26 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>I am writing to share my feedback regarding the Highway 102 Special Planning Area.<br>I strongly encourage you to preserve the Wilderness Area and to protect wildlife corridors. New homes and developments should be concentrated in areas that already have the necessary infrastructure, such as roads, transit, and other services, to support growth. Focusing development in these areas is not only more sustainable, but also more cost-effective for the community, as it reduces the need for expensive new infrastructure. This approach will help safeguard our natural spaces while addressing our housing needs.<br>Thank you for considering my comments as you develop your recommendations. I appreciate your time and attention to this issue. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Best regards, [redacted] |
| 27 | Dear Leaders,<br>Developing Sandy Lake and BMBCL would negatively affect HRM. This is because residents benefit from natural green spaces health wise, but also because natural areas mitigate effects of the adverse environmental changes we are facing (drought, flooding, storms). Keeping Sandy lake and BMBCL undeveloped will strengthen communities, make HRM a safer place to live, and make it more attractive to visitors. If you need proof for these effects, please conduct more extensive environmental and floodplain surveys, and also ask local scientific experts who are not biased by monetary profits. Sprawling development in HRM puts us on a track of growing into another Toronto, destroying the region's unique ambience. To avoid this, new housing must be kept within the Urban Service Boundary. Green spaces need protection in our shared interest. I request that the province remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list, and share all public feedback. I look forward to your help in keeping HRM's future healthy and green.<br>Kind Regards, [redacted] |
| 28 | Good Day Ross,<br>Thank you for your replay, I appreciate you taking the time to respond to my letter.<br>I am cheered by your news that HRM will continue to explore the possibility of acquiring additional lands adjacent to provincially-designated wilderness lands and that these lands may then be considered for inclusion into a revised park boundary. However, I am curious as to which lands HRM is looking at (possibly the remainder of the Annapolis Group lands that aren't included in the SPA?).<br>So much work has been done by people in government, volunteer organizations, and general citizens for years to save the most unspoiled wilderness for the largest boundary of national urban park, that it would be heartbreaking if the development in the province's SPA went ahead. Once the land is developed, obviously, it's not coming back. I am also concerned that once it starts, the precedent is there for more development to follow. The national urban park should be the largest it could possibly be, for future and current generations. Any city parkland within the SPA would be a pale substitute (playgrounds and pickleball courts.)<br>As well, this SPA is outside the USB, as you're well aware. Why isn't development being fast tracked in brownfield sites (Bloomfield and both St. Pat's school sites; the former Piercy's site on Robie; even moving the acres of surface parking of car lots on Kempt road, for example) instead of the costly development and maintenance in a pristine greenfield site? I attended the feedback session, and the Steven's Group proposal remarked that there was polluted land on their property due to water run-off (I forget the exact |

| | |
|---|---|
| | description.). Can this pollution be from their quarry operation? Can they be trusted to take the environment's protection seriously when they didn't before?<br>In summary, here is what's at risk:<br>• Wildlife corridors cut off<br>• Increased flood risk for nearby communities<br>• Permanent loss of protected green space<br>• Major traffic congestion & longer commutes<br>• Huge costs to taxpayers for new infrastructure<br>I continue to thank you for your time with this critical matter and wish you a pleasant day. [redacted] |
| 29 | Good day,<br>I'm writing to you today to express my strong opposition to any development within the Highway 102 Special<br>Planning Area and lands adjacent to the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area and to insist that<br>Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>This area has long been identified in municipal plans as part of the preferred boundary for the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park; and, ideally, it would be incorporated into a national urban park-a park planning process that is already well underway. The proposed national urban park must be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>It was promised to the public as a protected wilderness, not as a site for high-density housing or commercial use.<br>The conceptual boundary of the national urban park, which Friends of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes advocate for, is based on sound environmental research and park planning principles and reflects decades of work by citizens, environmental groups, and numerous government staff.<br>I also offer the following feedback:<br>-The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national<br>urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary, and any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors.<br>-All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>-Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas should be released to the public, to allow for transparency and authentic input regarding the proposals.<br>-Development and housing solutions should be prioritized in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary.<br>I thank you for your time and assistance with this critically important matter and wish you a good day.<br>Kind Regards, [redacted] |
| 30 | Hello,<br>I am writing to request the removal of the 102 West Corridor Lands from the Fast Track list as a Special Planning Area. I want to live in an economy, here in Nova Scotia, that values nature, not as a resource to extract or destroy, but as a partner in prosperity. The proposed National Urban Park, is in an active planning process awaiting designation, and was not fully acknowledged by both developers, with their abutting lands. This was an oversight on their part. How can this be ignored when both the province & HRM as well as other partners, NS Nature Trust and 2 Mi'kmaq partners are actively engaged with Parks Canada in the designation process? In addition there are many other reasons why this proposed development is not<br>practical or economical:<br>*Costs of servicing the area at a cost to current and future taxpayers.<br>*Lack of existing or future public and other amenities to serve the residents.<br>*Traffic by the thousands of proposed residents, adding to the existing traffic issues in the area & with limited egress, a safety issue.<br>*Interruption to Wildlife Corridors<br>*Pollution to the pristine Birch Cove Lakes, a part of the Kearney Watershed, and downstream lakes, already experiencing some challenges ( Kearney Lake).<br>*Challenge to Species at Risk including several bird species such as the Common Nighthawk, and the endangered Mainland Moose.<br>*Popular Birch Cove Lakes Canoe & Paddling routes, a mini Keji, interrupted. There are 22 lakes within the proposed National Urban Park boundary.<br>*Where would the public access to the National Urban Park be situated, past a high rise on Susies lake??<br>*Creating a healthy active community where the opportunities for physical activity and active living are available to all....in the proposed National Urban Park. Our population is overweight, we need collaborative opportunities, including greater use of PaRx, a prescription for active time in nature by health care providers, also important for mental health. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *Loss of Carbon storage of existing wooded areas.<br>*Lack of respect regarding historic use of the area for outdoor recreation and nature education ..affordable and accessible...by individuals and groups including Boy Scouts and others.<br>*Interruption of scientific research by local academics.<br>*Riparian buffer zones that respect best practices ( I note that PEI requests 50m adjacent wetlands and lakes.)<br>*Respect for Mi'kmaw cultural connection to land and water.<br>*Current and future employers claim HRM has easy outdoor recreation access..let's keep it that way with the establishment of the National Urban Park and front country access points for year round use.<br>* I could go on....<br>I look forward to reading the What We Heard Report and engaging in the second round of Community Engagement. But perhaps this will not be required if this Special Planning Area is immediately removed from the list as requested by myself and so many others. There are adequate brownfields awaiting development at affordable and timely sites elsewhere in HRM. The demand for housing does not currently justify the 18,000+ units and subsequent residential explosion of 40,000+. This has been compared with the introduction of the town of Truro into a compact space...think about the many missing services, schools, commercial, recreation and those that serve a complete community for all ages. The current services in Mainland North are already stretched..lack of affordable accessible recreation programmes, meeting places and schools.<br>In the meantime, HRM Parks Planning staff and others have promised Community Engagement, in person, regarding the proposed National Urban Park, an obligation to their role & resources ($) accepted from Parks Canada, in the planning process before designation. The Park Trail Plan has been a best kept secret to date. This should be happening in the New Year to meet the anticipated designation dates Parks Canada has established!<br>I look forward to next steps, [redacted] |
| 31 | [This email has been received from an external person or system]<br>Dear HRM Planners,<br>I am writing to provide feedback on the proposals for development around Sandy Lake Provincial Park and the Highway 102 W Corridor. I request that the Province remove these two areas from the list Special Planning Areas. Both areas have significant natural value and should be protected. While I understand that this whole thing was downloaded to HRM from the Province, it is still galling that public consultation for both of these areas was limited to presentation of development options; there was no public input on whether or not these areas should be developed. Likewise, the online surveys took as a given that these |

| | |
|---|---|
| | places would be developed for housing. I do not support the use of my tax dollars to fund the extension of municipal services to these areas. Cramming a city the size of Truro into the 102 W Corridor makes no sense to me, given existing traffic issues throughout the area. Flooding risk analysis and traffic surveys need to be undertaken to model the impact of a massive increase in vehicle traffic that will result from these developments. The planning process should include input from local community experts. I support new housing development within the current Urban Service Boundary and planning within the (democratic!) HRM framework.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 32 | Hello,<br>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to any development in both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Special Planning Areas (SPA). These areas are ecologically sensitive and important spaces, and developing them is not in the best interest of our community. We can do so much better than this. Both spaces hold immense recreational value, and the health benefits that nature provides to us are well-documented. We are so lucky to have such beautiful and significant wilderness areas within the HRM that make our city an attractive place to live, and we cannot destroy them with urban sprawl when there are much better alternatives. In Sandy Lake, the addition of a community of this size would be an immense burden on traffic and congestion, and the province's solution of adding a connector road has not been properly studied. It also passes through a key wildlife corridor, meaning that developing in this SPA would threaten and cut off wildlife movement. The impacts of development and housing runoff on the water quality of Sandy Lake and its watershed, wildlife, and valuable stands of old growth forest here does not make this a responsible area for development. It is also home to over 15 at-risk species, including the Atlantic Salmon, making the biodiversity in and around Sandy Lake a critical consideration against developing here. This area needs to be protected and join Halifax's green network urgently.<br>I attended the open house on November 19th for Highway 102 W, and I left deeply concerned about this SPA, which effects the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. The traffic and land assessments were done with the estimated units being around half of what the developers were showcasing in their proposed development plans. How are we supposed to correctly assess the impacts to the environmental and traffic congestion associated with developing here if our studies don't accurately reflect what is being proposed? I also asked whether the land assessment looked at how the impacts of building here would effect the surrounding wilderness area (which is habitat for the endangered Mainland Moose) and connected watershed beyond what was within the SPA—I was told it only looked at the impacts to the space within the planning area. Moving forward with development is irresponsible and inappropriate without additional and complete assessments to the whole surrounding wilderness areas |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and integrated waterways, which also help protect the surrounding neighbourhoods from flooding.<br>Highway 102 SPA belongs in the park boundary for the National Urban Park that we have been waiting for; it's ecological significance and<br>publicly accessibly recreation and education opportunities make this space a natural and cultural asset that should be safeguarded for future generations to benefit from.<br>We need to focus on building within existing urban service boundaries. There is plenty of space and opportunity to densify in already-serviced neighbourhoods and develop brownfields before we spend millions of our tax dollars on urban sprawl that destroys vital greenspace, makes traffic congestion worse, and will raise our taxes. This is not the kind of city we want or deserve, and we can do better than needless sprawl that will destroy vital natural assets.<br>Please remove the SPA designation from both areas and focus our tax dollars on adding housing density within the existing urban service boundary over sprawl. I also expect environmental research from local community experts to be considered in reports and<br>throughout the planning process.<br>Thank you for taking my concerns and feedback into account and, hopefully, standing with Nova Scotians to provide better solutions for our growing community than these SPAs.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 33 | To: Melissa Eavis (Sandy Lake) and Ross Grant (Highway 102 W Corridor) From: Our HRM Alliance Re: Feedback on Proposed Development Plans for Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL)<br>Our HRM Alliance is a coalition of over 60 organizations advocating for the protection of local greenspace and the creation of complete, sustainable communities across HRM. Our members bring expertise from environmental, business, community, sustainable transportation and health sectors, and two of our member groups – the Sandy Lake-Sackville River Regional Park Coalition and the Friends of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Society – are long-standing stewards of the areas currently under review.<br>Both Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 West Corridor (BMBCL) contain some of the highest-value natural assets in the municipality. These areas provide critical habitat for rare and endangered species, offer essential ecological services to surrounding neighbourhoods, and are cherished recreation spaces for residents and visitors alike. Their connected ecosystems strengthen the overall environmental health of HRM's entire green network.<br>HRM needs more housing, but planning for growth and development must happen in step with our wildlife corridors and ecologically significant open spaces.<br>Issues with the Special Planning Areas |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 1. Wildlife Corridors and Ecological Connectivity<br>Both SPAs lie within or in close proximity to wildlife corridors identified in the Halifax Green Network Plan (HGNP), a priority plan adopted by HRM to safeguard ecological networks and guide responsible development. These corridors support habitat, migration/movement, breeding, and biodiversity across the region. Development within them would fragment habitat and degrade ecological health well beyond the boundaries of the SPAs themselves.<br>The proposed 10% parkland dedication is insufficient, especially if considered to be contributing to the maintenance of wildlife corridors. Parkland cannot be equated with corridor function. Manicured green space lacks canopy cover, strong riparian buffers, and the natural structure required for healthy wildlife pathways. Functional corridors require intact, connected natural systems that are incompatible with the development being proposed.<br><br>Furthermore, Policy E-9 of the 2014 Regional Plan directs HRM to identify and protect natural corridors in advance of approving new secondary planning strategies or amendments. Because the “Greenbelting and Public Open Space Priorities Plan” referenced in E-9 has since become the Halifax Green Network Plan, a priority plan, HRM is obligated to ensure HGNP-identified wildlife corridors remain fully intact. Development within these corridors would not meet the intent of E-9.<br><br>2. Cost and Long-Term Servicing<br>Both SPAs are located outside the Urban Service Boundary (USB), meaning significant new infrastructure, such as roads, water, wastewater, stormwater, emergency services, and transit, would need to be built and maintained at substantial cost to taxpayers.<br>HRM must prioritize growth within the USB, where infrastructure and services already exist and where transit can be efficiently improved to support new housing. Expanding outward into remote, car-dependent areas is financially unsustainable and undermines efforts to build complete, accessible communities. These SPAs, as proposed, do not address affordability needs and would generate long-term servicing costs that residents should not be expected to bear.<br><br>3. Traffic and Transportation<br>Neighbourhoods around both SPAs already experience limited access to reliable transit and active transportation routes, making the proposed developments entirely car dependent. Adding thousands of new units in these areas would significantly increase pressure on Highway 101, Highway 102, Hammonds Plains Road, and the Bedford Highway. These areas simply cannot handle more traffic congestion. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | HRM must exhaust all options for growth within the USB before introducing developments that would increase regional traffic burdens. Improving transit and active transportation for existing communities must be a priority. This approach also aligns directly with HRM's climate and mobility goals.<br><br>4. Recreation and Tourism Impacts<br>Sandy Lake: Sandy Lake contains pockets of old-growth forest and rich biodiversity, with 11 habitats and 3 different lake types (including endangered Atlantic salmon habitat), making it a valuable teaching forest where frequent and ongoing university research occurs. It is also high-quality recreation area for Bedford, Bedford West, Kingswood, Lucasville, Sackville, and surrounding communities. As these areas densify, access to large, natural recreation spaces becomes even more essential for health, wellness, and community connection. It is also habitat to 15 known endangered and rare species – a density unheard of for urban forests. Any adjacent development would impact the sensitive water quality, impacting the wellbeing of these species, and reducing recreation opportunities on the lake.<br><br>Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes (BMBCL): BMBCL is a candidate for National Urban Park status, making this park a potential municipal, provincial and federal tourism cornerstone. The area offers wilderness hiking, paddling routes, swimming, and backcountry-style camping, all within minutes of the urban core. Its proximity and high ecological integrity are unique in HRM and make it a major regional asset. Adjacent development would compromise the very environmental wellbeing and natural qualities that make BMBCL nationally significant.<br>Issues with the Process<br><br>1. Structure of the Public Survey<br>We appreciate the survey opportunity for both Special Planning Areas, as this is an accessible engagement method. However, the public survey includes leading questions that assume the participant is accepting of the proposed developments. This limits the reliability of the results and risks misrepresenting community sentiment. Any "What We Heard" report must clearly identify this limitation so public feedback is not interpreted as support where it does not exist. Reporting on surveys where questions were omitted is also crucial.<br><br>2. Transparency and Use of Public Input<br>"What We Heard" reports from the open houses, written submissions, and surveys must be released publicly as soon as they are prepared. Given the accelerated timelines and exceptional nature of the SPA |

| | |
|---|---|
| | framework, HRM must demonstrate that public input, especially related to ecological integrity and responsible growth – has informed all recommendations sent to the Province.<br>The report would ideally include an appendix with a written list of all comments from the sticky notes left at the Open Houses to most accurately demonstrate what was said by community.<br><br>3. Provincial Overreach and Democratic Concerns<br>The nature of the SPA process represents a significant instance of provincial overreach into municipal planning authority. By removing HRM Council from its normal decision-making role, capping timelines, and restricting the municipality's ability to apply its own planning policies, the Province has disrupted democratic processes that ensure transparency, accountability, and public participation.<br><br>This approach sidelines Council, diminishes public trust, and limits HRM's ability to uphold its evidence-based strategies for sustainable, climate-aligned growth. Given the extraordinary nature of the SPA system, HRM must take every possible step to preserve democratic participation, reinforce the role of public input, and reassert municipal authority in land-use planning.<br><br>Recommendations<br>1.Recommend the Province remove Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 West Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>2.Conduct comprehensive environmental, floodplain, wildlife, and traffic studies for both SPAs and the surrounding connected ecosystems, including existing parkland and wilderness areas.<br>3.Prioritize transit and active transportation improvements within the Urban Service Boundary before considering any outward expansion.<br>4.Integrate site-specific research and data from local experts and long-time community stewards into all ecological and planning assessments.<br>5.Release complete "What We Heard" reports for both SPAs.<br>6.Identify and propose alternative development areas within the Urban Service Boundary that do not compromise wildlife corridors or burden taxpayers with costly sprawl.<br><br>Protecting wildlife corridors and ecological connectivity is essential to the environmental, social, and economic well-being of the entire municipality. These SPAs overlap with ecologically significant lands whose health supports biodiversity, strengthens neighbourhood resilience, and anchors the regional green network that benefits all residents. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Growth must align with the Halifax Green Network Plan. By protecting these irreplaceable natural systems and focusing housing within the Urban Service Boundary, HRM can pursue a future that is sustainable, affordable, and grounded in responsible planning.<br><br>These recommendations also align with Our HRM Alliance's Seven Solutions, our coordinated framework for achieving sustainable growth in HRM. The Seven Solutions call on the municipality to protect the Green Network, focus growth in serviced areas, invest in transit and access to nature, adhere to Regional Plan growth targets, act on climate, ensure growth pays for itself, and strengthen meaningful public engagement. Together, these principles reinforce the core direction of this letter: that protecting ecological systems and prioritizing affordable housing within the Urban Service Boundary are essential to building a resilient, affordable, and sustainable HRM.<br>Sincerely,<br>Our HRM Alliance<br>5<br>Our HRM Alliance Groups:<br>Trail Groups<br>Cole Harbour Parks and Trails Association<br>Halifax North West Trails Association<br>Hike Nova Scotia<br>Preston and Area Trails Association<br>Penhorn Lake Area Trails Association<br>Wilderness Groups<br>Canoe Kayak Nova Scotia<br>Eastern Shore Forest Watch Association<br>Five Bridges Wilderness Heritage Trust<br>Sackville Rivers Association<br>Sackville Lakes Park and Trails Association<br>Save Bedford's Waterfront Society<br>Sandy Lake Conservation Association<br>Friends of Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes<br>Sandy Lake-Sackville River Regional Park Coalition<br>Environmental Groups |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Citizens' Climate Lobby – Halifax<br>Backlands Coalition<br>Canada Green Building Council – Atlantic Chapter<br>Dalhousie Office of Sustainability<br>Ferguson's Cove Neighbourhood Association<br>Friends of McNabs Island Society<br>Friends of First Lake Society<br>Ecology Action Centre<br>Halifax Field Naturalists<br>Halifax Urban Greenway Association<br>Lake Echo Watershed Association<br>McIntosh Run Watershed Association<br>Purcell's Cove Area Residents Action Committee<br>Sandy Lake Conservation Association<br>Shore Active Transportation Association<br>Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society<br>St. Margaret's Bay Stewardship Association<br>Williams Lake Conservation Company<br>Woodens River Watershed Environmental Organization<br>Community Groups<br>CAPE NS<br>CARP Nova Scotia<br>Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Society<br>Dalhousie School for Resource and Environmental Studies<br>FUSION Halifax<br>Halifax Cycling Coalition<br>Heart and Stroke Foundation of Nova Scotia<br>It's More Than Buses<br>Lucasville Community Association<br>Musquodoboit Harbour and Area Community Association<br>Purcell's Cove Neighbourhood Committee<br>PROBE<br>Rural Coastal Communities Network |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Walk n' Roll Halifax<br>Wyse Society for Sensible Urban Development, The<br>YWCA Halifax<br>Akoma Holdings Inc.<br>Business Improvement Districts<br>Downtown Halifax Business Commission<br>The Village on Main (Main Street Dartmouth Business Improvement District)<br>Quinpool Road Mainstreet District Association<br>St. Margaret's Bay Chamber of Commerce |
| 34 | Hello Grant,<br>I'm emailing to add to the feedback about the development of the Highway 102 W Corridor: I'm concerned about the way we continue to extend the urban footprint of HRM, reducing everyone's access to wild green spaces within a reasonable distance of home; increasing sprawl & the need for car and other infrastructure. We need more development within the Urban Service Boundary so that we can work on public transit and making the city more walkable and bikeable to reduce congestion.<br>For these and other reasons I'm hoping you'll recommend:<br>That the province remove Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>• We should complete additional environmental and traffic surveys, as well as<br>• floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks.<br>• Include environmental research from local community experts in the reports and<br>• planning process.<br>• Release publicly available What We Heard reports about the public feedback on the<br>• Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas<br>• Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service<br>• Boundary and do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors.<br>Thank you, [redacted] |
| 35 | Dear HRM Planners,<br>I am writing to provide feedback on the proposals for development around Sandy Lake Provincial Park and the Highway 102 W Corridor. I request that the Province remove these two areas from the list Special Planning Areas. Both areas have significant natural value and should be protected. While I understand that this whole thing was downloaded to HRM from the Province, it is still galling that public consultation |

| | |
|---|---|
| | for both of these areas was limited to presentation of development options; there was no public input on whether or not these areas should be developed. Likewise, the online surveys took as a given that these places would be developed for housing. I do not support the use of my tax dollars to fund the extension of municipal services to these areas. Cramming a city the size of Truro into the 102 W Corridor makes no sense to me, given existing traffic issues throughout the area. Flooding risk analysis and traffic surveys need to be undertaken to model the impact of a massive increase in vehicle traffic that will result from these developments. The planning process should include input from local community experts. I support new housing development within the current Urban Service Boundary and planning within the (democratic!) HRM framework.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 36 | Good day,<br>I'm writing to you today to express my strong opposition to any development within the Highway 102 Special<br>Planning Area and lands adjacent to the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area and to insist that Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>This area has long been identified in municipal plans as part of the preferred boundary for the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park; and, ideally, it would be incorporated into a national urban park—a park planning process that is already well underway. The proposed national urban park must be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>It was promised to the public as a protected wilderness, not as a site for high-density housing or commercial use.<br>The conceptual boundary of the national urban park, which Friends of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes advocate for, is based on sound environmental research and park planning principles and reflects decades of work by citizens, environmental groups, and numerous government staff.<br>I also offer the following feedback:<br>-The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary, and any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors.<br>-All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>-Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas should be released to the public, to allow for transparency and authentic input regarding the proposals.<br>-Development and housing solutions should be prioritized in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary.<br>I thank you for your time and assistance with this critically important matter and wish you a good day.<br>Kind Regards, [redacted] |
| 37 | Hi Grant,<br>I don't believe we had the chance to connect personally at the 102 open house. I just wanted to follow up and thank you for hosting the event, and providing solid opportunities for the public to interact with HRM staff and share their feedback. I was wondering if you'd be able to meet (perhaps for a coffee?) in the near future to discuss initial feedback from the event we have both been hearing, and discuss next steps/opportunities where we can help support your process. The best time to do this would likely be after Dec 11th, when the Regional Plan public hearing has finished. Do you have any availability the week of Dec 15th? I can be pretty flexible to your schedule. Hope to connect soon, [redacted] |
| 38 | Hi Ross,<br>Thank you for this comprehensive overview of HRM's next steps. EAC has been encouraging individual comments from members and the public, and I believe Our HRM Alliance is planning to submit something formal, of which EAC is a member. I will reach out again in the New Year and we can find a time for us to connect in person then. More than potentially discussing the feedback, I think it would be beneficial for us to meet, as this work has a great impact on the Halifax Green Network Plan and the Alliance as a whole. I can make a note to message you in Jan!<br>Happy holidays :) [redacted] |
| 39 | Hello,<br>I'm writing to express my opposition to development in the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Special Planning Areas.<br>If development goes ahead, we can expect tax increases, increased traffic congestion, and environmental destruction. Please note that as I write this, HRM is cutting its budget, the Mayor and the Premier frequently mention how much of a problem traffic congestion is in HRM, and we are all noticing the effects of climate change. We should not act in a way that would make these problems worse. I ask that HRM Complete additional environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks. Include environmental research from local community experts in the reports and |

| | |
|---|---|
| | planning process. Release publicly available "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas. Request that the province remove Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 West Corridor from the Special Planning Areas list. Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service Boundary, and that do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors. I'm confident that if HRM acts in accordance with good planning principles and sound ecological practices, we can have a better future. There are many good ways to get more people into housing; this isn't one of them.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 40 | Dear Sirs/Madams:<br>My name is [redacted] I am a retired federal public servant living in Halifax West. I worked in Real Property Operations and Maintenance for most of my work career. My activities in retirement are volunteering with trails work and enjoying the outdoors in parks and natural areas. I stay within the local area to enjoy our special places. I consider myself fortunate to live in a city with such wonderful outdoor spaces in close proximity to the city core . I use these places frequently because they are so close and enjoyable and beneficial to my health and well -being.<br>I request the Provincial Government remove Highway 102 West Corridor(Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes ) and Sandy Lake from the Special Planning Areas list. I also request that the Province and the City complete additional environmental and traffic surveys as well as floodplain surveys for surrounding communities and adjacent parks and lands. I have concerns about water quality, and storm water runoff .Please ensure the quality and quantity of water in the lakes are preserved. These areas have<br>clean water lakes surrounded by healthy forests full of wildlife and extensive plant species.<br>These areas are worth preserving and protecting from developments. Additionally, I also urge you to include environmental research from local community experts in your reports and planning processes. Much work has already been done that could be captured and used to help in the decision making on a way ahead forward plan. I took part recently in completing the surveys and participating in the open houses/<br>forums .I request that you release publicly and make available the What We Heard reports about the public feedback you received on both of these special planning areas.<br>I also propose that there are alternative and better areas to prioritize development and housing. There are other areas already within the urban service boundary that would not interfere with wildlife corridors or impact lakes' water quality or the health of forests. I would suggest and urge any new housing or |

| | |
|---|---|
| | development be in areas already serviced by municipal services within the already established Urban Service Boundary.<br>I would like to offer a few ideas as alternatives for you to consider as being more appropriate and better suited for housing and development. These include Shannon Park and Dartmouth Crossing where lands are available and already within the Urban service Boundary. Shannon Park can play a major role in solving multiple problems concurrently with the construction of high density urban housing. Being within harbour waterways access this location could form part of the new urban rapid water transit ferry system connecting Shannon Park to Halifax, Dartmouth, Woodside and Bedford. From my past work experience, a ferry service existed from the Shannon Park site to transport folks to the Halifax side of the harbour. This could be replicated in future at a larger scale to form part of the expanded Halifax Transit ferry system.<br>Shannon Park<br>lands could accommodate many thousands of residents living in high density housing and using such a ferry transit system.<br>To conclude , I would urge all involved to look at the" best fit "approach to match and relate existing infrastructure with planning and future development to maximize efficiency, minimize cost and minimize disruptions and interferences with natural spaces. The starting point would be the removal of Sandy Lake and Highway 102 WestCorridor Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes from the special planning areas list .<br>On a more macro view as per growth within Nova Scotia the best approach would be to encourage growth in the small towns and communities so that we can be a province with multiple similar -sized cities. With half of the NS population in Halifax with over 500, 000 people it would make sense and allow planning ,in general, to occur at a better more- controlled pace; producing better outcomes. Better and more even population distribution would make for a more stable and more balanced provincial economy. Please include these comments, suggestions, views in the public record.<br>Respectfully, [redacted] |
| 41 | Mr. Grant,<br>I am writing to you on behalf of the Canadian Association of Retired Persons, Nova Scotia Chapter, Environment Committee. We also live in the Clayton Park area and are very familiar with the land and water in between Lacewood and Kearney Lake Rd. As a City Planner, we know that you must be under a great deal of pressure from the Provincial Government. It is very discouraging and upsetting to see our local city councillors sidelined in such a heavy handed and, frankly, undemocratic manner by our current government. It is probably not what you signed up for but, here we are. Certainly I think we can all agree we face unprecedented growth, lack of affordable housing, and climate change. The recent devastating |

| | |
|---|---|
| | forest fires near exit 5 and the floods that followed gave us all a wake up call. Climate change brings us an important message -be careful where you build.<br>Yes, we face many challenges in this day and age, however,there is a bright light for the citizens of HRM, biodiversity, and perhaps most important, the climate. This ray of hope is the possibility of a fully realized 12,000 Acre National Urban Park. We have a wonderful legacy opportunity in the possibility of a National Urban Park, but frankly, the 102 west corridor will drive a stake into the 'heart of the park'. Did you know that<br>BMBCL is home to mature Acadian forest, wetlands and glacial landforms and that it<br>provides critical wildlife corridors linking other protected lands across the Chebucto Peninsula? In fact, BMBCL is recognized as one of the most ecologically rich and accessible wild areas in an urban centre in Canada. The facts are quite clear and I'm sure we can all<br>agree that development of any kind in this area would be a massive loss to future generations of our fair province. We have a serious decision to make and, while we are not against housing developments, we ask you to please stop and think about this potentially destructive housing project . We<br>recommend a moratorium on building in this area until all community groups have had a<br>chance to work together to come up with a plan that works for all including the developers.<br>This plan could include combined funding from all three levels of government to purchase the<br>land needed to protect urban wilderness. We are all being pressured into something that needs<br>a great deal more discussion and planning.<br>Give our City Councillors back their voice. They are in touch with their community. Return democracy to the Citizens of this province. Let community planning start from the ground up and not top down as, sadly, and ineffectively, it stands today. The recent public meetings were inadequate and skewed for development. I had one developer tell me that our taxes would not increase with this development which we all know is just not true.<br>We respectfully ask that you consider meeting face to face with Parks Canada, and local<br>community groups, such as Friends of BMBCL, the Halifax Alliance, and our own C.A.R.P.<br>NS. Environment Committee. We, along with the other community groups, have had 'boots<br>on the ground' for many years now and can provide in-depth knowledge of the area. Have you<br>spoken to the Indigenous? You are proposing to build on well documented, historic,<br>Indigenous canoe routes. A National Urban Park is an opportunity for reconciliation.<br>I'm sure you are aware that clean water will be even more valuable in the future. Currently<br>there are 22 lakes and two watershed river systems in the proposed park's conceptual<br>boundary. The water is remarkably pure to this day. We ask you to consider protecting these |

| | |
|---|---|
| | lakes including Kearney Lake which hosts National canoeing events. We certainly don't want to see the water in Kearney Lake degrade as Lake Banook has over the years. Sadly, once this gem of a wilderness is gone, it is gone forever.<br>Stop the continuing urban sprawl until our infrastructure and medical services have had time to catch up. Meet face to face with the community stakeholders. Come up with a plan that includes a fully realized National Urban Park which includes the precious, fragile Birch Cove Lakes.<br>[redacted]<br>C.A.R.P. NS. Co-Chair Environment Committee |
| 42 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>I would like to express my sincere opposition to the Highway #102 Special Planning Area<br>I am sure you are receiving many similar letters so I will keep my letter short and to the point<br>My primary concern is about the certain impact any development in this area will have on the existing Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness and the potential National Urban Park. This area cannot be viewed as a resource to be exploited for any reason. Once the damage is done, it cannot be undone<br>In addition, development of this area does not make sense from a financial investment intended to address the very real issue of housing availability, especially affordable housing<br>As it exists outside the current Urban Service Boundary, the cost of development would be higher than the available alternatives. The additional costs, regardless of who carries them, will either add to the prices of homes or to the already high tax burden for HRM residents<br>Alternatives exist. There are “brownfield” sites all around HRM that would be much less expensive to develop, have minimal impact on the environment, and not add additional burden to the existing transportation infrastructure<br>In closing, I plead with you to put a stop to this project and consider alternatives<br>We are fortunate to have such a gem of an area so close at hand<br>Do not let short-sighted thinking become a regret for generations to come<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 43 | I have tried multiple times to fill out the vision part of the questionnaire. The word count has been below the 250 words and yet the pop up says I have exceeded it and the questionnaire will not go through.<br>HELP! [redacted] |
| 44 | Hi Janet (Councillor Steele),<br>I saw your post regarding the special planning area and have completed the survey for the 102 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | area.<br>Though I am a casual user of the Blue Mountain Area, I support development in this region, provided it does not encroach on the designated wilderness area in the future. Further residential growth here would certainly strengthen the case for more recreation facilities, including the potential expansion of the Canada Games Centre to incorporate a 50m pool. I am also curious about the developer plans for the industrial portion of the land. In the prerecorded presentation, a developer's site plan showed the quarry pit displayed in blue. Does this indicate that the pit may be converted into a lake, potentially for recreational use?<br>Finally, to build on our previous conversation about outdoor facilities, I believe HRM should leverage this development to include appropriate outdoor amenities. This location would be ideal for a multi-field baseball complex, given its proximity to the highway and other amenities, including a hotel. Since the developers have included park planning in their proposals, perhaps what is designated as parkland could be used for such a facility. This could, in turn, free up older, unused ball diamonds to be converted into other park types, such as the dog park concept I previously mentioned. [redacted] |
| 45 | I'm shocked at the scale of the proposed development. I want to see a smaller scale of development with lots of attention to livability and accommodating a variety of family sizes -<br>eg 3 bedroom living spaces and not all bachelor or 1 bedroom. I want to see a real focus on<br>public transportation to move people around without cars. Transit should be frequent and low<br>priced. I want natural spaces and the proposed urban park to be protected from adverse effects<br>of development. I want to see truly affordable housing as a component, ideally publically<br>owned or managed by true non-profit or co-op organizations. I did complete the survey, but felt compelled to say more and was not given that option in the<br>survey fields. [redacted] |
| 46 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>I remain hopeful that the Corridor 102 SPA will be cancelled and we can return to the possibility of a national BMBCL park filling out the original borders that were eagerly sought.<br>Below is the wording of a letter I sent to John White Honourable Minister of Housing. It outlined my concerns more specifically.<br>Thank you for your kind attention.<br>[redacted] (please see signature at bottom)<br>I have been actively involved in the promotion of BMBCL as the national urban wilderness park.<br>So you can imagine my concern and grief about the developments proposed for the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We do need housing, especially affordable housing, in HRM. People do require housing and access to food and public transportation. They also need access to nature and to wilderness areas. I say "need" because time spent in nature, even without the advantage of exercise, has been proven to improve health - even to reduce pain.<br>Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes wilderness area, is an exquisite area of ecological diversity. I take my teenage grandson's hiking in that area. And they are entranced with it. I want it to be there for them. And for generations to come. Once lost that opportunity is gone forever.<br>The current proposed housing project threatens the entire idea of the national urban wilderness park. It also renders the wilderness area too small to successfully accomplish the aims of a national park. And the anticipated ecological damage from the housing projects would be huge.<br>It also seems more appropriate to choose brownfield SPA areas in that they also wouldn't require such a taxpayer burden for the building of infrastructure.<br>Please remove the Highway 102 area from the list of Special Planning Areas, and pursue first, the designation of land for the National Urban Park.<br>Thank you for your attention to my concerns.<br>With best wishes - and hope, [redacted] |
| 47 | Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary.<br>Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors.<br>All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>Release "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas.<br>Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary.<br>Halifax could have one of the country's greatest national urban parks. A national urban park built on strong park planning principles and environmental considerations will attract eco-tourism, support local |

| | |
|---|---|
| | businesses, provide free and accessible recreation for future generations, and offer limitless education opportunities. Once development begins, this vision<br>disappears forever. [redacted] |
| 48 | Good day,<br>I attended the open house on the 102 Special Planning Area. I'd like to make these points:<br>-This is a rushed proposal to develop in the long-standing proposed boundaries of a potential National Urban Park.<br>-It seems opportunistic to say the least, to use the excuse of needing housing to gleefully rush through wilderness area greenfield when other areas ARE available and make more sense.<br>-We should incorporate all the national urban park area that has been identified for some time, working with the Province, the Municipality, and groups such as Nova Scotia Nature Trust, Nature Conservancy Canada, and the BMBCL Friends to secure funds. The Federal Government often wants to assist with this type of land protection.<br>-All environmental and traffic surveys should be completed in FULL before any development is decided upon.<br>-Release public feedback on this development proposal and others.<br>-Remove Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) as a special planning area entirely.<br>-Build in urban areas where current public transit and infrastructure is already present.<br>-Make the dream of a National Urban Park become a reality and watch tourism grow and protect fragile waterways, wildlife corridors and precious watertables!<br>Thank you for listening! [redacted] |
| 49 | Ross,<br>Just curious, do you have a sense of numbers of responses to the survey to date?<br>It was a great turnout at the Open House....many thanks for all the work the team was able to share in support of the event.<br>And the media managed to cover the topic well.<br>Have a great weekend, [redacted] |
| 50 | On November 19, I attended a public open house regarding the Special Planning Area of the 102. I was disappointed that once again development is being proposed on land that was supposed to have been part of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Park. The initial wilderness park map shows the same land has become an issue once again. Approximately, 13 years ago, I went to a presentation given by the city of Halifax in the very same location where the public were shown the plan for that park. That plan |

| | |
|---|---|
| | included the private land around Quarry Lake now marked for development in the Special Planning Areas document. The plan was that the city of Halifax was supposed to purchase the private land so it could be added to the wilderness area. Later, approximately 2018, the municipality held another session where development was being discussed. After an uproar from the public, development was put on hold in favour of the municipality purchasing the private land. I was informed at the current session that the actual decision on the land use is to be made by the province although there were no representatives of the province at this session. Therefore I decided I would contact the province myself. The other thing that stood out to me about this proposal is that the city seems to be treating the plan as if it has already come to be. At least the<br>feedback survey regarding the proposal was written that way. The survey makes it appear that public feedback on the existence of this development makes little difference to the outcome. I would hope that the proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before allowing development on its boundaries.<br>The size of the development is preposterous and also the fact that there will be development on the edge of Quarry Lake is most unfortunate. My understanding from environmental scientists is that any development around one of those lakes threatens the pristine nature of all of the lakes and I believe that to be the case. No matter what provisions are made for the run off obviously some percentage of run off will wind up in<br>the lake. In addition, there have been concerns in the past from environmental scientists regarding development on the park boundaries and its effect on the integrity of the environment with in the park as a whole. Research from local environmental experts must be included in the planning and report and their findings made public. Not only is there the loss of the park integrity but also there will be many challenges owing to the enormous size of this development. Noise and traffic and loss of wildlife habitat are chief among them. For example, wildlife corridors must not be interfered with. Flood plane surveys and traffic surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks must be completed before any development takes place. I am a long time resident of the area and I do not take kindly to the changes and massive upheaval that will be caused by this enormous development. Through the decades Ihave been subjected to many changes caused by numerous developments and that is not unexpected. But this particular proposal is a betrayal in my opinion. I believe there are many other people who hold views close to mine on this subject. I urge the province to oppose this development and work to achieve the initial proposal for the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes wilderness area. The wilderness park would be a great asset and a great draw to the Halifax area and whereas more apartment buildings and high density housing create |

| | |
|---|---|
| | nothing special out of land that is very special. I realize people need housing but I think there are other areas<br>that are better suited for that purpose, particularly those that are already within the Urban Service Boundary. Once this land is destroyed there will be no way to undo the damage. "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake an Highway 102 West Corridor Special Areas must be released. The Highway 102 W Corridor should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 51 | Dear Ross Grant,<br>Below is my email concerning the proposed housing development in the Suzie Lake area.<br>This urban wilderness only remains effective if left intact. Seeing housing units removes the remoteness and lessens the amazing effects being surrounded by wonderful nature offers HRM citizens. We have something special very here.<br>Thank you, [redacted]<br>Deer Minister Halman and department heads of the Protected Areas and Ecosystems Branch, NS Environment<br>I am writing to express my concerns over recent occurrences involving development proposals for Protected areas, such as Mabou Beach, as well as the proposed development along Highway 102, Suzie's Lake area. I believe the mandate of the NS Environment is to Protected land within NS. Please take a stand against the further loss of habitat and valuable nature accessible to Nova Scotians. The land proposed for the Suzie's Lake development was previously pledged as part of the proposed wilderness area. As well, a golf course on Mabou Beach will destroy the forest and natural habitat, and introduce non-environmentally sound practices. As well as removing access to the area for the general public.<br>Please stand by your Protective Area mandate, and take a stand for preservation and protection. Otherwise, constituents, like me, will no longer have trust that you will manage and protect our natural areas, as per the duty of your elected office.<br>I appreciate your review of this matter.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 52 | Hi Ross,<br>Thank you for getting back to me, and for truly considering what we have to lose here. We hike these trails all the time. And a couple of years ago my husband, daughter and I drove 5 minutes from our house in West Halifax with our canoe and put in on Suzie's Lake. We spent the day canoeing on lakes, still waters and rivers doing a loop from Suzie's Lake, Crane Lake, Fox Lake, where we picnicked and swam, and |

| | |
|---|---|
| | back to Quarry Lake and Suzie's Lake. It felt like we were in backcountry Keji, but it was moments from our home. Lose that sense of remoteness and we lose the magic.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 53 | I fully and sincerely support the position as highlighted below. This incredibly beautiful, unique and valuable natural resource right next to our city needs to be protected and turned into a National Park and this process is well supported and well underway already. Housing is clearly an area needing to be addressed but there are other options than taking over this unique park land. Sincerely, [redacted], Whites Lake NS<br>Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary.<br>Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>Release "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas.<br>Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary. [redacted] |
| 54 | Good afternoon Mr. Grant,<br>I'm writing to share feedback about the proposed Special Planning Area around Hwy 102 that would impact Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes.<br>As a resident and rate payer, I would like to officially request that Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) be removed from the Special Planning Areas list. The proposed national urban park needs to be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park. This is a tremendous asset to HRM and all of Nova Scotia, and something that cannot be recovered once construction begins.<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | This land is essential for NS biodiversity and any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made. Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>I strongly urge you to release the "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas. The public deserve to know the timbre of public opinion on this topic and the government owes it to us to be transparent.<br>I am a supporter of development and HRM desperately needs new housing stock. However I encourage HRM and the Province to prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary. Densify existing developed lands before destroying some of our most important and cherished natural assets.<br>Thank you for your consideration, [redacted] |
| | Hello Ross,<br>Thank you and HRM for creating this opportunity to give feedback on important decisions that are to be made. While the Province needs more housing, it makes no sense to allow developments that will ruin important aspects of these long-planned and highly valuable green spaces, BMBCL (Highway 102 W Corridor) and Sandy Lake Regional Park.<br>I request that the city and Province:<br>• Remove Sandy Lake SPA and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>• Give both parks the time and attention they need to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the parks.<br>• At BMBCL the Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary.<br>• Any development in either proposed parks should not interfere with wildlife corridors. Also act upon maintaining connections between the two parks, the Mainland and the rest of the Chebucto Peninsula.<br>• Before development decisions are made, complete all environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks.<br>• Include in the reports and planning process the environmental research from local community experts, scientists and planners, and make it all public.<br>• Release "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas as part of the process and before any decisions are made.<br>• Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary. Develop brownfields rather than developing potential park lands.<br>All the best, [redacted] |
| 55 | As an ecologist and lifelong Nova Scotia resident, I would like to see more collaboration and balance between conservation and development in this province.<br>We have the opportunity to create a leading example with the intersection between the 102 SPA and potential BMBCL urban park area.<br>Allowing status quo development in this area seems to only contribute to urban sprawl, when we should be focusing on densification and building up instead of out. The global research overwhelmingly shows high return on green space investment, especially in the metrics of mental and physical wellbeing, property values, and pollution management. Smog, low air quality, and heat islands is no longer a big city problem or something reserved for countries lacking in emissions standards, we are seeing these things happening across Canada between wildfires, pollution, and increased extreme heat days. Areas like the BMBCL are buffering Halifax making it a desirable place to live, do business and invest in.<br>Studies have shown that the cost to replace the air and water purification services, and climate regulation (cooling effect) of ecosystems with human-built systems can be huge and never does as good of a job as the natural system did. Let alone the recreational, ecological, tourism and mental health co-benefits provided by a natural system that a water treatment system doesn't have.<br>Are we going to continue the stereotype of a backward, old fashioned province with outdated planning and development practices that benefit a privileged few at the expense of the heath, safety and sustainability of future Nova Scotians? Or can we be future looking, using current research and boldly stand for a greener economy and creatively merge development and conservation?<br>Thank you for your time and consideration [redacted] |
| 56 | I was in attendance at the HRM Open House on Nov. 19 at St. Peters Anglican Church during the three - two hour periods of public participation. What surprised me was there were no Nova Scotia Dept. of the Environment & climate change (DECC) reps on hand to explain their involvement in this process, and the HRM reps said nothing about their involvement as signed on partners with NS DECC, Parks Canada, NS Nature Trust, and two Mi'kmaq Reps regarding the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness Area becoming |

| | |
|---|---|
| | a National Urban Park.<br>I see a generational opportunity surrounding the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes(BMBCL) Wilderness Area becoming a significantly important jewel of a National Urban Park for Nova Scotia. I would ask how can the NS government and HRM spend taxpayer revenue planning to develop in an area (the SPA), that they also signed onto as a partner to develop as a Nation Urban Park that overlaps that SPA?<br>In an effort to preserve the long planned for integrity of the BMBCL Wilderness Area to become our HRM National Urban Park and provide access bordering the hwy 102 it would be possible for sports fields, adjacent schools or environmental centers where students have access to the National Urban Park. I believe what is required in addition to the will, is to;<br>-Remove the Hiway 102 West Corridor designation from the list of Special Planning Areas.<br>-The partners; Parks Canada, NS DECC, HRM, NS Nature Trust, and two Mi'kmaq groups continue with planning of the National Urban Park and at the same time the Province and the City work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban park area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary.<br>- Environmental research from local community experts should be included in all reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>Respectfully, [redacted] |
| 57 | Dear Ross Grant,<br>Below is my email concerning the proposed housing development in the Suzie Lake area. This urban wilderness only remains effective if left intact. Seeing housing units removes the remoteness and lessens the amazing effects being surrounded by wonderful nature offers HRM citizens. We have something special very here.<br>Thank you, [redacted]<br>Deer Minister Halman and department heads of the Protected Areas and Ecosystems Branch, NS Environment<br>I am writing to express my concerns over recent occurrences involving development proposals for Protected areas, such as Mabou Beach, as well as the proposed development along Highway 102, Suzie's Lake area. I believe the mandate of the NS Environment is to Protected land within NS. Please take a stand against the further loss of habitat and valuable nature accessible to Nova Scotians. The land proposed for the Suzie's Lake development was previously pledged as part of the proposed wilderness area. As well, a golf course on Mabou Beach will destroy the forest and natural habitat, and introduce non-environmentally sound practices. As well as removing access to the area for the general public. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Please stand by your Protective Area mandate, and take a stand for preservation and protection. Otherwise, constituents, like me, will no longer have trust that you will manage and protect our natural areas, as per the duty of your elected office.<br>I appreciate your review of this matter. [redacted] |
| 58 | Good afternoon Mr. Grant,<br>I'm writing to share feedback about the proposed Special Planning Area around Hwy 102 that would impact Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes.<br>As a resident and rate payer, I would like to officially request that Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) be removed from the Special Planning Areas list. The proposed national urban park needs to be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park. This is a tremendous asset to HRM and all of Nova Scotia, and something that cannot be recovered once construction begins.<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary. This land is essential for NS biodiversity and any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made. Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>I strongly urge you to release the "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas. The public deserve to know the timbre of public opinion on this topic and the government owes it to us to be transparent.<br>I am a supporter of development and HRM desperately needs new housing stock. However I encourage HRM and the Province to prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary. Densify existing developed lands before destroying some of our most important and cherished natural assets.<br>Thank you for your consideration, [redacted] |
| 59 | Greetings,<br>I attended information sessions on November 12 and the 19th about these two Special Planning Areas I am writing to request that the province remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list. Complete additional environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks. Include environmental research from local community experts in the reports and planning process. Release publicly available |

| | |
|---|---|
| | What We Heard reports about the public feedback on the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas<br>Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service Boundary and do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors. I have been a resident of Bedford off and on since 1976 and just recently settled in Hammonds Plains. I am a long time volunteer with the Sackville Rivers Association, currently sitting on the Board of Directors. I truly fear for our community if these two areas are developed. The damage to the environment, continued damage to homes and infrastructure in the floodplains, and increased traffic on already busy roadways will only create more problems. I am also not happy with the over reach by the provincial government in making these Special Planning Areas in the first place. If the purpose of these SPAs is to help accelerate housing development, I believe the HRM has the capacity to reduce barriers to accelerate development.<br>There is also very little, if any, affordable housing in the plans.<br>Thank you for your attention. [redacted] |
| 60 | For 20 years, our national urban park's preferred boundaries have been readily identified. They include wildlife corridors, environmental considerations, possibilities of one of the best parks in our nation (which would increase eco-tourism, inspire new business, recreations, education). This park must include the BMBCL waterways. And so, protecting that whole area is crucial.<br>As our voices, you should speak to assure all that necessary surveys are completed, problems are addressed, and local experts' work made public. I have been there...it is beautiful, healing, and so very accessible to city people and wanderers/nature lovers from everywhere.<br>This place is a gift, and should not be thrown away irretrievably.<br>Thank you for considering this carefully.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 61 | Dear Melissa Eavis and Ross Grant,<br>I am writing to you to urge you to remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor from the Special Planning Areas list, and to protect these areas instead.<br>I also speak on behalf of around 120 physicians and other healthcare professionals of the Nova Scotia Regional Committee of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment (CAPE NS) Home - CAPE which I chair. Our members have sent several letters to decision makers and have spoken repeatedly to the media in support of protecting these areas.<br>The reasons why we as healthcare professionals do so include the following: |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 1. These urban wild areas are exceptionally biodiverse and form essential wildlife corridors.<br>2. They bring precious environmental benefits by reducing flooding and noise pollution, improving air quality, and many others.<br>3. Most importantly from our perspective as healthcare professionals they provide scientifically measurable physical and mental health benefits to HRM residents who spend time in them, as shown by a recent scientific study we completed in the Sandy Lake area (attached) and supported by a wealth of evidence in the medical scientific literature. PaRx: A Prescription for Nature<br>4. While, as health care professional we strongly support developing housing for HRM residents, this should be done in areas which are closer to transportation routes and services, such as Shannon Park or the Penhorn Mall area.<br>5. Developing Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor will not benefit those individuals most in need of housing but merely destroy precious urban wild areas from which all HRM residents should benefit, and add to urban sprawl, congestion and harmful traffic related air pollution, only benefitting developers and the affluent. This is not intelligent and citizen focused urban design.<br>At a minimum following must be completed:<br>1. Additional environmental and traffic surveys, and floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks<br>2. Inclusion of environmental research from local community experts<br>3. Release of the publicly available What We Heard reports about the public feedback on the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas<br>We are so fortunate to have these wild areas in the HRM. We urge you to treasure and protect them for the HRM residents you were elected to serve, and not be swayed by the pressure of profit seeking developers.<br>We would be happy to provide any additional information. |
| 62 | I am writing to ask you to not approve this development. Having the wilderness so close to our city is one of the things that makes our city the wonderful place that it is. I may not get out in this area to much but I feel that for the health of our city having it there is very important. Our current infrastructure can not support the population that we have.<br>thank you for your consideration of this<br>[redacted] |
| 63 | Subject: Critical Review Required: Highway 102 West Corridor SPA<br>Dear Mr. Grant: |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I am writing as a resident deeply attentive to the proposed development in the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area. I have reviewed the publicly available studies produced by HRM and Stantec Consulting reports including the Land Suitability Analysis, Transportation Study, Watershed & Stormwater Management Study, Servicing Study, and related planning documents. While I am not a technical expert, I am using them to the best of my ability to inform my perspective and substantiate this letter about feasibility and potential risks. My concerns are based on my understanding of these documents, together with publicly available information and community feedback. I am doing my best, as an ordinary citizen, to form an informed and ethical opinion.<br>My letter also reflects my personal ethical considerations and the long-term responsibility we hold to protect these lands for future generations. After carefully analyzing these reports, I am deeply concerned about the technical feasibility of the proposed development and the ethical implications of proceeding in its current form.<br>Technical and Practical Challenges<br>The Highway 102 studies highlight significant barriers to implementing the proposed development as envisioned:<br>• Land Suitability Analysis (LSA): Large portions of the site are classified as “moderately to highly constrained,” with steep slopes, wetlands, and sensitive ecological zones. Developing these areas would require extensive earthworks and modifications that are costly, high-risk, and environmentally damaging. Labeling them as developable is optimistic and unrealistic in practice.<br>• Transportation Study: The projections assume major investments in transit infrastructure that do not exist. Without these, the development would generate<br>thousands of additional car trips, worsening congestion on Highway 102 and adjacent roads, contrary to the “complete community” vision.<br>• Watershed & Stormwater Management Study: Proposed stormwater mitigation relies on engineered solutions that cannot fully replace the natural flood control and water filtration functions of the existing landscape. Climate variability, extreme rainfall events, and construction impacts make these solutions uncertain and potentially insufficient, putting lakes, wetlands, and downstream communities at risk.<br>• Servicing Study: Infrastructure expansions for water, wastewater, and utilities are extremely costly and dependent on assumptions about developer capacity, timelines, and maintenance that are not guaranteed. Failure would shift financial responsibility to taxpayers.<br>• Planning Documents & Developer Rationale: Promises of mixed-use, urban-style neighborhoods with significant open space are conceptually attractive but practically unlikely given the site constraints, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ecological sensitivity, and infrastructure limitations. The envisioned scale of development, adjacent to a protected wilderness area, is essentially building a city within a highly constrained landscape.<br>These technical challenges show that the proposed development contains elements that are utopian rather than grounded in achievable planning. Moving forward without addressing these realities risks environmental degradation, fiscal burden, and failure to meet community needs.<br>Ethical and Leadership Concerns<br>Beyond technical feasibility, I am deeply troubled by the ethical dimension of this project:<br>• Accelerating development in sensitive ecological areas without thorough public consultation, independent review, or adequate safeguards compromises public trust.<br>• Decisions that prioritize short-term economic gains over ecological protection, clean water, and air quality undermine leadership integrity and the well-being of future generations.<br>• Normalizing the idea of high-risk ecological disruption as an unavoidable consequence of urgent housing demand subtly conditions communities to accept the loss of irreplaceable natural areas. This narrative is harmful and inaccurate, because viable alternatives exist within serviced urban boundaries that do not require sacrificing ecosystems.<br>• This approach sends a troubling message: that economic expediency can override scientific evidence, community voice, and ethical responsibility.<br>Requests for Action<br>Given these serious technical and ethical concerns, I respectfully request:<br>• Immediate pause on approvals for the Highway 102 West Corridor SPA until independent, peer-reviewed studies verify feasibility and environmental impact.<br>• Transparent public release of all reports, studies, and consultations.<br>• Reevaluation of SPA designation, taking into account ecological sensitivity, infrastructure constraints, and risk to community safety.<br>•Binding requirements for environmental protection, stormwater management, transportation, and utility servicing that are realistically achievable.<br>•Ethical oversight to ensure leadership decisions prioritize long-term community welfare over short-term economic or political gains.<br>MLA Suzy Hansen, is copied on this correspondence, as provincial oversight is vital in decisions involving Special Planning Areas.<br>Protecting these lands is not a matter of resisting development. It is a matter of upholding ethical planning, protecting non-renewable ecosystems, and ensuring the well-being of citizens and future generations. |
| 64 | Dear officials, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I am very skeptical of the wisdom of going ahead with these Special Planning Areas..<br>I request that:<br>1. The province remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>2. Complete additional environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks.<br>3. Include environmental research from local community experts in the reports and planning process.<br>4. Release publicly available What We Heard reports about the public feedback on the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas<br>5. Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service Boundary and do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors. |
| 65 | I am writing about the Special Planning Area which is set to include the Highway 102 Corridor on the edge of the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove area - proposed to be a national urban park. Please do whatever you can to protect this environmentally sensitive area. Remove this area from the housing fast track list!<br>Of course there is a housing crisis in NS and in the HRM, but the housing development that is planned for the Highway 102 Corridor on the edge of the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove area would take far too long to build and would be too expensive and would not meet the housing crisis needs for affordable housing now. It would also prevent this area from being able to be fully preserved and declared a national urban park. People in the HRM need accessible places in nature such as this for mental health and also physical health opportunities. This area is ecologically important with rare species and mature/old-growth forests. Once they are lost, they cannot be replaced or recovered. There are better, more appropriate places to build homes and urban communities. Please call for full environmental and traffic assessments before any final approvals are made about allowing housing developments in that area.<br>[redacted] |
| 66 | To all concerned,<br>As a mother in NS, I am anxious about what their my kids' future lives will be. The constant emphasis on other priorities when we're living through droughts (this year), and fires and floods (2023) is so short-sighted—it is essential that we wake up and look at the longerterm effects of the decisions we are making today. If you have children, I hope you also want to pass on a sustainable world to them. The ONLY way to do that is to stop mindlessly fast-tracking development—especially in essential wildlife corridors!<br>Please remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Planning Areas list!<br>Be on the right side of history.<br>[redacted] |
| 67 | Good day Mr. Grant,<br>I live in Wedgewood currently but have lived in the same area for over 20 years. I attended the public information session and wanted to provide some feedback. I use the current Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area for walking my two dogs and hiking pretty much every day. From a practical point of view if the current issues on the 102 are not fixed, all this development will be is a parking lot. The current crisis of the 102 is significant. I travel that highway every day and typically multiple times daily for work, pleasure, trips to the airport and more. Last Thursday I dropped my daughter to the airport and we left a 6pm and it took us an hour and 15 minutes which is a 20-minute door to door drive with what was, normal, traffic. That isn't a one off, there are issues with the funnels filling up and jams every single day including weekends. My suggestion is that nothing should be considered until this is fixed.<br>The other thing that needs to be fixed prior to adding such a mass development is public transit. The bike lanes are another conversation, but we have to be able to move people in and out of town efficiently and that's not on a bike. All major successful cities have a great public transit system. You'll solve a major part of the traffic issues with good, fast reliable public transit.<br>As far as the proposed development goes its ugly and way too dense. I know we need housing but spreading out 4 story buildings across the whole plan and having less than 10% single family residences is not very wise. I believe you should drastically increase all your setbacks from water courses, wildlife corridors, highways etc. If the project is moving ahead, and it seems no matter what the residents really want it will, at least make it reasonable. Going higher with fewer buildings would be worth considering. You'd need ten 4 story apartment buildings spread way out over the land that one 40 story could hold. That's just as an example. But don't increase the height just to allow more buildings.<br>You should also note most of the people at the public hearing felt no matter what their input this is a done deal and that is very unfortunate. I tried to convince a lot of other folks to go and express their views and although they had opinions, they said it didn't matter, the city was doing it regardless of that the public's input was.<br>The last point I will make is the costs of developing this property will be extremely high. The amount of granite in the area and different elevations will make this ridiculously expensive. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | You can say the developer will bear those costs but that isn't entirely true. We the taxpayers are going to end up bearing a lot of those costs as well.<br>You have a difficult job here and an opportunity to make this area something special. One of the questions on the survey was how I envisioned this in 20 years but I would rather think about the next 100. The way the planet is going we need all the beautiful, protected and natural places we can get.<br>Good luck and thank you for the opportunity. [redacted] |
| 68 | would like to make the following requests:<br>the province remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list. That additional environmental and traffic surveys be completed, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks.<br>That environmental research from local community experts be included in the reports and planning process.<br>Release publicly available What We Heard reports about the public feedback on the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas<br>Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service Boundary and do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 69 | Dear Lead Planners,<br>I am writing as a community member who cares deeply about the future of Sandy Lake and the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes. These areas are not only ecologically sensitive: they support key wildlife corridors, wetlands, and lake systems, but they are also places that enrich the daily lives of residents like me. I regularly walk, swim, birdwatch, and fish in these areas, and I know first hand how vital they are for people's wellbeing, recreation, and connection to nature.<br>Because of their ecological significance and their value to the community, I urge HRM to remove Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor (BNBCL) from the Special Planning Areas list and pause any advancement of development plans. At the very least, I ask that before any decisions proceed, HRM: updates environmental, biodiversity impact, traffic, and floodplain assessments; incorporates research from local environmental experts into these assessments; and releases the What We Heard reports about public feedback to this planning to ensure transparent public engagement. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | There are many suitable development opportunities within the existing urban service boundary that do not compromise wildlife corridors or sensitive ecosystems. Prioritising those areas would allow HRM to meet housing needs while protecting the nature that makes Halifax such a livable and resilient municipality. Once these natural areas are gone, they are gone forever.<br>Thank you for considering this request and for your commitment to thoughtful, evidence based planning. [redacted] |
| 70 | Good day Mr. Grant,<br>I live in Wedgewood currently but have lived in the same area for over 20 years. I attended the public information session and wanted to provide some feedback. I use the current Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area for walking my two dogs and hiking pretty much every day. From a practical point of view if the current issues on the 102 are not fixed, all this development will be is a parking lot. The current crisis of the 102 is significant. I travel that highway every day and typically multiple times daily for work, pleasure, trips to the airport and more. Last Thursday I dropped my daughter to the airport and we left a 6pm and it took us an hour and 15 minutes which is a 20-minute door to door drive with what was, normal, traffic  That isn't a one off, there are issues with the funnels filling up and jams every single day including weekends. My suggestion is that nothing should be considered until this is fixed. The other thing that needs to be fixed prior to adding such a mass development is public transit. The bike lanes are another conversation, but we have to be able to move people in and out of town efficiently and that's not on a bike. All major successful cities have a great public transit system. You'll solve a major part of the traffic issues with good, fast reliable public transit.<br>As far as the proposed development goes its ugly and way too dense. I know we need housing but spreading out 4 story buildings across the whole plan and having less than 10% single family residences is not very wise. I believe you should drastically increase all your setbacks from water courses, wildlife corridors, highways etc. If the project is moving ahead, and it<br>seems no matter what the residents really want it will, at least make it reasonable. Going higher with fewer buildings would be worth considering. You'd need ten 4 story apartment buildings spread way out over the land that one 40 story could hold. That's just as an example. But don't increase the height just to allow more buildings. You should also note most of the people at the public hearing felt no matter what their input<br>this is a done deal and that is very unfortunate. I tried to convince a lot of other folks to go and express their views and although they had opinions, they said it didn't matter, the city was doing it regardless of that the public's input was. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The last point I will make is the costs of developing this property will be extremely high. The amount of granite in the area and different elevations will make this ridiculously expensive. You can say the developer will bear those costs but that isn't entirely true. We the taxpayers are going to end up bearing a lot of those costs as well. You have a difficult job here and an opportunity to make this area something special. One of<br>the questions on the survey was how I envisioned this in 20 years but I would rather think about the next 100. The way the planet is going we need all the beautiful, protected and natural places we can get. Good luck and thank you for the opportunity.<br>[redacted] |
| 71 | Dear Councilor Morse,<br>I attended the public information session last Wednesday evening and was quite disappointed that the implied feeling on the information placards and in the HRM online survey is that this 'proposed' subdivision is a done deal. It was obvious listening to residents in attendance and the notes left on the map on the table in the middle of the room that they are strongly not in favour of the proposed development. Not only will it have a direct effect on three lakes, it will have a residual effect on Kearney Lake. Kearney Lake has stayed reasonably healthy because of limited development around the lake, however there has been evidence of changes in the past few years due to the apartment construction above the north end of the lake and most likely the quarry as well. I'm a member at Maskwa and we've noticed increased residue growth on the buoys and buoy lines since the construction started. A new subdivision to the west of Kearney Lake will have detrimental effects on the lake. I already have concerns about the development of the old LaFarge quarry on Kearney Lake Road and other proposed developments along the lake and how they will impact the area/lake.<br>Another major concern are the roads and volume of traffic. One accident on the 102 and everything comes to a standstill. The roads in the area (including the 102) cannot support a new development along the 102. Kearney Lake Road is also close to capacity on a good day with no accidents. Cars are lined up on the off ramps from the 102 onto Kearney Lake Road.<br>If the 102 corridor development is a 'done deal', then the roads need more capacity before any consideration to building a new subdivision is made.<br>I hope the staff working on the review of the proposed development listen to the residents and put an end to this proposed development.<br>Regards, [redacted] |
| 72 | Dear Mr. Grant, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I have completed the survey for this project, however, since I do not want this area to be developed, I don't think my survey was processed.<br>Could you please record my wishes and contact me so that I know my wishes were recorded.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 73 | Dear Mr. Ross,<br>Thank you for the planning session organized last week on the SPA for Highway 102.<br>It appears from the information provided and the online survey, the decision has already been made as to what direction to move in.<br>i am strongly opposed to this decision. As the Stantec report on this area states, much of this area is not suited for development. So, why not follow their advice, that we paid for, and do just that? As, this area is outside the Urban Service Area, it would be cheaper to develop sites within the service area and save us money as well.<br>We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to preserve these lands for the next seven generations. As BMBCL is a candidate to become a National Urban Park, and the largest one in Canada if it comes to fruition, why not work with the Federal Government to move that ahead?<br>This is not vacant land waiting for development. This is a wilderness area that once gone cannot be revived.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 74 | Dear Minister LeBlanc and members of the HRM Planning Committee for the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning area;<br>I am writing to you to express my tremendous disappointment at how this project is being handled. I attended the public information session on Nov 19th where it became clear that this project is not simply in the concept phase, but is being rammed through, no matter what the people want.<br>I completed the online survey, which was one of the most blatantly biased surveys I have ever seen. It is clear this government is not looking for public input, but is again appeasing rich developers who will forever destroy this majestic property. This land is indeed 'special', so much so that it is to be included as part of the largest urban wilderness park in Nova Scotia, imagine how wonderful that would be, what a tourist attraction, what an amazing resource for our residents, and what an incredible legacy to leave to future generations. Instead, these developers will blow up every stunning rock face, and cut down every beautiful tree.<br>I have hiked these lands for over 30 years. This is extremely rugged terrain with mountain |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ridge after mountain ridge. These trails are very well used, although not one HRM staff member I spoke to on the 19th had actually been on this beautiful property. Surely those working to destroy this property should first have to walk it with those that love it.<br>We don't need more strip malls or apartment buildings. It is clear to see our housing crisis has now ended as for sale and apartment for rent signs can once again be seen around town.<br>Once you pave paradise it can never be undone. Please use your power for good and say no to this terrible terrible terrible plan,<br>There are many other areas within HRM that are easier to develop and won't put additional burden on an already over saturated community.<br>Say NO to the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning area and protect this land as part of the National Urban Wilderness Park.<br>Kind regards, [redacted] |
| 75 | Hello Ross<br>We are writing to say we think the proposed development for the 102 Corridor is a grave mistake and will have a damaging impact for BMBCL. Having unspoiled natural lands so close to our ever expanding city is invaluable. This development risks compromising and damaging the wilderness and our future park.<br>We need to move forward with BMBCL, progress has been stalled long enough, instead of supporting further sprawl with more development.<br>Please note our concerns along with the many who are opposed to the 102 Corridor proposal.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 76 | Hi Grant,<br>I write to oppose the proposed 102 development on the birch cove lakes area. This area should be a national urban park due to the natural richness. Our city can find other areas to put these developments without destroying habitat for species risk and a recreational area our family enjoys. Please ensure your report reflects the fact that Halifax residents do not support this.<br>Many thanks, [redacted] |
| 77 | Bypassing HRM's ridiculous online “surveys” on the Sandy Lake and Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes special planning areas, I will just say this:<br>Development of these precious wilderness areas will destroy ecosystems that provide animal habitat, filter water and air, store carbon, and act as buffers for wildfires and floods, and they are spaces for healthy recreation. These are not insignificant considerations.<br>If essential-for-life biology doesn’t resonate with our purportedly cash-strapped municipal and provincial |

| | |
|---|---|
| | governments, perhaps the fact that if these developments go ahead, HRM citizens will be saddled with increased traffic and its related problems, not to mention the huge costs to both municipal and provincial taxpayers for services and infrastructure. Can it truly be justified, and are MLAs and councillors prepared to take the heat for it?<br>It would be a smarter investment and better for human life if we built smaller-scale communities in pockets all across the municipality, rather than raze vast tracts of pristine wilderness for very large, high-density housing developments of questionable architectural merit.<br>A cynic would say this could never happen as long as big developers are in charge.<br>[redacted] |
| 78 | Good afternoon,<br>Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the Open House. However, I wanted to provide my input.<br>Below are my responses to the survey. I couldn't complete it online because I could not answer question #4 based on the options available.<br>1. What is your main connection to the area? (Select all that apply) Required<br>I visit the publicly owned lands in the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Wilderness Area for hiking, swimming, canoeing or to enjoy the natural environment<br>I primarily value the natural environment of the area.<br>Vision and Guiding Principles<br>A vision statement and set of guiding principles will shape future development within the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area, and the municipality wants them to be developed with community input. The following questions invite you to help shape this future vision.<br>2. Vision: Imagine you are 20 years in the future and are describing the new neighbourhood in this area to a friend. What key features stand out? What housing is available? How do you travel throughout the community and to and from other places? What parks and public spaces would you tell your friend about? What environmental considerations have been made? Please tell us what you would tell your friend. Required<br>The area has remained intact as a natural park, focused on low impact recreation and education. The only development is a trail system, washrooms, nature centre, and limited parking. The area is accessible by bus.<br>You have 37 characters remaining<br>3. Guiding Principles will provide direction and clarity around what residents value for the new community. Please select the principles that most closely align with how you think the new community should be designed. Select your top three (3) statements. Required |

| | |
|---|---|
| | A well-connected all ages and abilities (AAA) cycling and walking network.<br>Better access to adjacent parks and wilderness areas.<br>Protecting and enhancing nature, habitats and wildlife.<br>6. Commercial Uses are an important part of any community, providing services and amenities. Please select the commercial uses that you most want to see in the new community. Select your top three (3) features. Required<br>School<br>Nature Centre<br>7. Park Features and activities will determine park programming. Please select the features or activities that you most want to see in the new community. Select your top three (3) features. Required<br>Trails for hiking in nature<br>Multi-use trails for walking, rolling and biking<br>Canoeing / Kayaking / Paddleboarding<br>Demographic Questions<br>8. What are the first three (3) digits of your postal code? Required<br>B3K |
| 79 | Hi Grant,<br>In this instance, it won't allow me to select the 'I am not a robot' prompt. It immediately scrolls back to the required written paragraph as if I had not completed that section.<br>Also note, it would not accept the written portion at any less than the 250 characters. As a workaround, I entered periods to fill out the form, but seems it still won't accept this.<br>[redacted] |
| 80 | Dear Tim Outhit,<br>I hope you are well. I am writing to share several concerns regarding the proposed development in the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. I have attached a short PDF that outlines these concerns in more detail, including direct excerpts from Stantec’s reports.<br>Key Points (details in attached PDF):<br>Significant risk to the Kearney Run Watershed and its interconnected lakes, wetlands, and streams.<br>Water quality impacts—from increased runoff, sedimentation, phosphorus loading, and nutrient pollution—are not well understood.<br>Stantec identifies risks but did not conduct watershed or water-quality modelling; therefore, the real impacts of development are unknown. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Mitigation measures recommended by Stantec are extensive, yet the Province has already rejected HRM's proposal to increase watercourse buffers from 20 m to 30 m—casting doubt on whether needed protections will be adopted.<br>Development sits outside the Urban Service Boundary, requiring costly extensions of sewer, road, and transit infrastructure.<br>Substantial opportunities exist within HRM for infill, brownfield redevelopment, and higher-density residential housing where services already exist.<br>The area is closely connected to the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes landscape and includes highly valued, accessible wilderness features such as the Charlies Lake Lookoff—places that could be permanently altered or lost.<br>This land has long been part of the intended boundary for the future Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park and is under consideration for a potential National Urban Park.<br>Given these concerns, I respectfully ask you to support a pause on development approvals for the Highway 102 Special Planning Area until comprehensive watershed studies are completed and serviced alternatives within the Urban Service Boundary are fully considered.<br>Thank you very much for your time and attention. Please see the attached PDF for full details and supporting excerpts.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 81 | Hello,<br>After taking the time to thoughtfully complete your survey for the Hwy 102 Special Planning Area, it seems a technical glitch will not allow me to submit.<br>This seems to be a recurring issue when I try to provide public input on HRM development applications.<br>Curious you have had other complaints.<br>Thanks kindly, [redacted] |
| 82 | Ross,<br>I have reviewed the 2 surveys...Sandy Lake & 102 West Corridor....different style of response requested, in particular re Housing styles.<br>Is there a reason for this? Perhaps you did not collaborate with the planner to share style of responses.<br>It would be strategic to have similar surveys, using the Sandy Lake model for comparatives down the road...I know 'what we heard' will be important.<br>Just wondering. Any response appreciated. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | If I am not interested in what style of housing would be preferred ( NO development), I am unable to respond to the 102 Survey.<br>[redacted] |
| 83 | Subject: [External Email] This Survey did not allow me to complete the Questionaire. Can I speak to you by phone instead?<br>[redacted] |
| 84 | Hello Ross Grant,<br>I just had a look at your survey for the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area. As a researcher with over 30 years experience designing, analyzing and vetting/approving surveys, I have a concern about question the way Q5 is worded.<br>This is the current wording:<br>“ 5. The transportation network consists of sidewalks, streets, trails, bike lanes, bus lanes and more. From your personal perspective, rank the forms of transportation infrastructure below from least important to most important.”<br>With this wording and the response format, it is not clear whether the number one rank would be least important or most important The way it is worded, it seems that #1 should be the least important, which is counter intuitive.<br>I anticipate that different people will interpret the manner of ranking and you will get people ranking in two different ways (i.e. with #1 indicating most important for some and least important for others), which will make your results impossible to accurately analyze and therefore unusable.<br>This could be readily addressed by clarifying the wording, such as by indicating that #1 is least important (or most important, whichever is the case). I hope it’s not too late to fix this problem with that question.<br>Feel free to call if you wish<br>[redacted] |
| 85 | Ross,<br>Will you have paper copies of the survey on hand for those who do not have access to a computer or prefer to complete the survey at the Open House?<br>Is there a deadline date for Survey submissions?..cannot locate it.<br>Also, I am searching for the proposed panels/boards on hand at the Open House available for those who will not be able to attend on the 19th. I note that Sandy lake SPA has posted the boards on hand.<br>[redacted] |

| | |
|---|---|
| 86 | Hello Ross, I did all the questions on the survey but Q 5 would not record my responses and so I couldn't submit the survey. Very frustrating. Any suggestions?<br>[redacted] |
| 87 | Good day Ross,<br>I did a brief review of the stantec plans for the transportation study.<br>I have a few comments which I hope you can help answer.<br>1. Great design plan for Kearney lake with the two roundabouts that is needed sooner than later as a lot of that traffic is getting increased due to the increase in population in Bedford<br>2. Is there a plan for an overpass between the Kearney lake exit and the Bayer's Lake Exit, to provide another access point to Bayer's lake. Anyone who is a resident of Spryfield, Clayton Park, Bedford, etc. understands how the Bayer's Lake area needs improvements. In my opinion it was poorly designed from the start as there's for the most part one main entrance. The other two entrances are huge bottlenecks as well. With all meeting at the intersections near Moxies and the tower hotel.<br>3. The roundabout leading off into the Bayer's lake exit is warranted but additional lanes or a access point is required as the area is not built to a growing population and should match a similar design point., let's say as Dartmouth crossing which planned for the future.<br>4. The planned neighborhood needs to have multiple access points as from the preliminary designs you can see that there's one way in and one way out and as this is near wooded areas is poor planning by designers as they're following the same blueprint as Tantallon. HRM needs to put more effort in establishing access points and emergency entrances and exits. It's almost common knowledge at this point to plan for that.<br>5. I'm really hoping that all the upgraded improvements to the 102 are implemented before this is executed. As the highway is already insane during rush hour periods and we need to look for advancements in design of our highways and also our public transit. Sadly, the highways have seen little to no advancement upon their inception in the '60s. Thanks for taking the time to read my comments but the overall message is to plan for the future in all infrastructure aspects. Plan for 20 years in the future not 5 which is a serious issue we have been seeing for Halifax and that's why we are having such big issues in our infrastructure in a smaller sized city. 102 improvements, increased public transit options and innovative ways to improve the bottlenecks throughout HRM will put us in a great position for the future.<br>Cheers, [redacted] |
| 88 | We are writing to express our strong opposition to the designation of Sandy Lake and the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes as Special Planning Areas. We live in North end Halifax. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | For more than ten years, these spaces—especially the Blue Mountain–Birch Cove Lakes area—have been essential to my family's connection with nature and access to free, outdoor recreation. Being there feels like stepping out of the city; it allows us to pause our routines and experience a sense of healing. Because we cannot afford to travel, this is the place where we spend much of our summer, enjoying nature close to home. It is one of the main reasons we feel connected to this city and continue to see it as a livable and meaningful place—because it still offers opportunities to experience the natural world without cost or long journeys. In recent years, our daughter has also grown attached to this land.<br>We were deeply saddened by the wildfire that affected the area this past summer. Now, learning that the province is moving quickly with plans for development—despite the ongoing efforts to establish a national park—feels equally disheartening. Developers do not share the same relationship with this land that our community does.<br>We hope future generations will have the same opportunities to connect with and enjoy nature as we do. We urge the province to make decisions that reflect the realities of our time, particularly in the context of climate change that is causing drought in this province. We ask for preservation, not short-sighted development. We ask the province to remove both sites from the provincial Special Planning Area list. Nobody, except developers, asked for that. They can find other places to develop, we surely cannot afford travelling to find other healing spaces like these.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 89 | There are ways to make this a good idea, putting housing along the highway rather than to devastate the beauty we share and hike and walk in with out families and friends and dogs ...<br>You can put infrastructure there without blasting out the wilderness. We can all get what we need. You can enjoy the trails off your back yards ...<br>[redacted] |
| 90 | I share the concerns [redacted] expresses below regarding development in the Blue Mountain Wilderness Area.<br>Kindly inform me regarding how these concerns are to be addressed.<br>Many thanks,<br>[redacted]<br><br>"I'm writing about the plans to develop the lands off Highway 102 in the Blue Mountain Wilderness.<br>I am also copying my Councillor so she is aware of my concerns. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | As you know, this is an environmentally rich and stunning area that is a favourite spot for me and my child and our friends to get out into the woods, for hiking, nature observation, berry picking, playing, running, swimming, walking dogs and so much more.<br>It is also an incredibly accessible area: one does not have to drive far to get here, and can even take transit.<br>This is a unique and very special treasure for our community.<br>I am *strongly* against any development in this area, but I understand the province has compelled the municipality to open it for development - but I am asking HRM to do everything in its power to minimize the impact of this development on the incredible wilderness area that we love.<br>I also read the Stantec report that analyzes the area's "suitability for development" using a whole bunch of different metrics:<br>I note that according to their analysis, a great deal of the land is "not suitable for development" and a whole bunch more is "not well suited".<br>I wanted to ensure that the municipality will take these ratings very seriously.<br>What would be the point of paying all this money for the report, if you do not follow its recommendations?<br>I want to make sure that HRM will not allow development on any land that was ranked as "not suitable" or "not well suited" for development.<br>This will help ensure the most sensitive areas are kept wild, and that access to lake shores and rich forests will continue to be maintained for the greater public good.<br>I encourage you to also consider the following when opening the lands for development:<br>- Concentrate the development near the highway - this area is already compromised for nature because of the pollution and noise from the highway - if any land must be developed, this would be the best choice.<br>- Research and enact special bylaws to help reduce human impacts on sensitive natural areas -- this is something that you could work in partnership with universities and local environmental protection organizations on, but here are some examples:<br>- Require that domestic cats (who have a brutal impact on local bird and reptile populations) are kept indoors or leashed on private property at all times - no cats should be allowed to run free in this area.<br>- Require that windows over a certain size are treated with a recognized bird-strike deterring treatment.<br>- Establish a list of "high risk invasive plants" for this area, and forbid any of these plants from being grown in people's gardens. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - I am sure that experts could come up with other similar ideas to help protect the wilderness from human encroachment.<br>- Ensure that development is as dense as possible and the rest of the lands are designated as protected in perpetuity.<br>If we need to put in a certain number of housing units, then prioritize compact and affordable development that minimizes sprawl and environmental destruction.<br>- Within the developed area, use bold and creative techniques to keep the community as "naturalized" as possible during and after the development process. The typical way of doing suburban development is to bulldoze the whole area, then come back to plant nonnative lawn grass and street trees.<br>But we see that in downtown Halifax, developers are able to work carefully in tight areas, to preserve mature trees.<br>Similarly in this development, there should be "protected pockets" fenced off on every block, to preserve native ground cover, establish seed banks, and create micro habitats for the creatures that call this area home. Thus, when the development is complete, we will hopefully continue to have some viable habitat for birds, insects, amphibians and small mammals -- rather than a sanitized development covered in Kentucky bluegrass.<br>I have other thoughts in this vein about what could be done to minimize human impact – but I hope you will talk in detail to professionals in habitat preservation and the very dedicated and knowledgeable organizations who are working to steward these areas-- including the Friends of Blue Mountain and the Ecology Action Centre, and follow all their recommendations.<br>Finally, I also wonder:<br>is there any chance to negotiate with Parks Canada to purchase the land in question, so that development could be taken off the table entirely?? Please try as hard as you can to explore this option!! Please think about the future of our city and its own ecological health- and the well-being of all the people who will want nearby nature access in the future, and do what you can to preserve this wilderness for the greater good.<br>Thank you, [redacted]” |
| 91 | Dear Mr. Ross-<br>I'm writing about the plans to develop the lands off Highway 102 in the Blue Mountain Wilderness.<br>I am also copying my Councillor so she is aware of my concerns.<br>As you know, this is an environmentally rich and stunning area that is a favourite spot for me and my child and our friends to get out into the woods, for hiking, nature observation, berry picking, playing, running, swimming, walking dogs and so much more.<br>It is also an incredibly accessible area: one does not have to drive far to get here, and can even |

| | |
|---|---|
| | take transit.<br>This is a unique and very special treasure for our community.<br>I am *strongly* against any development in this area, but I understand the province has compelled the municipality to open it for development - but I am asking HRM to do everything in its power to minimize the impact of this development on the incredible wilderness area that we love.<br>I also read the Stantec report that analyzes the area's "suitability for development" using a whole bunch of different metrics:<br>I note that according to their analysis, a great deal of the land is "not suitable for development" and a whole bunch more is "not well suited".<br>I wanted to ensure that the municipality will take these ratings very seriously.<br>What would be the point of paying all this money for the report, if you do not follow its recommendations?<br>I want to make sure that HRM will not allow development on any land that was ranked as "not suitable" or "not well suited" for development.<br>This will help ensure the most sensitive areas are kept wild, and that access to lake shores and rich forests will continue to be maintained for the greater public good.<br>I encourage you to also consider the following when opening the lands for development:<br>- Concentrate the development near the highway - this area is already compromised for nature because of the pollution and noise from the highway - if any land must be developed, this would be the best choice.<br>- Research and enact special bylaws to help reduce human impacts on sensitive natural areas -- this is something that you could work in partnership with universities and local environmental protection organizations on, but here are some examples:<br>- Require that domestic cats (who have a brutal impact on local bird and reptile populations) are kept indoors or leashed on private property at all times - no cats should be allowed to run free in this area.<br>- Require that windows over a certain size are treated with a recognized bird-strike deterring treatment.<br>- Establish a list of "high risk invasive plants" for this area, and forbid any of these plants from being grown in people's gardens.<br>- I am sure that experts could come up with other similar ideas to help protect the wilderness from human encroachment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - Ensure that development is as dense as possible and the rest of the lands are designated as protected in perpetuity.<br>If we need to put in a certain number of housing units, then prioritize compact and affordable development that minimizes sprawl and environmental destruction.<br>- Within the developed area, use bold and creative techniques to keep the community as "naturalized" as possible during and after the development process. The typical way of doing suburban development is to bulldoze the whole area, then come back to plant non-native lawn grass and street trees.<br>But we see that in downtown Halifax, developers are able to work carefully in tight areas, to preserve mature trees.<br>Similarly in this development, there should be "protected pockets" fenced off on every block, to preserve native ground cover, establish seed banks, and create micro habitats for the creatures that call this area home. Thus, when the development is complete, we will hopefully continue to have some viable habitat for birds, insects, amphibians and small mammals -- rather than a sanitized development covered in Kentucky bluegrass.<br>I have other thoughts in this vein about what could be done to minimize human impact - but I hope you will talk in detail to professionals in habitat preservation and the very dedicated and knowledgeable organizations who are working to steward these areas-- including the Friends of Blue Mountain and the Ecology Action Centre, and follow all their recommendations.<br>Finally, I also wonder:<br>is there any chance to negotiate with Parks Canada to purchase the land in question, so that development could be taken off the table entirely?? Please try as hard as you can to explore this option!! Please think about the future of our city and its own ecological health- and the well-being of all the people who will want nearby nature access in the future, and do what you can to preserve this wilderness for the greater good.<br>Thank you, [redacted] |
| 92 | I received our notice for the Highway 102 West Corridor Future Serviced Community public open house today. I would like to confirm my assumption that this process does not include the properties off Saskatoon Dr., particularly those landlocked lots which are part of the original Hamshaw sub- division?<br>[redacted] |
| 93 | I got your email off the HRM page dealing with the Special Planning Area for the 102 West corridor. This development needs to be reworked in my view and I wanted to hear your thoughts if you'd be willing to share. I'm a local map maker for CKNS, you'll notice this account says CKNS Mapping Committee but i'm not reaching out today as a representative of CKNS (Canoe/Kayak Nova Scotia), I'm reaching out as a |

| | |
|---|---|
| | private citizen with a wild idea and some interesting info. I've been shopping it around for a while to basically anyone I felt might be interested and in the wake of the SPA announcements I felt the need to broaden the effort, hence this email today.I don't expect you can do much here, but as a city planner I felt it might interest you to know that I think there is a very workable alternative to the SPA that preserves a continuous landmass for the future National Urban Park, protects Susie and Quarry Lake from the destructive forces of development, while at the same time creating a win/win for developers and the community at large. We all know the SPA is basically "phase one" of development in the area.<br>This map is just a bunch of napkin math but it outlines a grand bargain and new vision for the BMBCL, where lands that are not as relevant to the future national urban park are traded for the lands around Susie/Quarry Lake known as the Annapolis/Stevens lands. Trade the red for the blue on the map. It's basically a 1 to 1 trade in terms of acreage. The traded lands are mostly municipally owned with small parcels of crown land and provincially protected land. The new vision involves a conceptual National Urban Park post grand bargain. (see maps below) Clicking around the map will give you all the info you need to work out the basic idea. I spoke with Mayor Filmore about it a couple months back, he asked me to send him this same ma after I showed it to him on my phone. He acknowledged receiving it.<br>Here's the Google Earth Map link.<br>https://earth.google.com/earth/d/12DJRwIt96FrL9_sPJp7_6bFMBwCxQ4if?usp=sharing<br>Anyway it's a hail mary but any development on the west side of Washmill lake would be heartbreaking so here I am. Lets build around the area not in it.<br>Ask any questions you may have.<br>Cheers, [redacted] |
| 94 | Just curious, do you have a time & place for the Open House on Nov 19?<br>And will it be a panel of resource people answering questions?<br>I hope that it will show some of the current assets, maps and other useful info.<br>[redacted] |
| 95 | Dear sir:<br>I've been reading about the Highway 102 West Corridor Lands Special Planning Area (SPA). Apparently this particular designation appears to allow the province to circumvent Council approval to speed up the process in order to complete a large housing development. I was shocked to learn the following:<br>This is a mammoth project with up to 11,500 units planned. This development would border the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes which is an identified conceptual regional park and the site of a proposed National Urban Park. Environmental advocates, such as the Friends of Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes and the Ecology Action Centre, argue that the development poses several threats: |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Irreversible damage to the near-urban wilderness.<br>• Loss of wildlife corridors.<br>• Increased flood risks for nearby communities due to impact on<br>• natural water filtration systems and wetlands.<br>• Potential for threatening the water table and lakes due to blasting<br>• through granite.<br>The proposal is controversial because it bypasses the established municipal planning process and potentially conflicts with the long-standing community vision of protecting the area as a regional park. This kind of heavy handed approach to urban planning is shocking. We need to protect these lakes; they should<br>be left, pristine, for all to enjoy! I hope that before this project is green-lit, there will be other, meaningful opportunities for dialogue among stakeholders, citizens and environmental groups. Railroading plans through without clear and multifaceted consultation is not good resource management.<br>[redacted] |
| 96 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I'm writing about the proposed development of the blue mountain birch cove wilderness area. This development goes directly against decades of community work to protect this very special natural area. I can remember public consultations 10 years ago when there was talk of developing this land. The answer from the community was a resounding "No" and this has not changed.<br>We certainly need more housing in Halifax, but we need affordable housing with access to services and public transportation, not further car-dependent urban sprawl. The access to pristine wilderness is part of what makes Halifax a desirable place to live. I have led countless community wilderness trips to the blue mountain birch cove wilderness, in particular, the area you are planning to develop. I have witnessed many students and newcomers have their first experiences in nature (camping, swimming, winter hiking) at<br>Suzie's lake. The immense value of this wilderness to the community is difficult to put into words, but the quantitative research completely backs up what we wholeheartedly know to be true; access to nature improves quality of life in every way.<br>I want my children to grow up knowing wilderness like I did, having formative adventures in nature. Suzie's lake in particular is a rare gem, and turning it into a suburb for the sake of corporate greed is not what our community wants or needs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I urge you to please listen to the needs of the people and build developments that make sense for us, not for the profits of developers.<br>We have something really special here in Halifax, please don't take our forests from us.<br>With hopeful regards, [redacted] |
| 97 | Hello Mr. Grant<br>I am writing today to let you know that the proposed development at Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes would make life in that area much worse. I live right off of the 102 by Lacewood.<br>Also I don’t want to see any more wildlife habitat destroyed in this area.<br>I oppose this development<br>I hope that you reconsider<br>[redacted] |
| 98 | I am a resident of Halifax and I do not agree with the proposal. I believe we need to continue with the proposed Blue Mountain Birch Cove lakes National Urban Park.Such a beautiful place, please do not destroy it.<br>Thank you.<br>[redacted] |
| 99 | I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed Highway 102 Special Planning Area project. As currently outlined, this development directly overlaps with the ideal boundaries identified for a future urban park—an irreplaceable opportunity to preserve ecologically significant land for future generations.<br>The impacts of this proposal will:<br>Increase risk to nearby residents, including development in flood-prone areas that have not undergone adequate study or mitigation planning. Eliminate crucial open space, permanently removing natural landscapes that cannot be restored once developed.<br>Cut off critical wildlife corridors, further fragmenting habitats already under pressure and threatening biodiversity. Generate significant traffic impacts that contribute to congestion and lengthen everyday commutes. Impose substantial costs on taxpayers, as large-scale infrastructure investments will be required to support new development. I feel our city has a responsibility to safeguard natural assets such as sensitive waterways, wetlands, and ecosystems. I urge HRM to pause this proposal, conduct comprehensive environmental and watershed assessments, and fully integrate the urban park vision into any plans for this area. Once this natural habitat is altered, we will not get it back.<br>Thank you for your time and consideration.<br>[redacted] |

| | |
|---|---|
| 100 | Dear Mayor,<br><br>As a citizen of HRM , I think that developing the Highway 102 Special Planning Area is not advisable. The land in question is on a sensitive and, so far, essentially unpolluted watershed on or adjacent to the planned Urban Park, supported and much publicized by governments as a precious future asset for the city, making it a leader in Canada. Development, particularly along the lines of the projects presented par the current candidates, would be the first step in the degradation of the site and the possible abandonment of this park. If approved, it would create a precedent welcomed by all landowners on or adjacent to the site of the park to apply for more developments of this type and/or sue the government for damages.<br><br>In addition to the reservations as for the suitability of the site in general and the recommendations of the consultants ( high density not advisable, 30m buffer along all waters, need for extensive infrastructure ...) I think there is not enough attention given to the possible consequences for the Kearney lake, Paper Mill flowage. So far Kearney lake is holding its own because of the limited development on it. Now it is already threatened by new developments runoffs through Black Duck brook at one end. The natural drainage for the special planning area is through Kearney lake. As the present climate tends to extreme weather with long dry and warm spells and torrential rains it is doubtful that even an oversized storm sewer system will be able to prevent runoffs into Kearney lake in heavy rain . And low flow in warm spells will favorise algae growth and intensify pollution.<br><br>This lead to a second set of reservations, monetary this time Given the situation and the nature of the grounds it appears that a lot of work would be necessary. The share of infrastructure works traditionally assigned to the city would be extremely expensive. Add to this the cost of additional services to a new area. Then money appears already to be tight in HRM. There is a 10% tax increase for next year and probably more to come. And, as the recent new developments are far to be adequately serviced, they should have priority and that costs money.<br><br>I think the best would be to wait until planning for the new park is more advanced. This would define precisely the protected area. Regarding potential adjacent developments, if any, it would also allow time to draw precisely the special, strict regulations necessary to protect the integrity of a fragile and precious area. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Meanwhile I know HRM does need more housing. However there is plenty of other land to build on . This could be done in or close to the existing new underserviced development areas, Then economy of scales could help provides necessary services to all at a lower cost<br><br>Thank you for your commitment<br>[redacted] |
| 101 | Mr Ross,<br>I am writing because I understand that rather than creating the housing we need in the city, the density we could easily manage, I hear that instead the city wants to build new neighbourhoods in the Blue Mountain - Birch Cove area. I am appalled.<br>I truly am at a loss. This area must be set aside as a wilderness area for the people of Nova Scotia, honouring the work of community members who have worked for many years to advance this area as a special nature park. The people — neighbours, environmentalists, nature lovers, moms, grandparents, hikers, dog walkers, students — have worked hard for this, and you undo that work just like that. Wow. Build where people already have services, in the city where there is existing robust public transportation, bike lanes and all the amenities needed by residents. We don't need urban sprawl. We need solutions that meet the needs of the constituents of this city. Not one that removes a pristine, natural site that's been earmarked for conservation. Please change your approach. Build vertical, not horizontal. Build affordable, not "market value". Build responsibly, for the future generations. We need housing, but not like this.<br>[redacted] |
| 102 | Lisa<br>I'd like to add my voice to the appeal for protecting the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area for<br>those who currently enjoy the benefits of a close wilderness area, but more especially for our children and grandchildren who can expect to be the unhappy recipients of financial debts and climate risks. We have the chance to give them something precious and probably irreplaceable; don't allow this chance to be thrown away.<br>Yours sincerely<br>[redacted] |
| 103 | Hello Mr. Grant<br>I am writing as Chair of the Friends of Blue Mountain - Birch Cove Lakes Society. We are an advocacy and education group, formed in 2018 to encourage the establishment of a Regional Park on the lands between the Birch Cove Lakes (behind Chain Lake Dr) and Cox Lake – now short-listed for designation as |

| | |
|---|---|
| | a National Urban Park. We have spent many years, before 2018 and since, and thousands of volunteer hours, advocating for the protection of these lands, educating both the public and politicians and civil servants, and leading hikes and stewardship activities throughout these lands. We are heavily invested in seeing the dream of a first class wilderness park come to reality. You will have received, by now, a great many submissions that delve deep into the value of these lands and their sensitive ecology and fragile geology, so I won't repeat those arguments here. I simply wish to summarize the critical issues before you as you investigate the development potential of these adjacent and overlapping lands. I say overlapping intentionally - the original park plan provided for the inclusion of the Birch Cove Lakes in their entirety, with a<br>healthy buffer zone to protect the waters and shorelines of these lakes. I have attached a copy of that plan here, which shows the Lakes being included in the Concept Park. Since that time additional lands extending to Cox Lake have been added to the Concept Park, also shown on<br>the plan attached to the Conceptual Plan report.<br>First - The Birch Cove Lakes are referred to as the Jewel of the future park. They are stunning waterways, surrounded by granite, making it extremely risky to attempt servicing and development in this area. Great care must be taken with your investigations in relation to this part of the SPA. Not nearly enough information is contained in the recent Stantec reports to adequately advise on the wisdom or ability to safely attempt to run servicing through this portion of the SPA. In fact, earlier reports done for HRM, notably the Porter Dillon study in the 1990's, provide much more in-depth information about this risk and conclude that the risk is in<br>fact too high and the lands should be left in a natural state. Curiously, the Porter Dillon study was conducted by some of the same engineers involved in the recent Stantec reports, but with vastly different focus and detail. The traffic studies alone are incredibly lacking in real information. For example, on any Thursday, Friday of Saturday, accessing Bayer Lake at the Highway 102 interchange, is an exercise in frustration and safety - but yet this is one of only two points where access is planned, or even possible, to reach this SPA.<br>Second - The planning for the National Urban Park needs to be done before any conclusions can be reached on what lands should be left for development. The opportunity presented by the National Urban Park is a legacy for all of HRM and Nova Scotia, for the rest of time. We have one opportunity to get this right and have a Park that can contribute not just recreation opportunity and natural habitats to enjoy, but scientific, health education and tourism benefits that we cannot yet imagine. Already there are events being conducted by Trail groups that attract participants for several countries and other provinces, as well |

| | |
|---|---|
| | as being a preferred location for Search and Rescue training activities - mainly due to the extensive variety of terrain found inside the proposed park area.<br>Third - Consideration must be given to the extremely high cost of this development to taxpayers. One thing the Stantec reports do cover is the inadequate capacity of the adjacent public services to handle the requirements of this development. It seems very irresponsible to consider development of such a challenging site, outside the serviced area, when there are a great many other sites, brownfield and otherwise, that can provide housing in a more timely and cost effective manner, without adding debt and additional traffic woes.<br>In conclusion, a great deal more information is required to understand the risks and challenges of attempting development on these lands and I hope that there is an extensive amount of additional research conducted - particularly around servicing in granite and protection of the watercourses and the very shallow ground water table on the greenfield portion of these lands.<br>In addition, great care must be taken to protect downstream watercourses - as the lands downstream are not on city services but reliant on well water - not to mention the potential impact on Maskwa Aquatic Club, who are continually turning out award winning paddlers.<br>Good luck in your efforts and we look forward to more conversations throughout this process.<br>Thank you<br>[redacted] |
| 104 | To Whom It May Concern,<br>I've written about this before, but as it continues to barrel ahead with little consideration for the constituents who live in this area, I am writing again. I deeply oppose the development of both Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 corridor. In fact, I know of no one in the area of Hammonds Plains and West Bedford who support this project - every neighbour and every person I've spoken to is against this.<br>There are numerous reasons neither of these should go ahead - a large one being that neither area can support this many new residents. The infrastructure in these areas is already well over capacity. Schools, rec centres, and roads are all congested and these projects will only worsen this.<br>Hammonds Plains Rd, and Highway 102 and Bedford Highway cannot sustain the thousands of new residents these are proposing - all these roads are already heavily congested. Neither of these developments are on regular public transit lines (something that is already abysmal in the municipality), so they will certainly increase congestion.<br>Many schools in the area are also already near capacity or over capacity, so it seems like no one in the government or planning department cares about the well being and education of the next generation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Outside of the already heavily burdened infrastructure in these areas, both Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 corridor are home to sensitive and important ecological sites and are habitat for countless native species, included endangered species like the Mainland Moose. Both developments will degrade the local waterways, as well as take away key ecosystem services, including providing clean air, and helping to prevent local flooding.<br>These areas are also important recreation sites for many people in the HRM and beyond. Places like these not only provide a space for people to get exercise, enjoy nature, but studies are also that access to wilderness places like Sandy Lake and the Blue Mountain area improve mental health significantly.<br>I could go on about the numerous more problems with these developments, but the fact is that they are short sighted and poorly planned, with no regard for the constituents who live in these areas. I hope you each take the time to listen to the actual people who live here.<br>Thank you, [redacted] |
| 105 | Dear Ross,<br>I am writing to you today in regards to the Blue Mountain - Birch Cove Reserve area.<br>Halifax has many other available spaces for development. Especially areas that do not involve decimating precious wetlands, forests, rivers, and habitat. We cannot fast track developments as this means these irreplaceable and sensitive areas will be harmed or likely, destroyed.<br>I understand this area is also being proposed for a National Park. A National Park serves all Canadians. Our Nova Scotia tourism brought in 3 billion dollars in the last 9 months alone. Imagine what having a Urban National Park would do to our local economy? The spin-off and direct effects mean that many benefit from the economic growth versus the few that benefit from private developers.<br>Haligonians and Nova Scotians alike love our green and wild province. Destroying a beautiful wildlife corridor and reserve, is not what the people want. It is obvious we need housing, but we need to be proactive about the spaces we cannot replace. The value of wetlands as carbon credits and the shower amount of carbon stored in those areas is immense.<br>Please consider a National Park. Please consider a future for our children. This world is sacrificing so much of our green spaces for concrete jungles. Cost of living is high enough, a park means we can generate revenue for all.<br>Thank you for your time<br>[redacted] |
| 106 | Hello Ross Grant, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | I am writing you today to inform you how deeply disappointed I am with the municipality for considering building a housing development in the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness Area.<br>The wilderness area provides high value habitat for wildlife in a sea of fragmented green spaces and ecologically poor surburban areas. There are many species at risk and species of concern found in and around the wilderness area so developing this remaining large natural space would be devastating to them. Once the area is gone, it's gone for good and there would be nothing we could do to bring back the ecologically important landscape.<br>Additionally the area and lands are historically and culturally significant to the Mi'kmaq. They have stewarded the land for generations and the municipality should respect this and not bulldoze over them (or the land).<br>Finally, I grew up around there and spent much time hiking and appreciating nature in the wilderness area. Many people are able to spend time outdoors there due to it being close and accessible. Taking that away from local communities would be an insurmountable loss.<br>The city should not be destroying some of the last remaining large non-fragmented wilderness area around Halifax. I urge you to stop this consideration before it causes significant harm.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 107 | Dear Mr. Grant.<br>I am a resident of Halifax, living in postal code B3H.<br>While it is still possible to do so, I wanted to provide my feedback to the Highway 102 Special Planning Area.<br>Please find in point form below my feedback:<br>Highway 102 W Corridor should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list to protect the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area as there is a proposed national urban park in this area;<br>The proposed national urban park should be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of said park;<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary;<br>Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors;<br>All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made; |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public; and<br>We should prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary.<br>Overall, I do not support urban sprawl into a vital wilderness area and ask that the planning take into account how important the natural space is to the HRM and to Nova Scotia more generally.<br>Kind regrards, [redacted] |
| 108 | Dear Ross Grant,<br>I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Highway 102 West Corridor development. I am a resident of the HRM, so this issue directly impacts my community and my everyday life. If this project goes ahead, the environmental impacts will be devastating to the HRM and the surrounding area.<br>The Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Wilderness Area is a highly valuable, biodiverse forest. These kinds of forests are rich in ecological value for plants, animals, trees alike. They are very, VERY rare in this province. It's also incredibly valuable that this beautiful area is accessible to the many residents of HRM that do not have access to their own greenspace. Many, many people in the HRM live in apartments and do not have backyards, myself included. This is incredibly draining on the mental health and overall wellness of many people who live in the HRM.<br>It's incredibly special to have this level of forest growth only a bus ride or short drive away. Its existence is deeply important to the literal air we breathe, the water we drink, the birds we watch overhead and the mental and physical health of HRM residents or frankly, anyone who visits the area. Blue Mountain-Birch Cove is the lungs of the HRM. I walked through this forest over the summer and it's magical - I recommend you do the same to understand what thousands of people across the province are fighting to save.<br>Developing near this wilderness area will jeopardize its longevity AND the proposed development will make the traffic on the 102 even worse, if that's even possible. The proposed units on unserviced land without bus routes will demand that residents drive everywhere, making traffic a nightmare if every proposed unit has an average of 1-3 cars. That's thousands more cars on the road, clogging up the commute. The cost of this project will also fall on the tax payer.<br>The people of HRM do not want this. We do not want to pay for this. We do not want to live |

| | |
|---|---|
| | in cities built like this.<br>To be clear, I'm not opposed to development because I understand we're a growing province and I want to accommodate that growth. We need to get creative but more importantly, we need to use what we already have instead of destroying more natural spaces. Urban sprawl is uncreative and frankly, bad planning. Just look at the Toronto suburbs and the associated traffic and congestion as a case study.<br>Nova Scotia is renowned for its natural beauty, not its urban sprawl.<br>Do not sell out the health and wellness of future generations. Do not sell out our environment or compromise our physical and mental health. Do not sell out the future of HRM.<br>Thank you for your time.<br>[redacted] |
| 109 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>I'm writing to express my concern with the plans for the housing development in the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area. I'm strongly opposed to this development. I urge you to recommend this site be removed from the SPA list.<br>This SPA is right next to the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area, which is an important wildlife corridor and cherished space for the people of Halifax to go hiking, camping, and canoeing. I love using this area for hiking at all times of year, the trails there are beautiful and it is a welcome escape from the bustle of the city. There's a reason locals have been advocating for the protection of this area for the past 50 years, and do not want part of this valued greenspace lost to development. The proposed development is within the aspirational boundaries for what could be one of Canada's first National Urban Parks, which is such an amazing opportunity. We should be prioritizing protecting this area and ensuring it continues to be a haven for wildlife and local people to enjoy nature.<br>We should not be putting a development so close to the wilderness area. First of all, you have to destroy forests to make way for the development, which will further disrupt ecological connectivity in a landscape already under pressure from urban sprawl. Then having so many people (almost the population of Truro) live right next to the remaining wilderness will put pressure on the water quality in surrounding lakes and waterways. Also, we know that healthy forests and wetlands provide many ecosystem services for humans - they store a lot of carbon, they help protect us from flooding and wildfires, and they filter our air and water, not to mention they provide amazing recreational and educational opportunities that benefit our physical and mental health. Continuing to destroy intact forests and wetlands when we are in a |

| | |
|---|---|
| | climate and biodiversity crisis is crazy, and should not happen.<br>There are so many better options for the designation and development of SPAs in places with lower ecological/environmental value (for example on land that has already been degraded or developed in the past), and within the urban service boundary, where it won't cost a fortune to build/maintain new infrastructure and roadways.<br>Before proceeding with this rushed development plan, additional environmental surveys, floodplain surveys, and traffic surveys should be completed, including environmental research from local community experts and groups. The potential impacts of this development on the adjacent wilderness area, water quality, and wildlife populations needs to be better understood before moving ahead with a development that will permanently alter the landscape.<br>I also hope you will release publicly available reports on all the community input and public feedback that was collected regarding the Highway 102 West Corridor SPA. Thank you for your time.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 110 | Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society<br>Nova Scotia Chapter<br>P.O. Box 51086 Rockingham Ridge<br>Halifax, NS<br>B3M 4R8<br>Re: Public engagement: Highway 102 Special Planning Area and the proposed Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes National Urban Park<br>December 10th, 2025<br>To:Ross Grant, Planner III, Halifax<br>The Nova Scotia Chapter of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS-NS) is a charity that works to protect the province's rich natural and cultural heritage, and is actively involved in research, community outreach, and government processes for the designation and management of protected areas. CPAWS-NS played a key role in the designation of Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area, which received legal protection in 2009, and has since undergone several expansions. Since then, we have<br>advocated for it to become a National Urban Park and continue to work with partners, stakeholders, and the community to advance this designation. We are providing the following letter for the public engagement phase of the Highway 102 Special Planning Area project.<br>CPAWS-NS rejects the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. It is an inappropriate overstep of the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | provincial government into municipal responsibilities. The Special Planning Area is in active opposition to community work and plans that have been ongoing for decades to protect this near urban wilderness and to advance its protection as a National Urban Park. The people of the community who have worked tirelessly to protect Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes are seeing their efforts sidelined with this proposal. It threatens the health of wildlife, lakes, and waterways, and preempts important work occurring in the area, such as Indigenous archeological and knowledge studies that are contributing to Park designation.<br>Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes is a culturally significant area for the Mi'kmaq Peoples since time immemorial. It hosts important lakes and waterways, wetlands, mixed wood forests, large mammals, and Species at Risk. The large size and mostly intact ecosystems within the wilderness area make it important for conservation, especially due to its proximity to the rapidly growing city of Halifax. It is also a place that offers opportunities for outdoor recreation, education, knowledge sharing, and conservation of biodiversity on a large scale. It has aptly been selected as a priority site for a National Urban Park in Nova Scotia and should be a place for Nova Scotians and visitors to enjoy forever. The lands of Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes need to be given priority for conservation, not development.<br>As a National Urban Park, the environmental, health, and economic benefits would become available to everyone within the city of Halifax and beyond. Parks Canada is prioritizing green space access to all Canadians, and with federal support, a national park experience will be created here in Halifax through park infrastructure and accessibility improvements. There are no other areas that offer large-scale natural spaces, an extensive lake system, and both front- and back-country experiences this close to the city and therefore the opportunity for a National Urban Park exists only here. Currently, Mi'kmaq partners, all levels of government, and stakeholders are working together on the plan for the National Urban Park.<br>Furthermore, Future Serviced Communities are not the answer to the very real housing crisis in Halifax. Housing developments should be prioritized in areas that are already serviced by schools, hospitals, stores, public transit, utilities, adequate road infrastructure, and community centers. The Highway 102 Special Planning area fails to address the immediate need for affordable housing and instead introduces a long-term project requiring additional infrastructure to support development, including large investments into roads and utilities that puts nature at risk while contributing to urban sprawl. Taking away from the potential of a National Urban Park is not a fair trade. It will instead introduce stress, inputs, and pollutants into the ecosystem, threaten habitat for Species at Risk, undermine buffer zones, disrupt watershed systems, and further deplete ecosystems.<br>The Highway 102 Special Planning Area must not go ahead, and Halifax should instead focus on smart planning in areas where housing can be serviced without massive investments to provide the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | necessary infrastructure. Development to address the housing crisis in Halifax should not come at a cost to our protected areas and the important ecosystem services they provide, particularly at a time when the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity threaten our way of life. Rejecting the Highway 102 Special Planning Area and prioritizing the establishment of Blue Mountain – Birch Cove Lakes National Urban Park provides Halifax with a unique opportunity to become a city that can affordably house its citizens in serviced communities, provide natural spaces that improve health and quality of life, and boost the economy through outdoor recreation and tourism.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 111 | Hello,<br>I am writing to provide feedback on the Highway 102 Special Planning Area.<br>This proposed development puts the adjacent urban wilderness and all the work that has been done to try to protect it at risk. The city, the province, many community groups, and many citizens have put large amounts of time and resources into protecting the forests that are now part of Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness area and those that are part of the proposed Regional Park and National Urban Park. In high school, I did a research project in this area on the presence of wildlife that call this area home. I have attached several pictures of animals I found using trail cameras.<br>Additionally, the proposed development would severely increase traffic on roads that already experience severe congestion and would require significant infrastructure upgrades. I feel that development would be better suited in areas already within the urban service boundary, where realistic public transit options exist, and where development would not interfere with wildlife corridors identified in research like the Halifax Green Network Plan. I feel that the Highway 102 Area should be removed from the Special Planning Areas List and more studies environmental and climate resilience studies should be done to assess the impact of development in the area.<br>As an engaged citizen, I am very interested to hear what others thought about this proposal and am excited to read the What We Hear Report from this public engagement.<br>Thank you very much for your time and work, [redacted] |
| 112 | Hello Ross Grant- lead planner for 102 West corridor SPA, MLA Krista Gallagher, Premier Houston, Mayor Fillmore, and Councilman Cleary,<br>First, I was very disappointed to see that the engagement survey pertaining to this potential development did not leave space for important consideration of the value of this region separate from its potential development. This does a disservice to Nova Scotians and will not |

| | |
|---|---|
| | result in survey results that could reflect the range of important views on this critical topic.<br>Second, any development in this critical wild area will not solve our housing crisis. It will instead add to traffic-generating sprawl and destroy critical wilderness that make our region special. Critically, this region is envisioned as part of our future National Urban Park, which I view as a key asset in our region's successful and sustainable future. We need to establish this National Urban Park and set governance practices for this Park and adjacent areas before such development should be considered. Instead, we need to invest, now, in smart and dense housing in already serviced areas.<br>Thank you for your consideration, [redacted] |
| 113 | Hello<br>I am writing, not as a resident of the area but as someone whose frequents the area. My children have been attending Maskwa Aquatic club for years and the beauty of that area has always been noticeable. They have enjoyed hikes through the woods and the pristine water conditions of the lake, unlike some of the Dartmouth lakes that have struggled with closures; likely due to their proximity to additional houses and run off. Over the last number of years I have noticed how busy the area has become, not only getting to the area, but also around the beach itself, and this is without development.<br>The area of Bayer's Lake was once an quick and easy location to shop and enjoy a meal; however, the traffic in and out of that area is horrible and any visits to that area are timed carefully or I have decided to go elsewhere and not spend my money in that area.<br>The traffic on the highways is horrible and adding more houses into an area already stretched to its limits, while demolishing an urban nature area, where significant infrastructure will need to be established, is irresponsible. I hope that you consider what adding such a development would do to a such a gem as the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove areas as well as with the proposed development on Kearney Lake itself.<br>Kind regards, [redacted] |
| 114 | Mr. Grant;<br>Having lived in Halifax, both in Bridgeview and on the peninsula, for the past fifty years, it is very disappointing to see the direction that Halifax is going in term of growth and transportation. I have not known anyone, including keen cyclists, that can make any sense of the recent changes to roads throughout the city.<br>I am particularly concerned with the development along the Bicentennial Drive next to the Birch Cove Lakes. I believe this would be big loss for the city that could never be recovered. I ask that you remove this site from the Special Planning Areas list for the following reasons:<br>The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on |

| | |
|---|---|
| | development near or on the boundaries of the park.<br>The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the preferred park boundary. All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding<br>communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made. Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>Release the "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas.<br>Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary to save cost on roads, water, sewer, busing, etc.<br>I hope you can do your homework on this area and come to a good decision for the people of Halifax.<br>[redacted] |
| 115 | On November 19, I attended an information session about plans for a major housing development abutting Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area. I strongly object to this plan to destroy a pristine piece of wilderness in HRM.<br>I was extremely happy to hear that the Federal Government planned to create a National Urban Park in Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes, yet it was later decided to do this only on the part that was already protected. The National Urban Park should encompass the boundaries set out by Friends of Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes.<br>I, like many others, enjoy the area for its peaceful beauty. My daughter and I love to hike along the gorgeous Charlie's Lake trail. With HRM growing so quickly, it is important that we protect our natural environment. We need to save more of our beautiful forests and lakes for the enjoyment of generations to come. As early as 1971, the Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes area was identified by a federal-provincial-municipal joint park planning exercise ( The Metropolitan Area Planning Committee). The Special Planning Area overlaps directly with the 2014 conceptual park area. Unfortunately, only part of Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes was protected. Now, the province has declared a Special Planning Area for development.<br>With developments on the table for both Blue Mountain/Birch Cove Lakes and Sandy Lake, we are going to be looking at a huge increase in traffic in the area. Then the next step will be using more of our pristine wilderness (that was supposed to be protected) to build more |

| | |
|---|---|
| | highways to handle the extra traffic.<br>The boundary is very close to Charlie's Lake. Despite what developers promise, there are always issues of siltation in the waters adjacent to construction areas. There will be noise pollution. Habitat for many species will be destroyed.<br>We have learned that conservation can't wait, especially with a growing population. The more people who live and work in HRM, the more important and in-demand wild spaces are. But these wild spaces are also facing increased development pressures. Once they are gone, we will never be able to bring them back.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 116 | Dear Ross,<br>I have tried 3x to answer the survey and every time at comment 4 it will not progress.<br>I do not feel such a high density development is appropriate here. The proposed urban wilderness park is a prime asset for our developing city. If development happens I hope the access is closer to Kearney Lake than the 102, to help traffic flow. I would suggest that some of the land closer to Kent and Susie Lake be given to the wilderness area. This would be a valuable asset for them.<br>Development a retraction.<br>Definitely a more modest development, either townhouses or low rise apartments, definitely not the very high apt. These should not be all over the city , only some areas. They create wind tunnels, a lot of traffic and whatever goes with increased numbers of people. Please keep some of this land as a more peaceful, natural environment for the mental a health benefits and its adjacency to the very special wilderness<br>Thank you.<br>Your sincerely, [redacted] |
| 117 | Hello, and Happy Holidays.<br>I write to you today as a concerned citizen reading and hearing about the special planning area. I find it disgusting that it is even being considered to be developed. Halifax should be trying to protect as much of that area as possible, a shining example of some of the best nature<br>in Nova Scotia. Some of my best memories of fishing, hiking, and canoeing have been in the proposed area. My family, friends, and their families all have used the area in question and<br>appreciate it as is. My first hike with my goddaughter was up and around that side of Charlies Lake. Here are a few more things of concern outside of direct impacts to me:<br>• Wildlife corridors cut off Historic canoe and portage routes removed/affected<br>• Permanent loss of green space<br>• Major traffic congestion & longer commutes (we know that the minimal transit plan wouldn't |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • be sufficient based off of the dismal traffic in the city already)<br>Please, we don't need a well used area like that so close in to the city being destroyed by developers looking to create more sprawl.<br>Thanks, [redacted] |
| 118 | Dear Ross,<br>I am pleading with you as a long term resident near Birch Mountain Cove, to please consider developing elsewhere. This area is precious. There are wetlands here that are invaluable to our air and water quality. These are wetlands that cannot be replaced, nor can we build in such a way as to minimize impact. Developers will always push (& likely win) to exceed that protected space. This is raw and untouched land. Homes to bears, coyotes, deer and endangered species. As a Nova Scotian, I am proud of our green spaces. Not many cities in Canada have green spaces the way we do. We need to protect and preserve these areas from the developer greed. My children love to swim at Kearney Lake, and use the boat club. I like to camp in the woods of Birch MTN. We cannot replant trees the way nature has planted these beautiful giants. We cannot recreate<br>habitat. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. I want something left for my children and their children. Haligonians are tired of watching the spaces we grew up in, being stripped and torn down, destroyed for developer greed. Yes we need housing, but to fast track urban sprawl without proper consulting, without proper environmental impacts studies, this is unfair to the people and their futures. We need to look at this green space like carbon credits. The carbon this area has sequestered is immense. And when those trees are cut down, they release all the carbon they've ever stored. We are in a time we cannot do that. Please, I am begging you, there are many other places we could look at for development that makes much more sense. Please do not destroy the trails, the lakes, the streams, the trees that are so immensely beautiful and serve a purpose to the people. Thank you for reading my email, and considering that as a resident, who also needs housing, knows that this area holds more value as an untouched and preserved land than it does to demolish and erect over priced housing.<br>[redacted] |
| 119 | Good morning,<br>I am emailing today to express my disappointment and concern over the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. One of the concerns I see with the development is that homes regardless of size ie. Single dwelling or multi-unit, given the location will command high rent/cost for purchase. These<br>types of developments do not change the demographic for those most impacted in the city<br>housing crisis. These developments do not allow an individual facing homelessness to find an affordable unit. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Individuals are not leaving units that cost $1,000 and moving to units that rent for $2,500.<br>This development is tone deaf in this regard. Traffic congestion continues to grow. Many workers in Nova Scotia have not returned to working full-time on location of their employment. There is also on going construction in the west Bedford area. The volume of cars on the road has already lead to an increase in the<br>number of accidents which regularly occur on the 102 highway. The construction and infrastructure requirements to create a development as proposed would be the responsibility of the taxpayers. Taxpayers who do not wish to see this development move forward. Taxpayers who do not have access to proper medical care. Taxpayers who fund over crowded schools.<br>This development is an irresponsible way to promote growth in HRM while allowing necessary infrastructure to fall behind. Furthermore, this proposed development directly overlaps with the ideal boundaries for our<br>future national urban park. Development will impact water quality, disrupt critical wildlife corridors, and alter our daily lives in profound ways. I find it disappointing that the survey to obtain feedback was biased to obtain an answer to accept development. These types of surveys demonstrate a lack of confidence in what HRM residents actually want aligning with what is being pushed forward. True surveys obtain unbiased, unfiltered results and are generally representative of the respondents wishes. This<br>survey cannot and will not produce those results. I hope the concerns I have identified above are considered. Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I hope you have a nice day and look forward to a response,<br>Thank you, [redacted] |
| 120 | Dear Mr. Grant,<br>I am writing in response to the recently shared plans for development on land west of Highway 102 between Kearney Lake Road and Lacewood Drive. While I appreciate the effort that city staff have invested in preparing these plans, I am concerned that pursuing another large suburban expansion is not in the best long-term interests of Halifax.<br>The city is already facing significant infrastructure, transportation, and service delivery pressures. Extending development farther from the urban core increases municipal costs and deepens reliance on car-oriented growth patterns. Halifax has many areas—particularly those already served by transit, water, wastewater, schools, and emergency services—where increased density would be more efficient, more sustainable, and more aligned with our climate and housing goals. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Redirecting planning resources toward infill, density, and transit-supported growth would strengthen existing communities and help the municipality make better use of infrastructure that is already built and paid for. Encouraging compact, complete neighbourhoods will provide more housing while reducing environmental impacts and long-term financial burdens.<br>I urge the municipality to reconsider the scale and priority of this proposed suburban development and to focus instead on growing within our serviced areas. Doing so would better support Halifax's long-term resilience, affordability, and sustainability.<br>Thank you for your attention to this important issue.<br>[redacted] |
| 121 | Please consider the following. I support the Establishment of a national urban park.<br>Thank you ,<br>[redacted]<br>Dartmouth<br>Highway 102 W Corridor (BMBCL) should be removed from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>The proposed national urban park be given time to come to fruition before deciding on development near or on the boundaries of the park. The Province and the City should work with interest groups and developers to incorporate land into the national urban area that has been identified for more than 20 years as the<br>preferred park boundary. Any development should not interfere with wildlife corridors.<br>All environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks, should be completed before development decisions are made.<br>Environmental research from local community experts should be included in the reports and planning process, and all of this should be made public.<br>Release "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on both the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas.<br>Prioritize development and housing solutions in areas that are within the Urban Service Boundary. |
| 122 | Hello,<br>I'm writing to express my opposition to development in the Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Special Planning Areas.<br>If development goes ahead, we can expect tax increases, increased traffic congestion, and environmental destruction. Please note that as I write this, HRM is cutting its budget, the Mayor and the Premier frequently mention how much of a problem traffic congestion is in HRM, and we are all noticing the effects of climate change. We should not act in a way that |

| | |
|---|---|
| | would make these problems worse.<br>I ask that HRM<br>• Complete additional environmental and traffic surveys, as well as floodplain surveys for the surrounding communities and adjacent parks.<br>• Include environmental research from local community experts in the reports and planning process.<br>• Release publicly available "What We Heard" reports about the public feedback on the<br>• Sandy Lake and Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Areas.<br>• Request that the province remove Sandy Lake and the Highway 102 West Corridor from the Special Planning Areas list.<br>• Propose alternative areas to prioritize development that are within the Urban Service<br>Boundary, and that do not interfere with essential wildlife corridors.<br>I'm confident that if HRM acts in accordance with good planning principles and sound ecological practices, we can have a better future. There are many good ways to get more people into housing; this isn't one of them.<br>Sincerely, [redacted] |
| 123 | Hello Tim<br>I have attended the Nov 19th HRM Public Open House on the Highway 102 West Corridor Special Planning Area. I have completed the HRM survey on that proposed development but I felt I should pass my concerns on directly to you given the 'special planning area' means this development will by-pass the normal municipal approval and go directly to the provincial minister. The combined development proposals of both the Stevens Group (8,800 Units for 20,000 people) and the Annapolis Group Lands Master plan (9978 Units for 23,317 people) is for 43,317 people. This is to be serviced by two traffic access points and we all know the concerns of limited access developments following the 2023 Tantallon wildfire. The Annapolis plan has 5 streets which end on the SPA boundary implying there will be future development into the Annapolis lands. If the Annapolis Group develop at the same proposed density, it could bring the total development to 70,000+ people which is totally un-sustainable for a two exit development. I have read the Transportation Plan associated with this development. This study points out a concerning traffic increase on Kearney Lake Road, among other traffic problems. Below is a summary of current and proposed development in the Kearney Lake/Hammond Plains Road/Hwy 102 area:<br>1. Hwy 102 West SPA 11,500 units<br>2. Sandy Lake SPA 8000 units<br>3. Case 2023-00161 Kearney Lake Road 155 Units |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 4. Planapp 2024-00735 189 Kearney Lake Road 103 units<br>5. Case 20507 Paper Mill Lake Phase I & II 4714 units<br>6. Bedford West 1 & 12 SPA 2500 units<br>7. Bedford West 10 1300 units<br>It appears the above study only looked at the traffic from the first three of these developments and therefore has under-estimated the overall traffic problems which will be caused by this development. I know you are concerned about traffic since, as an HRM councillor, you delayed the Paper Mill Lake development (in May, 2024) pending a study of the Hammonds Traffic problems at that time. There has been no major changes in this area's road infrastructure and the Hammonds Plains Traffic has only got worse since then.<br>I do a lot of hiking in the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness area and I am a supporter of the proposed National Urban Park. Although this SPA only includes a portion of the proposed park, the areas around Charles Lake and Fox lake are the jewels of this proposed park. The Fox Lake Lookoff, in-particular, is a large granite bluff which is currently located at the north end of the Annapolis Group lands. If this block of land was added to the park, it would reduce the development density and the concern of disturbing acid generating bedrock and its effects on lakes in the proposed park.<br>Tim, I trust your voice will be of moderation in the future discussions of the Highway 102 West Corridor SPA.<br>Thank-you[redacted] |

**Table 2**
**Staff Notes Taken at Public Open Houses**

| Tracking No. | Staff Notes on Resident Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | Morning Session<br>• Condo residents near Farmingate/Parkland "Happy to see [the quarry] go"<br>• Consistent concern raised over 102 access perpendicular to Parkland<br>  o Asked whether there would be new access added to the 102 and what kind of impact it could have, whether it could handle new access points, etc.<br>• Resident from subdivision off Kearney Lake Rd. (Hamshaw Dr. / Saskatoon Dr. Area):<br>  o Raised concerns over lack of infrastructure upgrades in the local area (brought up dirt roads as example.)<br>  o Concerned over pedestrian safety<br>  o Wondering where water was coming from (re: services, not the proposed lake)<br>• Resident considered all of the park to be part of the urban park<br>  o Mentioned there was significant 'shock factor' regarding the SPA<br>• Many residents concerned over perceived reduction in parkland.<br>• Placement confusing to some residents<br>  o Skeptical (perhaps apprehensive is a better word) of the affordability of the proposed housing<br>• Environmental preservation -> "Neighbourhood shouldn't exist"<br>• Concerns raised over continued access to the canoe loop<br>• Multiple comments about hospital servicing/capacity; 102 capacity; daycare; rec facilities<br>  o No space, no capacity (currently)<br><br>Afternoon Session<br>• One resident brought up that it was the only game preserve within the city<br>• Worries about uncontrolled urban sprawl<br>• Capacity concerns – Where are these ~20k people supposed to go?<br>• Concerns over maintaining overall neighbourhood character.<br>• Residents expressed concern over tax burden of expanding the service boundary<br>  o Paraphrasing – No expansion of the service boundary, development where services already exist |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ○ Phasing of the construction was important to some residents – perceived it as easing the tax burden over the long-term.<br>• Some residents expressed full opposition to provincial planning authority<br>• Resident asked if the growth justified the infrastructure expansion or the other way around<br>• Comments concerning a lack of vision – "building for today"<br>• Questions raised about the developer's responsibility for service/infrastructure upkeep.<br>• Concerns raised about the density of the development cutting into existing green space.<br><br>PM Session<br>• Concerns raised about water – new supply, not just infrastructure.<br>• Deforested areas, urban sprawl, lack of accessibility (entry/egress) to the area, lack of green space.<br>○ Also raised concerns over rec and library capacity: "are the new residents expected to use the existing services?"<br>• Density or "real density"<br>○ High-rise w/ big parking lot is dense with large spaces between residential buildings – no neighbourhood cohesion, no walkability.<br>• Questions were asked about Indigenous engagement |
| 2 | Key takeaways from my conversations:<br>• Concerns about traffic as it is already so heavy in this area, desire for better transit and AT opportunities, and for transportation improvements to come before development<br>• Concerns about impacts to the adjacent wilderness area, including wildlife habitat/connectivity and sightlines (don't want to see development from lakes and trails) Many people would rather see no development here at all<br>• Concerns about impacts to water quality in the lakes within/abutting the SPA as they are valuable to the wilderness area, and also about downstream impacts to Kearney Lake (which is already experiencing impacts from the development of Bedford West)<br><br>MORNING SESSION<br>• Water supply in HRM is becoming an issue with climate change (drier summers) -- e.g. the water restrictions municipally-serviced customers were under this summer<br>• Schools are already over capacity in Clayton Park & Kearney Lake areas |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Concern about impacts to birds and loss of view of wilderness<br>• Not in favour of development here<br>• There are trails around Charlie's Lake and Washmill Lake that are currently used by the public<br>• Would like to see a wide buffer around Charlie's Lake so that the trail is still surrounded by wilderness<br>• Need to ensure fish passage over dams and under Hwy 102<br>• Observations of salmon and gaspereaux in the lakes in this area<br>• Concern about climate change altering the flood risk -- even when using the 2100 mapping (2100 is only 75 years away and we need to be thinking longer term)<br>• St Margarets Bay Effect: there is a mesoscale weather effect that impacts the study area and adjacent areas of Hwy 102 when a wind from the southwest blows warmer ocean air over cold land in the fall. This creates patches of fog and ice and snow accumulation in this area that are worse than surrounding conditions. This impacts visibility on the highway and creates more treacherous driving conditions due to slippery roads (especially when coming down the hill from Bayers Lake). This will impact travel through the 102 and can worsen traffic.<br>• Concern with watercourse buffer width -- 20m not enough<br>• Concern with water quality downstream -- we need more stringent water quality measures here than what is typically required<br>• The area around Charlie's Lake is very sensitive. Don't want too much recreation so the wilderness can be preserved.<br>• Would prefer to see more fulsome public engagement during the background studies so the public understands them and the findings.<br>• Wetlands have significant biodiversity and should be protected<br>• Need wildlife corridors<br>• People only exist because of the other living things on the earth, we need to protect biodiversity<br>• Concerned about water servicing, traffic on Hwy 102, and environment (specifically wildlife)<br>• There is a wilderness canoe group that uses these lakes, which is the only such group that is accessible by bus<br>• Concern about impacts to lakes<br>• Since this watershed drains to Mill Cove, there is a First Nations interest in this project<br>• Mourning the loss of opportunity to purchase this land for the park<br>• Understanding that we need to grow but concerned about such a high density in a small |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • area and the lack of necessary services here; it's important that these services are integrated with development:<br>• Hospitals<br>• Road improvements (in response to traffic on Hwy 102)<br>• Daycares<br>• Recreation<br>• Concern about trail access into wilderness area<br>• Traffic to get onto Hwy 102 from Lacewood currently backs up to Radcliffe Dr, Lacewood<br>• Dr is very busy (especially when school starts and ends at Halifax West High School)<br>• Need more efficient bus service in this area and transit priority measures<br>• In favour of congestion pricing on the peninsula to reduce traffic<br><br>AFTERNOON SESSION<br>• Wildlife seen in this area: snapping turtles, foxes, beavers<br>• Thinks development here is 'absurd', wants it to stay wilderness<br>• Traffic from this development will negatively impact the surrounding neighbourhoods<br>• Not in favour of any Special Planning Areas near lakes and nature reserves<br>• Density proposed is too high<br>• Concern about Highway 113 impacting the wilderness area (thinks that this highway may be constructed in response to this development)<br>• Wants to see missing middle housing forms here<br>• Need better transit in this area -- would improve affordability for residents<br>• Concerned about high costs to tax payers, especially if this development happens at the same time as the Sandy Lake SPA<br>• Fixing public transit in this area needs to be the priority<br>• In favour of congestion pricing to reduce traffic<br>• Not in favour of twinning highway 102 due to environmental impacts<br>• Hwy 102 can't handle peak traffic as it is<br>• Wants to see the Province build out communities like Truro and direct growth away from Halifax<br>• Traffic is already bad on Kearney Lake Rd, Lacewood Dr, Main Ave, and Bedford Hwy<br>• Concerned about loss of wilderness, would rather make it a park |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Don't want to see the type of development here that is along Larry Uteck<br>• Concern about timing of services with development (transit, schools)<br>• Frustration with developers 'needing the public and the city to make them do ‘responsible development'<br>• Concern with population growth<br>• Not enough infrastructure here to support development<br>• Concerned about wildlife in this area (deer, pheasants)<br>• Concerned about existing traffic issues<br>• Does not believe we need to expand when growth could be directed to existing serviced areas<br>• Suggestion for commuter train along the CN line<br>• Would prefer to see a brownfield site developed rather than impacting the wilderness area and wildlife movement<br>• Too much traffic, transit needs to be better<br>• Concerned about evacuation due to traffic -- this is already a problem within the existing neighbourhoods<br>• Need better bike infrastructure<br>• Wants to see affordable housing included<br><br>EVENING SESSION<br>• There was another study done on wildlife in this area when Bedford West sub-area 11 was developed, recommends we use it<br>• Wants transit<br>• Concerned about density here given Bedford West track record (traffic, services, environmental impacts)<br>• Need HOV, transit, and bike lanes<br>• Concerned about traffic, size of roundabouts -- driving in this area is difficult and dangerous, and the infrastructure is not sufficient for new development<br>• Need more schools<br>• Concerned about impacts to Kearney Lake as a result of development<br>• The development needs to be planned and managed well to avoid impacts to the environment and traffic |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Has been asking for buses on Kearney Lake Rd for a long time, doesn't believe transit will be able to adequately service this area<br>• Concern about compounding impacts of development with the Sandy Lake SPA<br>• Need to upgrade roads<br>• 400m is too far to walk to a bus stop<br>• Desire for the Province to contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements<br>• Need a 30m watercourse setback at minimum<br>• Concerned about impacts to lakes including Kearney Lake<br>• Poor water quality from development around the Birch Cove Lakes will 'trickle down' to Kearney Lake<br>• Kearney Lake already facing impacts from development -- sediment and algae growth<br>• Lots of traffic on Hwy 102 and Kearney Lake Rd<br>• Don't want to see the area around the lakes developed at all<br>• Concerned about traffic<br>• Need to see transit planning within existing communities first, since it's already not reliable<br>• Environmental and flood studies need to be more robust<br>• Watershed studies should account for the whole wildness area, not just the study site<br>• Flooding has already been experienced around Black Duck Brook, downstream of this area<br>• Concerned about negative impact to the National Urban Park (which will be a tourism asset)<br>• Concerned about integrity of ecological corridors<br>• Not all parks are created equal for providing ecological connectivity<br>• Need high quality corridors (big buffers, dense tree canopy) -- should take<br>• guidance from HGNP<br>• Need to implement the HGNP by starting with the corridors<br>• Let's start with have we have<br>• Tired of hearing what we can't do -- let's start doing the things we can<br>• Vision of zoning prioritization -- e.g. lands within corridors should be last priority for development<br>• 20m watercourse buffers are not enough<br>• Concerned about impacts to taxes as a result of development<br>• Concern about increased traffic and impacts to human health and environment -- this<br>• type of development doesn't meet provincial climate objectives |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Would like to see all of this park, but especially lands west of Washmill/Charlie's Lakes - thinks the federal government should purchase them<br>• Recommend wider watercourse buffers, developer seems open to it<br>• Should be no encroachment on wetlands<br>• Concerned that tall buildings will be visible within the wilderness area -- would like to see shorter buildings so sightlines within the wilderness area are not impacted<br>• Needs to be a complete community<br>• Would prefer to see higher densities closer to the highway and away from the lakes/wilderness area<br>• We should have naturalized areas within the development<br>• Community needs to benefit from the development -- e.g. parks, affordable housing<br>• There should be a higher standard for these things because of the SPA designation<br>• Development shouldn't begin until transportation upgrades have taken place<br>• Would like to see integration of solar energy and EV parking in the development |
| 3 | • Services, infrastructure, schools, sidewalks, and parks should all be in place prior to the housing.<br>• Leave this area as a park.<br>• Make more investments in rural areas of the province (outside of HRM) and connect them by train to HRM.<br>• Concerns about the capacity of existing infrastructure.<br>• Egress to the site is an issue.<br>• Transit is deficient.<br>• Before development goes in, the infrastructure needs to be already in place.<br>• Traffic and stormwater run-off are a concern.<br>• Glad to see that studies are being done.<br>• Like how information has been provided online ahead of the meeting. The content of the boards are informative.<br>• We need housing and commercial development.<br>• First concern is traffic. Transit should be provided.<br>• Stormwater management is a concern.<br>• Adequate water and sewer services will need to be provided.<br>• These are ecological sensitive lands. We should preserve the land for human health and happiness. Losing this area would be a blow to the health and happiness of HRM residents. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • This is a gem for Halifax. Keep it in its natural state!<br>• This area should be established as a National Urban Park. We should be preserving this pristine area.<br>• Transportation concerns. Only two proposed accesses to the site.<br>• 100% object to any development and roads through these lands.<br>• Acquire/expropriate these lands from private ownership. Expropriation has been used in the past to create National Parks. It is a public good. Expropriate!<br>• There are far better places to put housing.<br>• I don't want my tax money to go fund development, but I would be willing to have my tax money fund a National Park. We have something special here! I don't have to drive up to Keji National Park to enjoy nature, nature is already in close proximity to my neighbourhood. It is an amazing area and it should be protected.<br>• Kearney Lake is already stressed. This proposed development if allowed to go ahead will destroy the water quality of these pristine lakes. It will affect a dozen pristine lakes.<br>• Climate change is happening. We shouldn't be cutting down trees. We should instead be planting additional ones.<br>• HRM doesn't have to absorb all the population growth in the province.<br>• The area filters the water for Kearney Lake and Paper Mill Lake.<br>• The degradation of the land will impact the health of the lakes. Development needs to be set back as far as possible from the lakes.<br>• Best fit for lands is a park. It should all be parkland.<br>• Blasting will impact lakes.<br>• There is already too much traffic in the area.<br>• Highway 102 generates too much noise pollution.<br>• Not against development. It needs to be planned well.<br>• School capacity is a big issue.<br>• You need to provide community facilities for a population of this size. |
| 4 | 9am Session<br>• Concerns around environment impact of development<br>• Concerns over the loss of green space |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Concerns that housing will not be affordable<br>• Concerns over tax increases to cover the cost of the infrastructure<br>• Watercourse setbacks prioritizes the interests of the developer<br><br>2pm Session<br>- Concerns that the development overall prioritizes developer interests<br>- Concerns about the loss of wildlife and the larger environmental impact of the development<br>- Expressed a lack of faith in the process being a project that is approved by the province, expressed frustration around public feedback not being reflected when clear there is great opposition<br>- Questions<br>o How will this impact the ongoing park designation process? Would like to know more information on park designation<br>o What is the status of the park?<br>o Where is HRM in the parks conversation? They need to be speaking up<br>- Interest in protecting these lands – the urban park is a very special plan. The loss will be significant. Every acreage is important. Lands are a 'public treasure'<br>- The encroaching development will damage the biodiversity of the entire area due to the lake systems<br>- Concern about the construction noise and dust from the development, interested if there will be a noise wall / buffer built around the highway<br><br>6:30 pm session<br>- Interest in knowing how HRM can ensure that community spaces are incorporated based on the increased scale of the project<br>o Concerns about the useability of the park lands and the lack of roads in and out of the site<br>o Member of public spoke with Stevens Group and was very concerned about the potential lack of DA. Said Stevens representative believed everything can be accomplished through policy and bylaw. Concerns around HRM's legislative ability to be able to ensure the provision of parks, amenity spaces, and schools. Wanted to see more transparency to the legal mechanisms<br>o Wanted to see more amenity space integrated into the development through the master planning process, not just a school site |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Key Take-aways<br>1. Environmental concerns: concerns about the impact of the development on lake health and the loss of biodiversity, strong interest in the lands being integrated into the regional / national park for preservation, concerns around the impact of the construction of the development itself on surrounding neighbourhoods<br>2. Status of Regional / National Park: multiple questions on the status of the park designation and more transparency on HRMs involvement in that process<br>3. Concerns / frustration about process: expressed lack of faith in ability for public's voice and opposition to be heard and reflected in planning process, concerns about increased taxes to pay for infrastructure, belief that development prioritizes developer interests<br>4. Amenity spaces: concerns regarding HRM's ability through the planning process to require development to include a variety of amenity spaces, would like to see more transparency as to how these aspects are ensured through planning process |
| 5 | **9.1 Public Feedback**<br>• Concern quarry dust and construction dust impacts on adjacent buildings.<br>• Hamshaw Subdivision and Saskatoon Drive to the north should be included in the SPA.<br>• Do not develop these lands!<br>• This is supposed to be a national park – development in this area will displace wildlife and degrade the area's ecological diversity.<br>• Hamshaw Subdivision should have services extended into it.<br>• A buffer should be created between any development and the park.<br>• Existing and increased traffic needs to be considered in this area.<br>• Development does not need bike lanes.<br>• The survey is leading, is pro-development, and does not provide an option to oppose development.<br>• No development. Or at the very least create a huge buffer.<br>• We should infill existing urban and brownfield sites and not develop greenfield sites.<br>• The whole SPA is important to the park. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Ought to develop brownfield sites first, why expand to here?<br>• How can the park be protected if the area is developed?<br>• We need housing for people who are unhoused or precariously housed.<br>• This development won't solve the housing crisis.<br>• Affordable housing needs to be a part of the development.<br>• Public engagement information should speak to procedural best practices from around the country.<br>• Schools need to be considered for these sites. The existing schools are already at capacity.<br>• Park space should be preserved.<br>• Buildings should only be 4-5 storeys tall.<br>• Add more useable greenspace to the development.<br>• Highway 102 is already at capacity. Traffic and infrastructure need to be addressed prior to development.<br>• School sites are very important for this area and for creating a sustainable community.<br>• The nearby lakes need to be buffered, or they should be removed from the SPA altogether.<br>• Area should be left as a park.<br>• Traffic is bad throughout the area, especially Kearney Lake.<br>• The lights at Larry Uteck aren't aligned and it creates downstream impacts at the roundabout.<br>• Development needs bus shelters throughout. Many existing bus stops in the area do not have shelters or even sidewalk connections. Creating these shelters and connections makes it more appealing to take transit and brings more dignity to the process.<br>• Concern about development exacerbating existing traffic and infrastructure issues.<br>• There are no sidewalks out in this area. How are existing and new residents supposed to move around without a vehicle?<br>• Concern about the ability of existing infrastructure to support development.<br>• Concern for increase in crime and decrease in community safety.<br>• The roundabouts at Kearney Lake are dangerous.<br>• Existing schools are at capacity. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Concern for existing transportation and servicing infrastructure.<br>• Concern for wildlife displacement and impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods.<br>• Existing parking and access is already an issue for the Hamshaw Subdivision.<br>• Concern for the impact of nearby development on well water supply for unserved lots in the Hamshaw Subdivision.<br>• Development area and surrounding areas ought to include more active transportation infrastructure.<br>• Schools should be included within the development area. |
| 6 | Regarding Environmental Protection & Conservation<br>• Concerned about the loss of animal habitats, including habitats for pigeon, bears, fish, etc.. Where will the animals go? Will they be relocated? Noise and light pollution is not good for animals and HRM and developments have not acknowledged this concern in this open house.<br>• Against the proposed development as they due to the loss of green space, wildlife corridors, fauna etc<br>• People love Halifax for its nature. Concerned about the loss of green space. Looking to see how the potential impact on the environment could be mitigated through the planning process.<br>• Concerned about the proposed developments impact on the sensitive ecological area and would prefer this area be part of the proposed national urban park<br>• Against the proposed development as it will have irreversible impact on the nature, cannot bring back the green space<br>• A clear understanding is needed on how erosion, runoff and stormwater will be controlled. Particular concerns raised for wastewater and the impact to water quality.<br>• Worries about sewage treatment capacity and the effect on downstream communities.<br>• Several concerns raised about potential flooding impacts.<br>• Would like specific attention on the Lake Charles Loop trail. Request that HRM consider requiring larger buffers around this area, or that HRM negotiate to acquire this portion of land as parkland dedication.<br>• Would like the plans to show an increased buffer area around the park.<br>• Would like the development to be undertaken in a fashion that doesn't begin with clear cutting or bulldozing first. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Developing here would damage a great resource. Shade is becoming a more important factor for the climate. Natural shade should be a point of focus for all developments.<br>• Cutting trees has increased hurricanes.<br>• This development visually and mentally blocks access to the park and makes the potential for a national park less attractive.<br><br>• Regarding Parkland<br>Concerned about the potential impact on the proposed BMBCL. Believe that the proposed national park should be finalized before any development comes to this area.<br>• Believe that this area should all be included in a national park. |
| 7 | Regarding Transportation & Accessibility<br>• Concerned about the proposed population impact on already strained infrastructure, including Halifax water, wastewater, nova scotia power and road infrastructure<br>• Multiple community members have safety egress concerns about the limited entrances and exits to the proposed community (highway 102), especially when emergency evacuation happens. Several people referenced the previous Suzie Lake fire and the fear that there was no egress from the community today.<br>• Excited about this development just want to see adequate transit services using the existing transit infrastructure, including the lacewood terminals<br>• Transit needs improvement to accommodate the proposed development<br>• Multiple community members were concerned that the traffic generated by the proposed development will make the congested traffic condition worse<br>• Emphasize the importance of providing proper transportation infrastructure for community member with mobility issues as they cannot rely on public transit<br>• Concerned that our transit system is only suitable/good for commuting to work. Not good for everyday life, including going to grocery stores, visit friends/families as the connecting time is so long and not convenient.<br>• Suggestions on multimodality especially active transportation options that are safe and clear from automobile traffic.<br>• Some feel the transportation network should model more walkable transit-oriented cities like Montreal. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Transit and transportation infrastructure needs to come first. This development should not proceed ahead of any other plans.<br>• Traffic is a major concern. No bikes should be considered in this project. Community member has lived in this area for decades and has never seen bikes be used here.<br><br>Regarding Housing & Affordability<br>• Against high density development locating at the border of the proposed national urban park.<br>• Multiple community members mentioned that they would appreciate nice beautifully designed buildings instead of box buildings, using library as a great example of well-designed contemporary building<br>• Concerned the proposed density is too high for the general area, as it is right beside nature and proposed parks.<br>• Water supply capacity concerns tied to population growth<br>• Opposition to high density buildings immediately beside parks.<br>• Need to think vertically as much as possible. Build tall towers and then leave as much land as possible for parks and open space. Do not sprawl out.<br>• Calls for affordable housing and equity-focused approaches, including incentives.<br>• Need housing of unhoused and precariously housed persons. This development will attract people who could live anywhere but this does not help the housing crisis that the province is using to create SPAs and move developments forward faster.<br>• Several questions and concerns regarding the small, older subdivision off of Kearney Lake and adjacent to the project. Why is this area not included? The developer plans show this area as a potential access point, but the area is accessed via a bridge and the terrain is very steep. Concern that this development is going to strain the existing housing without improving the private access road. Quarry dust is currently a concern, how will the development dust and debris be mitigated? These properties are located on wells, concern the development will contaminate the existing wells and as its not in the SPA, no connection to services will be offered. Further concern that these surrounding lots are being bought by the developer and it is unclear what will be proposed or if this area will be included in this project after this public consultation period.<br>• HRM needs to add mechanisms to ensure that this area is used for housing, not cottages or secondary vacant properties. In support of full-time housing for citizens. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Regarding Community Well-being & Recreation<br>• Need more community facilities - Multiple community members mentioned subject site does not have adequate community facilities to support its community well-being, including schools, churches, malls, libraries etc.<br>• Address the importance of providing entertainment facilities for children of various ages<br>• Multiple community members expressed the important of new schools to accommodate more growth. Schools are overcrowded in this area and these proposed development needs to consider more elementary, junior high schools<br>• Multiple community members expressed concerns about the lack of parks in this area<br>• Green space easement - would love to see the western part of the Stevens Group proposed development, a long stripe of lake and green space, being accessible to the general public<br>• Advocate for development designed/planned for people not cars<br>• Noted that the province is investing on training more teachers who are eager to work, but infrastructure must match workforce availability.<br><br>Regarding Governance and Public Engagement<br>• Concerned about the province overreaching HRM planning process<br>• Concerned the online survey do not provide option for no development<br>• Great to be part of the 102-highway special planning area engagement process. Public engagement is important!<br>• Would appreciate inclusive (includes everyone!) and bottom-up planning engagement process. Any planning process needs to consider ecosystem first<br>• Open house boards – need to emphasize protecting nature. Various themes/topics are showed on the last board, but no nature related. Parks are different from nature.<br>• Desire for transparency and public inclusion in technical studies and initial planning phase. There should also be preference for community consultation prior to developer engagement.<br>• Several community members expressed that they are not in support of this project and/or are extremely opposed to this project.<br>• Concern that this project is going to quickly, would like the process to slow down, include more study of the impacts to the area and hope that other projects take priority over this one.<br><br>Regarding Fiscal and Socioecnomic Considerations |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Provincial Politician who works with developers make a wealthy life<br>• Infrastructure cost concerns raised, this will increase property taxes.<br>• A natural park would produce more income in the long run than this housing project.<br>• This project prioritizes a quick profit for some but won't continue to be profitable in the long run. Environmental protection would offer a greater profit in the long-term.<br>• Council is discussing a 10% tax increase. What will this development cost tax payers?<br><br>Regarding Comprehensive Planning/Broader Comments<br>• General comment about the development happens in Halifax lately - Concerned about the large developments happened lately does not address any concerns on transportation, building design, green space and art<br>• Needs more public consultations on various planning projects. Highly recommends proposed large high-rise development should involve public engagement, even its as-of-right<br>• Support density on peninsula<br>• Support pocket parks idea with high rises (park dedication issue as no new subdivision no new parkland)<br>• The high rise (probably ONE77) around Armdale Rotary has very bright blue lights pointing out. Very disturbing at night<br>• Supportive of urban development, but there needs to be a greater focus on brownfield and developments in existing built up areas.<br>• Development should be occurring in areas with existing transportation, water, electricity, waste disposal first before these SPA sites proceed.<br>• Concerns with the level of immigration in Nova Scotia<br><br>Afternoon Session<br><br>Regarding Environmental Protection & Conservation<br>• Couple community members are concerned about the loss of nature and believe other locations could be better suited for this development. They believe this area is more suited for nature and natural trails<br>• The areas behind the Charlies lake should be preserved as the community have been using it for nature, trails for years. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • The area is seen as too important to be altered, with calls to honour earlier promises to create an urban national park.<br>• Concerns regarding erosion, blasting, and the cumulative loss of natural landscapes.<br>• Preference for development on brownfield sites, not natural green spaces.<br>• Concerned that many lakes in this area will be lost and blasting will impact the existing nature<br>• Drought concerns raised. This summer the impacts show that this area was impacted. Concerned that studies do not accurately reflect the new realities of the climate.<br>• Any new development needs even more street trees.<br><br>Regarding Parkland<br>• The project site should be part of the national urban park and advocate for complete ecosystem.<br>• Firmly attending in support of BMBC and the park designation and is against anything that will have a negative impact to the park.<br>• Many community members are against this development as they are concerned about the impact and encroach to the national urban park and nature in general.<br><br>Regarding Transportation and Accessibility<br>• Advocate active transportation – need bike lanes that are separated from the traffic, like what Vancouver did<br>• Don’t want highway in the middle of a neighbourhood – its not liveable<br>• Multiple community members were concerned that the traffic generated by the proposed development will make the congested traffic condition worse<br>• Transit should be prioritized along the planning process<br>• It will be a great opportunity to have a direct bus to the proposed neighbourhood<br>• Concerns raised over a necessary public education on traffic rules, especially speeding, before introducing new regulations.<br><br>Regarding Housing & Affordability<br>• Concerned the proposed density is not a fit for the general area, as it is right beside nature<br>• Would not like to see the development going forward. There won’t be that much demand for the proposed large number of units |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Expressed that they would appreciate nice beautifully designed buildings instead of box buildings, using library as a great example of well-designed contemporary building<br>• Concerned the proposed building units will not be affordable.<br>• This development needs low-income housing build in and required from the start, not a fund.<br>• Concerned the proposed density is too high for the general area.<br>Concerns that development benefits profit-driven interests rather than building complete, liveable communities.<br>Development should include no towers. Low density development only. Community member has heard that young families don't want towers.<br><br>Regarding Community Well-being & Recreation<br>• Multiple community members mentioned that we need more community amenities/recreational facilities, including schools<br>• Build communities instead of subdivision with all the supporting amenities.<br>• Concerned more development will bring more litters around the city<br>• Concerned that clayton park area already has a shortage of green space and we need more parks here<br>• A strong call for preservation of heritage buildings and local cultural identity.<br>• The area is valued for scenic beauty and its role in community wellbeing. This project could be a model in how to build in beautiful areas.<br>• Could this area be a complete community? That would keep commuting traffic down.<br><br>Regarding Governance & Public Engagement<br>• Couple community members are concerned the online survey do not provide option for no development<br>• The province is taking over the city planning process. The city councillors and mayor should stand up against this using all the legal tools available including supreme court<br>• The province is overreaching HRM's planning process and they will only make the rich people richer<br>• Many feel that HRM has the duty to prioritise the wellbeing of its residents ahead of developer interests.<br>• Calls for council and staff to stand firm in protecting the land. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • The City should be loud in protest of SPAs.<br>• Longterm promises about land conservation should be respected and fulfilled.<br>• This project is proceeding without listening to the experience in the room.<br>• HRM and the province open all meetings with a land acknowledgement but this is not reflective in practice.<br>• The province is rushing this project.<br><br>Regarding Infrastructure<br>• Waste management systems are seen as under strain and needing improvement before more population growth.<br>• This project should be a model for environmental development, especially with access to the potential park. HRM could require green energy sources such as geothermal. Need to enact policies to require this.<br>• HRM should set up a process now to prepare designated areas for development and designated areas for protection. HRM can influence how the development is constructed and what requirements for construction the developer should follow<br><br>Regarding Fiscal & Socioeconomic Considerations<br>• The city should try to acquire and preserve this beautiful pristine nature areas<br>• Support HRM expropriate private lands around BMBCL using taxpayers' money<br>• Beauty has economic value.<br><br>Regarding Comprehensive Planning/Broader Comments<br>• The city needs to fix Windsor exchange and provide ferry.<br>• The province is still advertising for people to come live in Nova Scotia, this recruitment for immigration needs to stop.<br>• The birth rate is in decline. There is no need to be accommodating the level of growth we are building for. Who will live here?<br>• Development should be directed to other parts of the province outside the urban core such as in Bridgewater and New Glascow.<br>• What happens to this development if growth stalls? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • People like Halifax because if its size and access to nature. Developments of this scale change the appeal of Halifax as whole.<br><br>Evening Session<br>Regarding Environmental Protection & Conservation<br>• Need to maintain the pristine quality of the lake for paddling (Olympic paddlers) and have an area for exercise.<br>• Annapolis development maps show the development is too close to the water, it's not acceptable.<br>• Should not be developing islands on the lake; the Annapolis proposal is the nightmare scenario and not what residents were promised.<br>• There is conservation value, the water is clear but will be less clear from the development.<br>• Blasting will destroy the habitats; there is ample land elsewhere for development.<br>• Concern for deer and wildlife.<br>• Preference for the Stevens Group rather than Annapolis, it seems more environmentally friendly but concerned about possible expansion. The development should stop where it is proposed right now and not go any further<br>• The marsh is an important filtration system that works through the connected water systems – is there a study to confirm everything will be protected?<br>• Green space is important.<br>• Several comments request a larger buffer (30 metres+) around the lakes and wetlands.<br>• Specific concern that destroying the Marsh between Bayers Lake and Susie's Lake would directly harm lake health.<br>• Concern for further impacts to Kearney Lake.<br>• In full opposition of proposal with nuance that some greenfield development is okay. This area is of ecological significance.<br>• The flood impacts and impacts of flooding in the surrounding area has not been fully studied and needs to be considered more comprehensively.<br>• Need to consider the ecological connectivity in the area, this project will lead to degradation.<br>• Any further study needs to understand the shared watershed and tourism potential impacts.<br>• Don't build a castle in a swamp.<br><br>Regarding Parkland |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Opposed to this development because of the proximity to the park that the community has been fighting for over many years.<br>• In 2006, it was promised to acquire land through purchase and swaps.<br>• This needs to be an urban wilderness park it's majestic.<br>• Well used park for everyone, this would be a loss for everyone and future generations.<br>• Conceptual boundary of the park should follow the ridge line so you can't see the city and buildings.<br><br>Regarding Transportation & Accessibility<br>• Traffic – how are people supposed to get out of their apartments?<br>• Terrible area for increased traffic.<br>• Traffic will create a lot of noise; it's right against the highway and we should consider a noise barrier (people can't open their windows due to noise).<br>• Road network needs to be expanded; the highway is overused and difficult to get around.<br>• Roundabouts are a good idea but too backed up and not able to keep up.<br>• How will transit work with so many extra residents? Already don't have enough buses and drivers. How will routes connect and work with rapid transit.<br>• Need reliable and timely transit.<br>• This area needs a park and ride. If we want to convince people to use the bus, they need to get to the bus first. Set aside land in the plans now for a park and ride near a bus hub.<br>• Physical transportation needs to be prioritized – walkways and bikes.<br>• There needs to be consideration for evacuation during an emergency, not enough connections.<br>• Need better access to the highway.<br>• Significant concerns for existing traffic and congestion raised by many community members.<br><br>Regarding Housing & Affordability<br>• How can we guarantee affordable housing?<br>• Housing should be in a different area where it is cheaper, easier, faster and affordable.<br>• Project is too dense. Supportive of development but this amount has not been considered in the FSC and is too much.<br>• Worries that the proposed buildings facing the highway will suffer from noise and reduced liveability.<br>• Interest in ensuring sensible, context appropriate development, not over intensification. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Call for consideration of retirement homes as part of an appropriate housing mix, if any development proceeds.<br>• The side closest to the 102 would be best placed for development. Then place the supportive activities such as school, rec centre. Place these supportive uses beside the park so that they can access the park. Use the higher density as a buffer to protect animals, pollution and use taller buildings close to the 102 to reduce the noise from the highway in the park. Sliding the density closer to the one side of the development should then leave more buffer space to the park.<br><br>Regarding Community Well-being & Recreation<br>• Should be considering school capacity at Halifax West.<br>• Development needs to project the population to include schools that can accommodate all children. New schools re already at capacity.<br>• Should be considering the wellbeing of seniors and consider aging in place (retirement homes) and natural progression<br>• Fire station coverage is seen as in adequate; residents want fire services expansion to match population growth.<br>• Concern that development will harm scenic beauty and lower property value.<br>• Heritage preservation should be considered as an important aspect in the planning process.<br>• Recreation spaces are very needed in this area: need courts, playgrounds, indoor spaces for programming for seniors, families and youth.<br>• Current view is pristine, don't want to see the buildings this is not what people were promised<br>• Already have Bedford West, don't need development here and we don't need a strip mall.<br>• Concern for highway noise<br><br>Regarding Governance & Public Engagement<br>• There was a secondary planning exercise that was turned down, why is it being considered again?<br>• The Province should be at this meeting and HRM is being used by a more powerful system.<br>• The Province needs to have professional input from HRM staff and not just make political decisions.<br>• Participants say HRM should be buying private lands in the area to secure the conservation value.<br>• Deep frustration over unfulfilled promises from 2006, including land acquisition and land swaps expected to expand protected areas. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Continuous calls to follow through on the National Urban Park/Urban Wilderness Park vision, seen as a source of civic pride and long-term value.<br>• HRM and the province should outline the other options for development – why are we proceeding with this one?<br>• Why is HRM leading this process when the province is the approval body? Where is the province at these open houses? Why doesn't the province come and explain how they are supporting the SPAs that they are requiring HRM to prioritize? Why does the province come to the open house and explain how they will help pay for the infrastructure and regional transportation needed to support a development they are requiring HRM to proceed with.<br><br>Regarding Fiscal & Socioeconomic Considerations<br>• Request that HRM clearly show whether infrastructure costs related to new development have been properly factored in.<br>• The tax base will be paying for the upkeep and upgrades to this infrastructure. This is not something wanted.<br><br>Regarding Infrastructure<br>• Fire risk – worried about exit points and fire-resistant infrastructure<br>• Should upgrade current infrastructure first, not expand it into this area.<br><br>Regarding Comprehensive Planning/Broader Comments<br>• Development is okay, but not at this location.<br>• Would be supportive of a smaller, dense development area. Not supportive of the current size of this proposal.<br>• People want to stay in HRM and Nova Scotia because of the lifestyle. This project risks that community feel.<br>• Would like to see the rapid transit plan for all of HRM and surrounding areas proceed first.<br>• Would like to see the Lacewood and Dunbrack Site (suburban growth node) be prioritised. |
| 8 | Regarding Environmental Protection & Conservation |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • BMBCL society was not consulted by Stantec after a single first meeting – they feel they didn't get to provide input on the study's findings, with which they say there is missing or inaccurate information.<br>• Concerns on development's impact on downstream areas with well water. Blasting granite was mentioned a few times as a potential contaminate concern. Questions about how this will be managed to prevent well water impacts and impacts on the lakes.<br>• It is still possible to fish from Kearny Lake. Concerns over impacts to fish if the development goes ahead.<br>• Concerns over the impacts on biodiversity of development in the area.<br>• Concerns over impacts to wetlands and watercourses. Some discussion of how there is siltation getting into waterways from Bedford West already and that this development will bring more.<br>• Can the lakes in the area get added to the monitoring program?<br>• Concerns over draught and Halifax Water ability to manage it and infrastructure to support it.<br>• Riparian buffers should be bigger than 20m.<br>• New parklands in the development should facilitate fishing and canoeing on the lakes.<br><br>Regarding Parkland<br>• The potential national urban park designation needs to be preserved/actioned.<br>• Ensure the urban/parkland/wilderness interface is carefully considered.<br><br>Regarding Servicing Infrastructure<br>• Residents from Saskatoon Drive/Hamshaw Drive area are interested in getting municipal services.<br>• Some expressed an interest in developing the area, but know they need services to do so.<br><br>Regarding Transportation & Accessibility<br>• Weather patterns over St. Margarets Bay mean that the area around the Hwy 102 special planning area is more susceptible to seasonal snow showers and fog compared to other areas. Transportation network needs to consider this as slippery/icy conditions and low visibility are more likely to occur.<br>• The transportation network should be as walkable as possible to reduce car use. Design for pedestrians not cars. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Many concerns over traffic volume increase as result of the development, and ongoing background increases, and what this means for safety.<br>• Concerns raised over the safety of the Belle Street and Larry Utek intersection.<br>• Suggesting that Highway 102 should have a sound barrier built next to it as upgrades to the corridor are completed.<br><br>Regarding Housing & Affordability<br>• Several comments on how there should be affordable housing in the development.<br><br>Regarding Land Use and Urban Design<br>• Ensure lighting on buildings points downwards and not towards other properties/natural areas.<br>• Ensure building design encourages unique buildings, not just boxes. Designs should have some curves instead of just corners.<br>• Consider sightlines to and from natural features and areas of the BMBCL.<br><br>Regarding Community Well-being & Recreation<br>• Residents in the Hamshaw Drive area are concerned about emergency access and egress, and access to water for firefighting from fire hydrants.<br>• Comments that existing community facilities are over capacity – need to add new facilities for these developments<br><br>Regarding Governance & Public Engagement<br>• Several comments questioning the transparency of the SPA process and concern that public feedback will have no effect on the development outcomes.<br>• Questions about how the SPAs were determined/declared.<br>• Several concerns over the provinces “interference” in the planning process and decision for the designation of the SPA in the first place.<br>• Some suggestions that all feedback be placed in an appendix of the What We Heard Report.<br><br>Regarding Fiscal & Socioeconomic Considerations<br>• Several comments sharing concern that the Municipal tax base will be responsible for absorbing costs associated with the development / overall cost concerns for the development. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Concerns that development costs here will be very high due to geological conditions (granite).<br><br>Regarding Comprehensive Planning / Broader Comments<br>• Development should be encouraged on brownfields, not greenfields.<br>• What engagement will take place with the Mi'kmaq / First Nations?<br>• Does not mind the idea of development here overall, but it shouldn't take away from/impact the potential BMBCL NUP or environment, and concerns over the cost implications for municipality – get the province to pay for HRM/s costs.<br>• Suggestion to include EV parking/charging requirements.<br>• Concerns over school capacity and comments identifying need for new schools to support development. |

**Table 3**

**Long Form Online Survey Responses (Question 3 on 20 Yr Vision)**

*Question: "Vision: Imagine you are 20 years in the future and are describing the new neighbourhood in this area to a friend. What key features stand out? What housing is available? How do you travel throughout the community and to and from other places? What parks and public spaces would you tell your friend about? What environmental considerations have been made? Please tell us what you would tell your friend.*"

| Response No. | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Zero transport infrastructure. Enormous traffic issues. Wildlife has disappeared. |
| 2 | You can shop, relax, and enjoy nature all within the area. My kids go to school in the area and go to after-school programs offered by the REC centre in the area. I can go to the grocery store on foot. I don't feel required to drive to live here. |
| 3 | x |
| 4 | Was 1 of the most beautiful places in HRM, majestic. So special was 2 b part of the largest urban wilderness park in North America. Sadly, gov't wouldn't listen 2 the people, catered 2 rich developers who blew up every beautiful rock & cut down every amazing tree; tragic |
| 5 | Without property infrastructure considerations I would be telling them about the terrible traffic congestion, especially on Hammonds Plains Road. I would tell them that a large portion of this are could have been national park |
| 6 | With the benefit of hindsight I would say to my friend what a great thing was done when the area was preserved as a wilderness asset right where people live and have easy access to Mother Nature. Suburban sprawl is not sustainable as planners knew. |
| 7 | Wilderness. I thought this was a protected area. Stop developing it. Leave Susies Lake alone. |
| 8 | Wilderness is preserved and lakes are accessible to everyone not just home owners. |
| 9 | Wide streets, nice manicured boulevards. Busses that don't stop in the middle of the road and hold up traffic. A new entrance to bayers lake. All lake adjacent to 102 should be developed. 102 should be widened. |
| 10 | Wide range of affordable housing. Gone green and saved millions of dollars<br>Have autos parked in a lot, away from homes Sidewalks for pedestrians and cyclists Beautiful beach, picnic park setting They took the environment concerns seriously for once |
| 11 | Well connected Roads within the community, grid layout. Excellent Schools and<br>Massive Urban park by considering environmental regulations. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 12 | Welcome to the most engaging urban parkland in North America, featuring trail systems, lakes for swimming, native wildlife and the opportunity to experience true solitude with the city only minutes away. |
| 13 | Welcome to Halifax, the home of Canada's largest and most biologically diverse wilderness area in an urban setting. Fortunately, the politicians of the day had the foresight to encourage Parks Canada in the designation of an urban wilderness. |
| 14 | Welcome to a varied and mixed neighborhood of low, middle and upper middle class housing complimented with neighbouring parkland with innovative athletic and play areas, walking and biking trails connecting systems throughout the HRM. |
| 15 | We would celebrate the recognition and preservation of this area for its ecosystem benefits. Complete neighborhoods nearer the urban core would serve housing needs. Residents could continue to enjoy Blue Mountain Birch Cove as a place of healing. |
| 16 | We will have chosen to protect nature, protect watersheds, and not missed the opportunity to create an urban park in HRM. Housing density can exist in adjacent areas. |
| 17 | We want a living environment that's safe for people who like to walk and ride bicycle. We want a family oriented community. We want community recreation area that supports adults and children basketball/pickleball court, swings and safe play areas. |
| 18 | We valued the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness area for all time<br>We do not value large tracks of land covered with high rise and cookie cutter homes jammed in together |
| 19 | We used to hike and explore nature with our family. The area used to be quiet and safe. It was believed that nature would be preserved here. This is where deer used to walk in the neighbourhood because it was a corridor for wildlife. Overdeveloped. |
| 20 | We succeeded by avoiding developing this precious area. It’s protected and is flourishing in its biodiversity - its integrity enhances the health of people & ecosystems. People connect with nature here. Residential density was achieved elsewhere. |
| 21 | We need to be able to preserve wilderness here - the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Wilderness Area must be protected! |
| 22 | We need green spaces because they make our province the beautiful place it is, and improve our mental and physical wellbeing. We need trees for clean air, and the wildlife who live in our wilderness areas are an important part of our ecosystem. |
| 23 | We live in a beautiful area with access to hiking, biking and swimming. Kearney Lake beach is no longer unsafe to drive through from June-Sept. Exiting 102 inbound at Kearney Lake to get home is no longer unsafe with traffic flowing not sudden stop. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 24 | We have a choice:<br><br>A. Being on the rocks at Fox Lake, watching loons, common nighthawks flying, enjoying the peace.<br><br>B. All wildlife is gone and all I see is more rows of McMansions. All the granite has been blasted to oblivion. The wildlife is gone. |
| 25 | We have a beautiful large national urban park in the entire area.no additional roads. no additional buildings. just beautiful lakes and forests with walking paths and trails. access to lakes and waterways . surrounding lands left in natural state. |
| 26 | We are concerned that this development will significantly increase traffic congestion and may have a negative impact on the Blue Mountain wilderness area. |
| 27 | We almost lost this valuable park and viable wildlife corridor to imposed development. We are so lucky we were able to stop it, how many cities can boast a wild space with size and wilderness connections that support biodiversity so close to the city? |
| 28 | We all know that this development is unacceptable. It endangers the health of our land (our own health!) and ignores sensitive waterways & ecosystems. It ignores the importance of promoting natural spaces going against basic needs for living beings. |
| 29 | Walkable infrastructure is key. Single family, duplex, multiplex and apartment buildings. |
| 30 | visionary planning ahead of it's time. Funded functioning transit with dedicated routes that allow neighbours to enjoy their neighbourhood walking and, biking with common green spaces with a national treasure next door. Birch Cove Blue Mountain Nat P |
| 31 | Vibrant community that respects Nova Scotia’s cultural identity, protects the large blue mountain wilderness area, and includes missing middle housing, and rapid transit options for all residents. |
| 32 | Very careful and limited development. Large natural buffers that protect wetlands, lakes and mature forest. Trail and non motorized access to lake frontage. |
| 33 | UNTOUCHED PROTECTED NATURE SITE |
| 34 | Unspoilt areas within or near urban areas are vital for our physical and mental health and of great importance to ecosystems and species within these areas. The encroaching footprint of new development threatens the future benefit of HRM wild areas. |
| 35 | Unfortunately infrastructure has not kept up with this development despite our input on this project in 2025. It took forever to build schools and they're overcrowded already & the national urban park that was proposed was pushed aside for density. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 36 | Unfortunately I event the conversation will be about traffic congestion, lack of appropriate infrastructure and the fact that the quick build for profit under the guise of housing resulted in cheap housing which did not stand up over time |
| 37 | Twenty years in the future I'd like to be able to say that government saw sense and halted development on this pristine nature area. They realized that the area could not sustain the increased population with no infrastructure. |
| 38 | Twenty years from now I would hope that this area would still be an urban wilderness for ALL to enjoy. We can't keep paving paradise. There are other less ecologically vital areas that can be allocated for development. Protect these lands. |
| 39 | Trees, nature, wildlife, hiking, canoeing |
| 40 | Trees, I want to see more trees and green space with less urban sprawl. No houses available, I would like to hike through the community of trees. I only want to see public space and not houses and more development. Save this one for the animals. |
| 41 | Transit systems have made massive improvements over 20 years. we are lucky that our parks and green spaces have remained unchanged for the last 20 years. Thankfully, we decided to concentrate populations and build up instead of outwards. |
| 42 | Trails, wilderness corridors connect neighborhoods; nature with waterways, wildlife respected. Green energy, Grey water, gardens food growing & available. Updated reliable public transit. Public spaces, encourage gatherings, art. NO 40 STORY BUILDING |
| 43 | Trails, access to downtown, and how proud we are about our national urban park. We love living in this area and we really need to save and support the amazing wilderness that is so accessible by the city of Halifax. |
| 44 | Traffic is awful due to poor planning. Kearney Lake lights choke flow, yet more vehicles keep coming. The 102 needs four lanes each way. Schools are overcrowded. I'd reconsider living here and choose an older, established neighbourhood instead. |
| 45 | Too much density, overwhelming the nearby lands long ago identified as a future urban park, but not yet legally created. Traffic is bad as the prov & HRM have not increased public transportation options to reduce the # of private cars on the road. |
| 46 | Too many people and apartments, not enough spaced out neighbourhood lots, not enough woods, too much traffic |
| 47 | This was supposed to be the front country of the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park, the buffer, the place where nature met the city. Instead, they let the developers build the Annex. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 48 | This was once sacred natural landscape of pristine lakes, unique wildlife, and clean air. Now, after population growth stop, it has become unaffordable housing, and cancer has peaked due to pavement, pollution, and degraded air and water. |
| 49 | This used to be forest and lakes. Look how they ruined it. |
| 50 | This used to be an area with beautiful hiking trails and clean lakes to swim in. There were plans to have it become an urban national park. Lots of wildlife in the area. |
| 51 | This used to be a wild forest with many clean lakes helping mitigate erosion and enhancing wildlife habitat and human enjoyment, helping to contain the urban sprawl with a greenbelt. Now, polluted water and a jungle of concrete and asphalt. |
| 52 | This used to be a place of great beauty and was protected until...it wasn't. The lakes were pristine and you could hike far enough in to completely get away from the sound of traffic. Now, all that is gone and there is nothing but endless traffic. |
| 53 | This used to be a nice place with a lot less people and the woods for the animals. Don't move to Halifax because we can't handle more people. Trying to get downtown for work is impossible. They make bike lanes that is a waste of tax payers money |
| 54 | This used to be a beautiful wilderness area enjoyed by thousands of people a month. People hiked, did trail running, ran their dogs, swam, & canoed here. It was a treasured wilderness area loved & enjoyed by all in the area.<br><br>Now it's just houses. |
| 55 | This survey is a shame. It ignores the fact that most people do not want the development at all. Remove this area from rushed and short-sighted development for the sake of our population and future generations. This is not progress for the city. |
| 56 | This region should be a neighborhood. We need thoughtfully planned housing in already serviced areas, not fast-tracked development in rare wilderness. It is most valuable as a place for people to connect with the outdoors and as a wildlife corridor |
| 57 | This question is insane. I'd tell my friend how the City allowed a (what should have been) protected wilderness area to be trampled for sprawling suburban crap. Also your options below are nuts. |
| 58 | This neighbourhood features homes for millions of native plants and animals. Housing is as diverse as the creatures that enjoy this important slice of nearby nature: soil, the hollows of old spruce and hemlock trees, the clear water of an open lake. |
| 59 | This neighborhood repurposed an industrial quarry into a beautiful neighborhood that restored an ecosystem that promoted a sustainable neighborhood in our city. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 60 | this neighborhood destroyed an amazing nature sanctuary that will never be revived because we had to build houses. These lakes were once full of fish, birds, and an amazing place to get away from the city. |
| 61 | This location is an established provincial park. No housing has been built-we stopped the environmentally destructive urban sprawl. We strengthened and grew our existing neighborhoods, built up the core & protected what wild spaces we have left. |
| 62 | This land was owned by the ppl of Nova Scotia and used weekly-by weekly by myself and many other friends of mine. Until it was sold by a weak boneless government to developers who could care less about the poor or anyone in any community, only money |
| 63 | This is the location of a large urban park where the wilderness and lakes area has been preserved. Traffic and congestion do not exist. |
| 64 | This is promised land. How is it even being considered to build on? |
| 65 | This is probably one of the worst planned destructions of our precious wild spaces ever conceived. |
| 66 | This is a well designed affordable neighborhood close to the City with an abundance of recreational use trails for walking and cycling. Schools P-12. Easy access to efficient, public transportation. A great place to raise your family! |
| 67 | This exceptional near-urban wilderness is protected, in perpetuity, and development is concentrated in already-developed communities and neighborhoods.<br>BMBCL is a rare gem that HRM needs to properly value and protect. |
| 68 | This development should never have happened. The lakes, forests, wetlands destroyed are necessary buffer for the mainland moose habitat, an endangered species (noise, lights effects). They are wildlife corridor, stabilize water table, water supply. |
| 69 | -Variety of housing types<br>-Amenities such as parks, shops, services, schools, etc<br>-Well connected to Clayton Park West with minimum 1 cross-highway connection to Parkland (near Farnham Gate). Possibly include on/off ramps with Hwy 102 |
| 70 | this development is unacceptable. It overlaps with the ideal boundary for our future national urban park and ignores sensitive waterways and ecosystems. |
| 71 | This development encroached to far into the wilderness area and has changed the ecosystem forever. It's unfortunate that better planning and consultation had not taken place. |
| 72 | This corrupt and for profit. Tim & Andy should be ashamed of themselves. This is for profit and not for the people. |
| 73 | This assumes that there is going to be development in that area.<br>In 20 years, the highway will be 6 or 8 lanes wide to facilitate transportation needs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 74 | This area was meant to be designated as park land, and as a national park it would have far more value that stuffing more houses into an area already high-density area with insufficient infrastructure. 250 characters not enuf to answer all these. |
| 75 | This area should stay as parkland to enjoy nature in an area that is losing that nature feel |
| 76 | This area should be preserved in its nature state and form [art of proposed national urban park. |
| 77 | This area should be part of the future national urban park. There are others areas for development. Those who came before us had the foresight to set aside places like Point Pleasant Park. This is our opportunity to leave a legacy for future generations |
| 78 | This area should be designed to attract out door enthusiasts that want to hike, mountain bike etc. with minimal space needs but access to out door and community features. Rapid public transit to the waterfront is key to avoid congestion. |
| 79 | This area once was a large area of significant ecological value. Unnecessary urban sprawl in a flood plain, crucial wildlife corridors cut off; increased traffic congestion. This survey is a joke. No meaningful engagement |
| 80 | This area must first be planned in relation to the regional/urban park and wilderness area needs before development planning occurs. Those lakes need a natural buffer from development and formal protection compatible with low impact human use. |
| 81 | This area is the largest and most diverse urban park in Canada and we can canoe, hike and camp in true wilderness the preserves wildlife corridors, watersheds, and sensitively built trails, allowing one side of to communicate with the other side, |
| 82 | This area is great because of the surrounding nature. Lots of beautiful hiking trails in the new urban national park! |
| 83 | This area is connected to transit and has spots that provide entrance into blue mountain birch cove park, that is set up more like point pleasant park. |
| 84 | This area is already experiencing extreme challenges with over population and the ability to get around the city. More importantly, protect ecological area and do not build. |
| 85 | This area is a traditional trapping grounds for mi'maki , HRM did an excellent job in preserving this area as a wild spa and provincial park, they planned to develop it but we decided it was unfit for development and better left protected. |
| 86 | These are some of HRM’s most ecologically important spaces. Extending services is expensive. We can add housing, but needs to be where services already exist. Need full environmental assessments. Remove the SPA, and protect area for park expansion. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 87 | There’s mixed housing, specifically low rise apartments. There is lots of green space, walking trails. It’s a walkable neighbourhood with amenities like grocery, convenience stores, cafes, accessible transit, a community centre, perhaps a bar |
| 88 | There’s a beautiful piece of woods working as a buffer between the 102 and the national park. Thankfully the province didn’t develop it creating an insane amount of sprawl and infrastructure costs. |
| 89 | There's no housing because the HRM/province had the foresight to not bulldoze a forest to put a development to fit nearly the population of Truro right next to an important wildlife corridor/wilderness area and beloved local recreation space. |
| 90 | There's a unique National Urban Park in Halifax! The city and province were wise enough to realize the true potential of this natural gift. What amazing international tourist potential! By restricting developments, they protected this wilderness |
| 91 | There's a beautiful park and greenspace dedicated to protecting the wildlife around. They've preserved the tree growth and the waterways, and the trails are kept clean. There's no houses too close to the lake so it still feels like a natural space. |
| 92 | There would be no new neighborhood and the entire area is protected for wildlife and the urban park. |
| 93 | There will be lots of housing as that’s all there will be, don’t plan on driving anywhere as there will be no update on road infrastructure at all as there is zero now and what public spaces and no consideration to the environment, a total disaster |
| 94 | there shouldn't be a new neighborhood here. this land needs to be protected from the likes of politicians and developers<br><br>Maybe you should actually listen to what the public is saying about this area and get your head out of your ..... |
| 95 | There should be NO development in this area until the fire trap that is the HP road and Larry Uteck are addressed. I have lived in the area for almost 20 years. Schools are bursting, traffic is horrific and property taxes continue to increase. |
| 96 | There should be no community built here<br>It should remain a urban park<br>There is lots of available land in hrm to build new high density housing. |
| 97 | There is no new neighbourhood or highway in the Birch Cove/Blue Mountain Wilderness Area. The wilderness area’s forests and wetlands have been stewarded and preserved, valuable ecosystem services and recreation will continue for future generations. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 98 | There is no new neighbourhood in my vision. Assuming there has to be for the sake of the question, housing would be ACTUALLY low-cost. It is ensured the BMBCL area is well protected (e.g. wetlands, very well managed runoff from development, etc). |
| 99 | There is no new neighbourhood because the citizens want and need a National Urban park to provide recreation, provide a habitat for wildlife and unique habitats, a corridor for the movement of wildlife and relief from unmitigated urban sprawl |
| 100 | There is no neighborhood because the province recognizes the value of wild areas and has slowed our unmanageable population growth |
| 101 | There is a national urban park. |
| 102 | There is a beautiful wildlife conservation just outside the city. Untouched and naturally shaped. Lots of trails available for the surrounding communities and shared lake access |
| 103 | There is a beautiful urban park in this area. |
| 104 | There is a 500m buffer around all watercourses. There are no lawns, trees were saved or planted instead, so the area has a great cottagey-forest feel to it. There are lots of trails throughout built in interconnected treed corridors |
| 105 | There are sound dampeners lining both sides of the Highway, in order to protect both the Clayton Park neighborhoods, and the new proposed area. The new area is entirely walkable urban density akin to Copenhagen/Amsterdam/Montreal/Vancouver. |
| 106 | There are proper environmental impact studies and assessments done & published to the public before ground breaks. If there is any housing, it is mix-use and properly affordable, set within the current USB. Forest and nature is abundant and untouched |
| 107 | There are multiple entries and exits in the area so everyone isn't bottlenecked during peak travel times. There is still green spaces and it's safe and easy to travel to and from regardless if you bike, walk or drive. Affordable homes/apartments. |
| 108 | There are large, well maintained public park spaces and trails. There is still some slightly wild forest with trails throughout. Mostly low rise apartments and smaller streets with few lanes, but with bus and bike lanes throughout. |
| 109 | The wooded housing lots, parks and trails and quiet (no highway noise pollution) were major selling features to me, and the reason I stay in the community.<br>Preserving those is critical to enjoyment of my property and the community.<br>Improve transit! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 110 | The wilderness has been preserved while giving us an exclusive racquet facility with ample parking, set far away from low density homes, that can host world class events featuring Squash, Tennis, and Pickleball, valuing our economy. Car and bus access |
| 111 | The wilderness area is beautiful and accessible. |
| 112 | The Urban park is an opportunity for Halifax to protect this valuable natural space where we can walk , hike, canoe and get away from the City. We need to not rush on development until the Urban park is established and environmental impact assessed. |
| 113 | The untouched lake and woodland areas are important ecologically and socially to the entire area. There is already congestion on roads and in area schools. Adding tens of thousands of people will be harmful to the environment and current residents. |
| 114 | The space should remain as is - a natural area of the city. It should not be paved over for development. The last thing this city needs is more urban sprawl and car dependent neighborhoods. |
| 115 | The ruggedness of the natural terrain has been preserved by building less high rise apartments and residential buildings with zero architectural features fitting the landscape. Wide boulevards provide for space along access corridors |
| 116 | The quality of the street trees and parks. There is dense single family homes and townhouses along side some high density apartment. A mix of families, young adults and elderly |
| 117 | The Province and HRM has failed to reserve a ROW connecting the 103 to the 101 for a Halifax Bypass. All future development would reserve the corridor. It would only take an afternoon to do a rough design including a double width for flexibility. |
| 118 | The outdoors shouldn't be restricted to drivers, and BM/BC is the only place accessible by transit where someone can have an immersive outdoors experience. With reductions in provincial budgets, why build unnecessary infrastructure? Leave it alone. |
| 119 | The only people who win when a spineless corrupt government sells public land owned by tax payers is the developers. We lost all this land because of corporate greed and behind the back deals made between government officials & developers. Sad, ugly |
| 120 | The new neighbourhood is compatible with the values of the urban National Park. I use the trails on a regular basis. I can take the bus to get there. Its accessible to people with disabilities. Seating areas are scattered across the area. |
| 121 | The new neighbourhood has affordable housing and green spaces. Transit options are available to connect the area to other parts of HRM without depending on cars. |
| 122 | The neighbourhood was created with service provision in mind. They built a school to accommodate the influx of residents, there’s lots of green spaces throughout and the skyline hasn’t changed that much |

| | |
|---|---|
| 123 | The neighbourhood is a protected urban national park! |
| 124 | The natural forest habitat |
| 125 | The natural environment stands out, conserved as Provincial Wilderness Area and National Urban Park, with ecological corridors connecting them to natural areas beyond the site. Travel is limited to active transportation on carefully sited pathways. |
| 126 | The natural beauty stands out the most, the housing available is amazing the moss is soft and you can pitch your tent anywhere. Moving through the area is like is like going back in time, the trails are easy to follow and lead to beautiful lakes. |
| 127 | The natural beauty of one of the largest and best managed urban natural spaces in the country providing physical and mental health benefits to the residents of HRM. No new developments harming these values at all. |
| 128 | The national urban park should be established before any development. The land that overlaps with the conceptual park boundary should be incorporated into the current national urban park planning process. |
| 129 | The most amazing thing about this area is the protected Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wildlife area that has been protected from development. No other city in Canada can boast about an urban wildlife park right in the city. |
| 130 | The main asset of this area is the urban park, providing natural environment with clean air, trails, trees, birds. Not enough green space in Halifax. In 2025 government and the community had great foresight to protect this land. |
| 131 | The lands remain wooded. Backcountry & canoe camp sites are scattered through into the wilderness lands to the south.<br><br>A bustling entry point offers canoe and kayak rentals & car camping.<br><br>The City is an equal partner with Parks Canada. |
| 132 | The land needs to be protected. No development should take place or be approved at least until the federal government approves our national urban park. Such a park would bring in far more money for the province than a housing development would. |
| 133 | The land is as it is, until the ongoing tangle about LRT is resolved. |
| 134 | The lake and parks have been protected, there are bike lanes, better transit & community housing |
| 135 | The key features would be the untouched forests and lakes. No housing, but camping sites. I would say how corporate greed wanted to ruin the land with no indigenous consultation, but people realized how this would negatively impact our health |

| | |
|---|---|
| 136 | The key features that stand out in 20 years are that the wilderness and wetland areas remain undeveloped. This area should not be expanded for travel and housing. |
| 137 | The key features that stand out are that it is built in consideration of the Blue Mountain - Birch Cove national park and respects the boundaries and sanctity of this park. |
| 138 | The intact wilderness so near the city center is a boon for locals and tourists alike |
| 139 | The hiking, trial running, canoeing, camping, lakes, and peaceful nature preserve. |
| 140 | The hiking trails are the major draw for me as the key feature of this area. The natural habitats for wildlife and vegetation would be destroyed by the proposed development as well. I would tell my friends that the development is a mistake. |
| 141 | The high density buildings have saved the forests and lakes, which are magnificent. Traffic on the 102 and Bayers lake shopping Centre are horrible, especially since the 102-103 connecting road was built. The 102 is like the 401 in Toronto! |
| 142 | The high concentration of apts means the streets are clogged with cars, getting around the area is a nightmare and the infrastructure (HWY 102) is overwhelmed. I wish 20 years ago the developers were given approval for 50% of what was approved. |
| 143 | The Hammonds plains road, the Kearney lake road, the Dunbrack, as well as all other roads into the city cannot hold the traffic. What about underground tunnels? Like Boston? |
| 144 | The government listened to the community and the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National Urban Park was finally created and expanded to is full potential with the purchase of lands from the Annapolis Group. |
| 145 | The future I envision for this land is to be untouched and left alone. There are invaluable wetlands here that filter our air and water. No human made technology can replace the filtration and carbon sequestration that wetlands provide. |
| 146 | The forest is healthy. There are NO houses or apartments or businesses in the area because the decision was made to protect these beautiful lands for future generations. Smart people decided to massively increase density in already developed areas. |
| 147 | The development needs to be done in a way that enhances, preserves and supports the nature in the area with less encroachment on the lakes, wet lands and park boundaries. The currently planned density appears excessive. |
| 148 | The community should respect the environment. The birch cover wilderness area should not be impacted and development should prioritize transit, community gardens etc. Native plants should be used in the landscaping and lawns should be limited. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 149 | The community has been built with accessibility, growth, and safety in mind. Streets are all 2 lanes to accommodate traffic, there are sidewalks on both sides of the road, and there are 2 exits from the highway. It has parks, and its own schools. |
| 150 | The city finally honoured its commitment to the people of Halifax and purchased the land adjacent to the Birch Cove lakes for the Wilderness Park, so the lakes themselves would remain pristine without contamination from developing that land. |
| 151 | The changes in this area were made based on solid and independently verified environmental assessments that ensured full protection of wilderness areas. They [unclear] access to wild nature as a major driver for wellbeing. |
| 152 | The Blue Mountain BirchCove area is incredibly valuable to our city and province as an easily accessible recreation area. The potential for hiking trails and canoe routes in this area is incredible. I would love to see this become more accessible. |
| 153 | The Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes national urban park is easily accessible by bus and bicycle from downtown Halifax for everybody to enjoy. |
| 154 | The area will include massive housing development including high-rise apartments interspersed with small pockets of parkland and small lakes. Wildlife will be virtually non-existent; waterways and lakes will be polluted as a result of street run-off |
| 155 | The area was never developed for housing and commercial. The province & HRM realized that the lands held values that have been recognized for the last 70 years and needed to be saved for multi-use recreation for all age groups. |
| 156 | The area was an undeveloped area with a rock quarry and access to lakes for fishing within the blue mountain wilderness parks. Area was clear cut and quarry owner expropriated from the land for urban sprawl. |
| 157 | The area should match the surrounding communities in aesthetic. It also should include retail and office space, with adequate evacuation routes available. The Parkland / Farnham Gate area is a good example. |
| 158 | The area remains undeveloped protecting the integrity of Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area which has become one of Canadas first National Urban Parks. This protects water quality, animal habitat, and ecological and recreational value. |
| 159 | The area remains an urban park with no development |
| 160 | The area remains a protected wildness park with access to trails for the already existing community. We do not need to build more generic suburban streets, just density the existing Halifax area. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 161 | The area is restored, preserved wildlife corridor & watershed ecosystem. Set back from the waterways would be affordable high-density housing, Transit connections, a school, recreational parks & essential businesses (grocery stores, medical clinics) |
| 162 | The area is now part of the BMBCL National Urban Park. The environment is protected for the future, for ecological integrity, for climate resilience, and for people to connect to nature. |
| 163 | The area has remained intact as a natural park, focused on low impact recreation and education. The only development is a trail system, washrooms, nature centre, and limited parking. The area is accessible by bus. |
| 164 | The area has been protected from development and is part of BMBCL Regional and National park. |
| 165 | The area closest to lakes to be house free and public. These are special places for people's mental health, and wildlife. Any development in the region should be affordable and maximize the number of people who can enjoy the space. No mansions. |
| 166 | The animal and fish habitat is maintained. Large forested areas remain. Plenty of public transportation options, high density housing with 3 bedroom apartments. |
| 167 | The ability for thousands of haligonians to go for a hike in the forest without first travelling by car or bus. |
| 168 | The 102 west corridor is a neighborhood that borders a large urban park owned and operated by Parks Canada similar to Rouge National Urban Park. 1, Washmill Heights; stately brick townhouses. 2, Lacewood North; high rises (20-10) w/ townhouses. |
| 169 | That we were smart and in advance of agreeing to this project we created a new hospital, several more health facilities including doctors/NP offices taking new patients and added more EMS services including hiring full time Fire/Ambulance and Police. |
| 170 | That we still have a park with green space and lakes to fish in. A place that has endangered flowers like lady slippers triums and other flowers. |
| 171 | That this was a huge mistake not to keep this land in the National Urban Park that previous HRM staffers have voted for. To take a bended knee to Tim Houston's current government was the worst mistake HRM could have made. Shame on you. |
| 172 | That this ruined the community. It already takes 1 hr to commute less than 10 km into the city centre. Adding more housing without FIRST upgrading infrastructure is ridiculous |
| 173 | That this area was once thought to be the access point for the proposed National Urban Park. Too bad, so sad in a city that calls itself the City of Trees! |
| 174 | That this a beautiful natural space that has been protected from development. It is a provincial or national park. The animals that live here are protected and so is there habitat. People can enjoy this nature. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 175 | That there was a proposed development in this area, but that the powers that be made the difficult but right decision to instead preserve the incredibly important ecological natural environment, and to further protect this land for years to come. |
| 176 | That the boundaries of this development overlapped with the ideal should have been our natural urban park. The traffic's already terrible. The government also did not consider the environmental impacts of this development in their decision making. |
| 177 | That the area used to be nature, places we came to as kids to swim and hike, but city planners threw in some houses and buildings adding to this over-populated congested city, with little thought to transit issues and now all traffic is deadlocked. |
| 178 | That a beautiful natural area used to exist here, with wildlife corridors and open natural space that was used for hiking, swimming and connecting with nature. I would say this new neighbourhood caused significantly more traffic in the area. |
| 179 | Thanks to our collective protesting of development in this area 20 years ago, now everyone can enjoy this protected national urban park full of nature & tranquility to which is critically important to Protect Forever. We Need Nature To Survive. |
| 180 | Sustainable mixed income and mixed density neighbourhood with office and commercial. Similar to Larry Uteck (but better!?) |
| 181 | Sustainable design that creates an active community. Design a community around an active lifestyle, and everyone benefits. Multi use lanes, green spaces, parks. |
| 182 | Strong connection to public transit<br>Highly walkable<br>Mixed use buildings<br>High percentage mix of public green space which is designed to be desirable to spend time in<br>No Box stores<br>No large parking lots<br>Local school<br>Community centre |
| 183 | Stay as far away from the lakes as possible please!!!! Minimize impact to surrounding nature in as many ways as possible |
| 184 | Stand out: Green spaces, natural beauty, sustainable and affordable housing that isnt bulldozing a national urban park<br>Traveling by bus ferry and occasional private car<br>I would like to be able to tell my friends about halifaxs new national urban park |

| | |
|---|---|
| 185 | Space for wildlife, hiking trails, buffer zone |
| 186 | Something like the Parks of Lake Charles would be great! |
| 187 | So, this survey supposes that there is no vision in which the development does not take place. I would expect that, if it does take place at all, a person could only be proud IF the development did NOT overlap with the proposed BMBCL Urban Park. |
| 188 | So grateful this area has been conserved for nature. I hike here all the time. Natural areas close to the city core is what makes Halifax the best city. |
| 189 | single family homes, duplex, row housing and some multi level buildings along highway blocking higway noise. Nature trails in wooded areas and lakes. Exit off 102 to community, Great location. A variety of price points for housing within community |
| 190 | Single family homes on large lots, low density. Preservation of all wildlife areas, significant increase in traffic infrastructure to support any additional housing |
| 191 | Sing family detached housing. Tree cutting restrictions. Shoreline protection. Walking trails. Access from bayers lake and Kearney lake. |
| 192 | Sinful, unhealthy physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually! There will be no green space left. More traffic issues |
| 193 | Silence greets us as this area is now devoid of all life. It used to be a beautiful life filled habitat full of native flora and fauna but has been destroyed by development and greed. No longer a lush forest- only emptiness, empty housing & highway. |
| 194 | Should be a master planned community with paved or concrete walking and bike trails with areas set aside to have natural looking ponds. Above all else a clear traffic infrastructure that minimizes congestion and avoids putting in stupid speed bumps. |
| 195 | Shame they built this neighborhood there was a truly one of a kind wilderness area here but the short sightnedess of our government at the time allowed this to be parcelled to developers that built these underbuilt cookie cuts. |
| 196 | Sandy lake still is there and allow family to sun bath and skate in winter |
| 197 | Safer Bus Stops that can be used in winter. No bike lanes that only can be used for maximum 6 months.Trees should not be planted on sidewalks.they must be planted by the edge of the sidewalks. |
| 198 | Safe/affordable housing - buildings with mixed rental incomes, i.e. not all low-income, and certainly not all middle-income. Community shops/businesses. Integrated and accessible wild spaces for wildlife and humans - flora and fauna. Eco everything! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 199 | Safe for walking and lots of green spaces for people to enjoy. Parks and a splash pad for children. Preservation of the natural environment to the greatest extent possible. A walkable neighbourhood with access to dining and shops on foot. |
| 200 | Rapid transit no cars Lotz of greenery and wildlife to explore |
| 201 | Quiet community of 3-bed, 2-bath single homes on larger lots with privacy, separate garages and cars only, no bike lanes. Clean streets with underground wires, sidewalks, nature trails, playgrounds, tennis courts, ball field and winter skating rink. |
| 202 | Quiet area with minimal housing. Lots of trees and natural space. Travel through the back end of any development closer to the back end of Bear Lake. There is too much traffic going into Bear Lake and on that highway as it is. |
| 203 | Public transit, reliably on time with frequent trips per day, connect to other parts of HRM<br>Public green spaces, designed for all age groups-shade, play equipment, frequent benches for resting seniors or disabled, variety of path surfaces, |
| 204 | public transit in the area should be trains of some sort above ground level<br>all buildings should have renewable energy and be off grid<br>bike lanes that are separate from traffic lanes.intersections in the city now are trying to serve too many users |
| 205 | Public feedback saved the area for the National Urban Park, let's go for a hike. |
| 206 | Protecting tracts of wilderness such as the blue mountain birch cove, potential urban National park, is of the utmost importance. Housing can be gained through increasing density which better uses existing infrastructure.<br><br>Do not develop this area. |
| 207 | protected wilderness area remains |
| 208 | Protected wild corridor in the city |
| 209 | Protect the existing nature |
| 210 | Proposed wilderness area the priority -why build more urban sprawl? Not sufficient public transit for existing communities -Apartment developments don’t generate the revenue for the r’qrd services! Maximize what we have, not bulldoze more wilderness. |
| 211 | Properly curated parks versus wilderness that’s not accessible to all. Development that has people using the wilderness. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 212 | Proper planning and infrastructure needed. Build infrastructure first!<br>Schools should be in walking distance of community served (alot of schools in industrial areas???) - so many cities do better planning -underground power lines! |
| 213 | Pristine wilderness. The trails are not just gravel paths. Trail and lake users are respectful. There is accessibility to the trails and lakes which aren't cut off by homes like in Glen Arbour or Dartmouth where access is limited to a few spots. |
| 214 | Preservation of the natural environment for use in the future |
| 215 | Preservation of the adjacent wilderness lands have been prioritized, especially Susies Lake, with a wide belt of parkland and minimal housing, mainly remediation of the old quarry lands to provide medium scale social and affordable housing. |
| 216 | Prefer no housing in this area.<br>Travel on the Halifax peninsula by bicycle and on foot. Car and bus occasional.<br>Invitation to enjoy green spaces in HRM like a National Park: Blue Mountain-Birch Cove.<br>Need a full environmental study. |
| 217 | Population density should be matched with available, sustainable and healthy green spaces.<br>Walking and biking trails. Along with less accessible wilderness areas we have protected for wildlife and the adventurous.<br>development regulations with teeth! |
| 218 | Please leave as it is. I would love to be able to tell friends about the beautiful urban park they can use close to home. |
| 219 | Please honour pact keep vital urban parks<br>Climate change  kept at bay by trees, widerness<br>Nature needs space to live Will windy, barren, flooded hrm be our legacy<br>Once goneno going back<br>Stop taking away our natural disaster mediators<br>Leave nature alone! |
| 220 | Please do not develop the blue mountain Birch Cove lake area. Leave it as a hiking, biking and swimming area for the public to enjoy as a park. |
| 221 | Parks, public space and accessible transit. There is so much traffic in this area already which is affecting the quality of life of people living, working and passing through the area! We need to be sustainable and not increase urban sprawl & traffic |

| | |
|---|---|
| 222 | Parks and hiking trails…schools…access to&from communities…medical and pharmacy locations…bus/train services…SPACE.affordable…pubs, restaurants and coffee shops…walkability..lake access and environmental protections.PARKING.green spaces/benches |
| 223 | own schools with grades pp-12. Its own mini fire dept. A mini police dept. small businesses of restaurants . Small gov. offices. green parks with trees. A soccer pitch ,bball courts., walking trails or track. A community centre. MANY road accesses . |
| 224 | Oh wow, I'm glad they didn't build all those houses without proper thought to active transportation and infrastructure. For years we saw developments in this area where no real infrastructure was developed before they crammed in more people and cars. |
| 225 | Not sure |
| 226 | Not a sole speaks English and the natives got illegal spoke and weed shops |
| 227 | None of this land should be developed. It has always been meant to be an urban park and this area cannot sustain more people as the infrastructure is already well over capacity. There are many sensitive and important ecological sites within this area |
| 228 | None of the houses or lands shall be purchased by foreign owned corporations. Canadian land for Canadians only. |
| 229 | None of the current wilderness area would be developed. If any remaining area was developed it would be affordable housing such as small apartment building and townhouses. Also small bungalows and single family homes that are affordable. Soccer field |
| 230 | None It is abutting a sensitive ecosystem and cutting off a valuable wildlife corridor. It will contribute to suburban sprawl It is not in the interest of the environment or those in need of housing - which should be centrally located and affordable. |
| 231 | No new neighbourhood or connector road built. Protected Urban Park, wildlife corridor, mitigates flooding, nurtures peoples wellbeing. We travel via a trails, walk/bike/scooter. Limit cars on Peninsula, Efficient, continuous public transport. |
| 232 | No neighbourhood has been built. Instead we've protected the environment in this area. Green spaces and clean water remain and we have not encouraged the overpopulation of our province. |
| 233 | No housing. No highways. Just beautiful unspoilt wilderness teaming with nature. We must not continue to destroy nature so property developers can profit. |
| 234 | No housing has been built within the now officially designated provincial park. We've stopped the environmentally devastating urban sprawl. There's no more outlying "new communities" disconnected from the core. We use the urban centre and build UP. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 235 | no housing and remains a crucial habitat for species. riparian areas are crucial for a healthy ecosystem and this will help mitigate flooding. |
| 236 | No housing and community are there - It's part of a vibrant Urban National Park which has a well used trail system, canoe portages, and community access. Developing these lands as a housing development is a waste of this natural resource. |
| 237 | No homes. This should be an urban park. Not only would this preserve the natural environment, but also bring a tourism boom and a national/maritimes treasure. |
| 238 | No development. Save our beautiful outdoor space full of wildlife, trees and natural open space. Development will impact water quality, water ecosystems and disrupt wildlife |
| 239 | NO DEVELOPMENT! This is pristine wilderness that should be protected at all costs. Halifax is rapidly losing its lush ecosystems that once made it so unique. Once this area is developed and disturbed, no amount of restoration can repair the damage. |
| 240 | no development, easy |
| 241 | No development took place in this area before the establishment of the National Urban Wilderness Park. The Annapolis Group lands have not been developed.<br>Any develop that has taken place has been in area owned by B.D Stevens. |
| 242 | neighborhood should respect the environment and maintain a large amount of Greenspace. Affordable Single family homes/few apartment complexes available. Travel accessible by car, transit, biking walking. Ideally, a trail connected to bayers lake |
| 243 | Nature is accessible. Wildlife is allowed to live.<br>Low income housing is available (not monster houses in former natural areas.<br>Public transit is available, efficient and affordable…and private vehicle use is discouraged |
| 244 | Na |
| 245 | My vision would be of an area that is left natural since it will be adjoining an awesome national urban park that is under Parks Canada. People will have a place of natural beauty to enjoy. Wildlife will have a place to call their own. |
| 246 | My vision of the area in 20 years is as it is now. An easily accessible, peaceful, and beautiful area showcasing the best of Nova Scotia while still in Halifax. I will have built more memories there with my family, my friends, and their families. |
| 247 | My vision is that this land is part of the proposed urban national park and that the Annapolis proposal in particular is not built. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 248 | My vision is NO highrise buildings to overshadow the NUP. Lower density is a must, many small neighbourhood parks are needed. This is bigger than Turuo with 0 amenities. I want low density, mixed housing & affordable homes for families. NOT 100% apts. |
| 249 | My grandchildren and I regularly i.e. twice a week go hiking in this beautiful and unique urban wilderness area. We are so blessed to have this space within city limits. Our family and friends can connect to nature, breath clean air. |
| 250 | multi-generational housing accessible to low- and middle-income households; well-managed green spaces for walking and recreation; easy connections via public transportation; accessible services for daily needs |
| 251 | More roads to get out of Bedford and Hammonds plains. Highway double the size. There should be no stopping on the highway, exits and entries should be long enough to merge safely with out anyone having to stop. Another highschool in this area |
| 252 | Mixed housing types, high quality access to lakes, mix of walkable retail and institutional (schools, rec centres, ice rink). |
| 253 | Mixed housing is available in this area. Nice walking paths to enjoy nature and gathering spaces for family to spend quality time outside. |
| 254 | Mixed housing for all ages & stages including a focus on options for seniors.<br>Services that support community continuity & contribute to creating a unique distinct 'hood.<br>LOTS of trees & areas left in their naturalized state<br>Safe walking paths/trails |
| 255 | Mix of single family, townhouse, and low rise homes. Public green space and fields for sports and leisure. Connections made to the nearby wilderness trails. Transport by foot/bike for local activities, high capacity vehicle connections to highways. |
| 256 | Mix of housing, low rise apartments and town houses, no housing on the lakes, public access all around all the lakes. Trails for hiking, parks and fields for kids to play, ways for kids to safely cycle and walk to school |
| 257 | Missing middle housing; active transportation that connects to a network of parks and green space. An extensive riparian buffer areas offers sustained foraging opportunities and a well connected trail system for recreation. |
| 258 | Medium or high density residential! This is a no-brainer being next to a major corridor to the city - it would be easy to service with rapid transit. A community facility for child care, health+fitness, and a general third space would stand out. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 259 | Many people worked hard to save this lovely area and the associated lakes from development. Urban development continued in areas where there was already housing but urban sprawl was slowed and Birch Cove wilderness area was expanded. |
| 260 | MAINTAIN THE PARK BOUNDARIES. MAINTAIN THE FOREST AND NATURAL HABITAT. PROTECT THE NATURAL LANDSCAPE AND WILDLIFE. CLEAN WATER. |
| 261 | Low density "missing middle "housing types to encourage young families. This would reduce traffic and infrastructure concerns. It would also improve birthrate which is critically low. |
| 262 | Lots of parks, a splash pad, mix housing, enough parking for 2 cars per family - stop putting houses without parking aka a big enough drive - multiple accesses in and out |
| 263 | Lots of budget friendly apartments |
| 264 | Look. We told them to build the school first. But no they cut down all the trees and crammed in 19000 more people. Did that developer from New York really need more money. |
| 265 | Limited impingement to the untouched lakes and wilderness area |
| 266 | Lies of green corridors, low density, affordable homes.  Parks and schools |
| 267 | Lets enjoy easy access to the National Urban Park, rent a canoe to paddle on the Birch Cove Lakes. We saved this area as the province removed it  from the Fast Track SPA inventory. Home to loons and other species at risk & easy access to nature! |
| 268 | Leave it as park land and develop in better areas. |
| 269 | Leave it alone, natural and wild - not some urban park. No infrastructure to support this development and it should be protected wilderness to support well being. |
| 270 | Leave existing wildness area in place. |
| 271 | Larger yards with space between houses. Communities directed towards families with schools and playgrounds. Lots of trees, hiking trails and space that gives the area a feeling of being outside the city. A community that kept some nature intact. |
| 272 | Large, wooded lots with 25' between houses. Driveways large enough for multiple cars so none are on streets. No building taller than 3 stories with no more than 100 units. 150' of protected land around all bodies of water and water ways. School. |
| 273 | Large set backs from the lakes and water courses. The quarry lands (Steves Group) were turned into medium & high density with a 15 minute city design w/active and mass transportation corridors. Thankfully, the Annapolis group lands were expropriated. |
| 274 | Large lot homes and apartments.  Boulevard streets with mix of cars, bikes and buses.  Brand new Ice arenas, with walking tracks, gym, community spaces. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 275 | Large green spaces;to be able to move around the community easily without a lot of congestion. Lakes and trails to be left in their most natural state possible and for animals and the natural environment to flourish. Water sheds are intact. |
| 276 | Keeping the wilderness area as a wilderness area for animals to thrive in a habitat big enough for them. |
| 277 | Keep lots of green areas and lots multie use trails and parks. Dogs parks, pickle ball courts etc…<br>Lots of bike trails… |
| 278 | ITS ALL PROTECTED LAND AND THE DEVELOPERS CHOOSE somewhere else that supported it better and was not as damaging- |
| 279 | It’s still a pristine wilderness park that we can enjoy for hikes swimming and camping |
| 280 | It’s known for: proximity to protected park land; spaces for people to gather outdoors with tree cover; decisions driven by a stewardship of native species; its walkable; there is restrictions on opportunities for monopolized retailers or chains. |
| 281 | It’s a huge green space that hosts small housing/ few apartments and encourages outdoor activities! There is more green space than housing! |
| 282 | It's walkable with local shops, low density near the wilderness areas with single family and parks, higher density close to the highway.<br><br>I'm extremely concerned about the loss of wilderness spaces. It's part of what makes Halifax a special place. |
| 283 | It's exactly how it appears today: pristine wilderness that can be enjoyed by every hiker, birder, paddler, camper, mountain biker, and person who wants to experience good mental health. There is no development. Development ruins the environment. |
| 284 | It's critical that in 20 years, what I'm telling my friend ISN'T "Back in the day, here stood the most beautiful & irreplaceable woods, trails, lakes that gave Haligonians a vital link to nature, and we gave it all up because we were shortsighted." |
| 285 | It's a beautiful green space in the heart of the city where anyone can access, with groomed walkways, and public washrooms. The city was very forward thinking, making certain that in spite of expansion, there would always be a connection to the wild. |
| 286 | It would be extremely unfortunate if we destroy this natural habitat. This should all be part of the Birch Cove Blue Mountain Wilderness area. This city does not need more urban sprawl. We have something special with a wild space close to the city |

| | |
|---|---|
| 287 | It should look like an urban Montreal neighborhood, or like Vancouver next to Stanley Park! You should be able to walk everywhere, and cars should need to park elsewhere and their drivers take a local tram into the neighborhood. |
| 288 | It is still active wetland and nature preserve. No building took place because of flooding risks to the neighborhood losing the natural marsh and lake systems. Also, infrastructure had nor been planned for (schools, traffic) so the site was abandoned |
| 289 | It is nice, not a cookie cutter of the cheap dense housing put up by developers at that time. It's a lot like old Clayton Park, lots of houses with nice properties, sidewalks, a few apartment buildings. |
| 290 | It is my hope that reason will prevail and no development will take place on the Annapolis group lands. The national urban park will be established and my children and grandchildren will enjoy this natural oasis for years to come. |
| 291 | It is horribly overcrowded and traffic is a nightmare. I remember how beautiful and clean those lakes around us were and now they are terribly polluted and devoid of life. |
| 292 | It is an undeveloped nature conservation area |
| 293 | It is a protected, natural area. Housing is built "up" in the centre of town to avoid sprawl and traffic.<br><br>Question 4 is ridiculous, as it does not offer this as an option. |
| 294 | It is a protected nature area, with trails and public access to nature. Nature is vitally important for our city snd community! Don't destroy a well used and loved nature reserve. |
| 295 | It is a desirable place to live with shops, restaurants, and easy access to a beautiful regional park. There is a mix of residences, including low rise apartments and affordable housing options. It is easy to access by bus. It does not damage nature. |
| 296 | Inter-connected woodland trails through subject area namely around lakes & connecting waterways + retention of unique forest areas. No housing should have direct access to water which should be publicly accessible. Neighbourhoods to include MUPs. |
| 297 | Infastructure needs to be upgraded before any construction happens |
| 298 | In twenty years my ideal vision is for this space to remain UNTOUCHED!! |
| 299 | In 20 yrs, I will continue to enjoy what the natural area provides, only now it is a National Urban Park! The trees, moss, lichen, birds+other wildlife will remain, as the decision to build homes was made more responsibly, in a more suitable location |
| 300 | In 20 years, we have an established national urban park. A park that has all the waterways, lakes and wetlands of today. I hope there is forests & access to canoe routes for everyone. NO to a town the size of Truro in/near the park boundary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 301 | In 20 years, I would tell my friends what should have happened to retain the beauty of the area. Once it is done, it can not be undone! |
| 302 | In 20 years, I would love to have more community based locations in this area (schools, clinics, small businesses, etc.) It would be nice to have access points to the lakes in the area, and other nature-based leisure points in the area too. |
| 303 | In 20 years, I hope to say Halifax protected its wild spaces, rejecting development that cost millions, threatened forests, waterways, and wildlife corridors. HRM kept nature intact and ensured everyone can reach a true wilderness refuge by city bus. |
| 304 | In 20 years there would be no major development there. This is a natural area that has been around forever and is one of the only connected to the city. I am seriously disappointed and worried about the cities planning efforts recently. |
| 305 | In 20 years I would be taking about how we protected these lands for our future generations and created one of the greatest urban parks in Canada. Well managed, and well protected. The Land and the water. |
| 306 | Improved infrastructure. That includes an overpass and also an additional entrance point to Bayer's Lake from HWY 102. |
| 307 | II would point out that housing was situated in brownfield areas elsewhere in the city. This area is a National Wilderness Park, the pride of our city. It provides a safe space for animals and plant species, and room for humans to enjoy it as well. |
| 308 | If this proposal goes ahead I envision worse traffic congestion, commuter issues, and disruption and decrease of natural areas. I would tell my friend not to move here. What makes this area a good place to live now will be lost. |
| 309 | If this development goes ahead I will move. This is a disaster of mega mistakes.<br>This land should be protected and not developed in anyway.<br>We need so many more schools, hospitals and commuting solutions before another neighborhood is planned. |
| 310 | If there was a new neighborhood in this planned area I would say there were no environmental surveys taken and the city of halifax destroyed a thriving wilderness area. |
| 311 | If primarily apartments - a stifling neighbourhood with two access points that are constrained by limited access and poor public transit abuting a busy highway. And hilly lake beach access hampered by runoff and algae blooms from manicured lanes. |
| 312 | If not enough parking is provided, the roads are wide enough to support parking. Bike lanes on the major roads. 20 year old trees lining the roads. Housing that is dense enough to make the roads worth it (unlike some development like kingswood). |

| | |
|---|---|
| 313 | If dev plans go through, I'd tell them that the traffic & congestion are a nightmare & avoid it. Housing but like a lot of areas in HRM, probably poorly planned with apts crammed together w/little transit opts & roads, especially if there's a fire. |
| 314 | If allowed to go ahead, the neighbourhood will look very similar to that currently along Parkland Drive. It will be a maze of roads, servicing a dense population of apartment buildings. No one else will be able to access the lakes or green space. |
| 315 | Ideally mixed housing, no highrises, lots of green space & recreation opportunities, medical services, schools, libraries, grocery stores, cafes, no big box stores, efficient transit services, including a fast transit system to anywhere in HRM. |
| 316 | Ideally I would like to see the Blue Mountain wilderness area transformed into a national park; to tour this theoretical friend around the natural wonders of Nova Scotia and marvel at how near it is to town would be wonderful. |
| 317 | I'm saddened to see our beautiful area that houses water systems wild life come that much closer to becoming a concrete jungle. We do not have the infrastructure to support all these new people. How will this affect future generations |
| 318 | I'm imagining a positive outcome, where the intersecting climate, biodiversity and social crises are taken seriously and addressed by city planners & policymakers in ways that protect the social & ecological integrity of the area. No more sprawl. |
| 319 | I'd say we have great walking trails and rapid transit to get around Halifax<br>Good shopping and eating options<br>Also it's a great place to live |
| 320 | I'd tell them how amazing it was 20 years ago but to move outside the city. All we have here is apartment buildings and no green spaces. No rec or community centre. Just CGC it's private so not affordable for many. Best to live away from here. |
| 321 | I would want to see a mix of high density housing/apartments, local businesses, public parks, and frequent transit. The area should stick to the "15 minute city" ethos. Additionally, environmental protection should be paramount in planning. |
| 322 | I would want to live in a community with outdoor walking trails, a rink, great schools with no outdoor classroom pods. Lots of cul-de-sacs. |
| 323 | I would tell them this land should not have been developed. It should have been protected with the rest of the BMBCL area and included in the urban national park. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 324 | I would tell them that this wildlife corridor and forest was threatened with development but the decision was made to leave it be and build livable housing on already existing developed land with existing transportation routes. |
| 325 | I would tell them that this area was a pristine.  It was meant to be an urban park but politicians took a the decision to develop it. Rather than a unique park suitable for all for year round sports, it was made available to only the privileged few. |
| 326 | I would tell them that it used to be a beautiful area but then 20 rears ago they put in a big, poorly planned, unnecessary neighbourhood and it caused havoc with respect to traffic and that it caused destruction of a beautiful wilderness area. |
| 327 | I would tell them I live in or adjacent to a nature reserve protected land. That I'm able to enjoy nature walks/hikes in an urban area. Key feature is solitude in an urban area, which promoted mental health and the overall well being of HRM citizens. |
| 328 | I would tell them how beautiful this corridor was but how the development has destroyed so many vital habitats for our animals and has caused so much congestion in travelling due the road infrastructures not keeping up with the building development. |
| 329 | I would tell them how beautiful the area used to be before it was destroyed by greedy developers and a shortsighted government. The new development has ruined the Birch Cove Blue Mountain Park, and it has made the 102 traffic a parking lot. |
| 330 | I would tell my friends the development was a colloidal mistake that has created nothing but issues and destroyed a beautiful, natural space. Those in charge should have had their heads examined before approving the project. |
| 331 | I would tell my friends how the city and province did the right thing and rejected completely the development of the stated section of land as part of amazing foresight into the importance of urban green spaces. That no development happened after all |
| 332 | I would tell my friends and family that it was vital for the municipality to maintain pristine and natural spaces and we are so lucky that it was left alone |
| 333 | I would tell my friend that this area used to be beautiful with untouched land teeming with wildlife until it was destroyed with the development of several houses and other structures and that not enough environmental considerations are ever made! |
| 334 | I would tell my friend that the decision to develop this land was disastrous to the environment, the ecosystem, the organisms that lost their homes and lives, and the well-being of humans due to the loss of the natural ecology here. |
| 335 | i would tell my friend that the decision makers aren't strategic and don't care about the environment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 336 | I would tell my friend that 20 years ago this area was in danger of being "developed" but thankfully saner heads prevailed and the natural beauty of this spot was saved for the enjoyment of generations to come. |
| 337 | I would tell my friend how vital the wilderness area is to have such easy access to nature near the city. |
| 338 | I would tell my friend how disappointed I am that our city prioritizes wealth and housing over valuable and utilized green spaces in the city. We do not need to tear down recreational land yet. There are other options. |
| 339 | I would tell me friend that there was once a connected green space in this area which was destroyed to build housing, when there were many other (already serviced with transit and infrastructure) pieces of land available for development. |
| 340 | I would talk about how Halifax and Nova Scotia were forward thinking and valued preserving natural landscape over short sighted development. There is dense, vertical housing. There are bus lanes. There is water to swim in and trails to walk on. |
| 341 | I would speak proudly of the national urban park and the fact that the park boundaries were respected. I would walk, bike, or drive to the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Park from home, and share in the environment with my daughter through hiking |
| 342 | I would see the area developed into a provincial or regional park, with some areas created for parking on the Lacewood and Kearney Lake ends of the area, with a mix of natural, gravel and bicycle commuting trails. The area would have zero houses. |
| 343 | I would say them that this used to be a beautiful forest area, where nature was protected but now is covered by a new unnecessary neighborhood with not affordable houses, the traffic is terrible, specially on weekends. |
| 344 | I would say that this area was once wilderness and it was a lost opportunity to protect it. |
| 345 | I would say that they wanted to destroy all this 20 years ago for a foolish and terribly thought out housing development. I would show them the old growth trees that litter the area, the wildlife, the best fishing spots on each lake. |
| 346 | I would say that at the planning, both the developer and the governments threw out all concerns from local residents and went ahead with this disaster of a development (can’t call this a community). Increased congestion, pollution, inc greenhouse gas |
| 347 | I would say I opposed it from the beginning. I will note lack of transportation infrastructure in place when the development was built; roads/highways in the area are already over-burdened; it impacts on a sensitive environment that we should protect |

| | |
|---|---|
| 348 | I would say I am grateful that the plan to develop this area did not go ahead and the land is still the beautiful natural destination that it's been for generations. If developed, I'd say the leaders who approved that are infamous for bad judgment. |
| 349 | I would recommend not focusing on this area but considering locations that don't require accessing this dense area with inadequate transport infrastructure. Twenty years is not long enough to rebuild the road infrastructure. |
| 350 | I would prefer there be NO DEVELOPMENT of these very sensitive waterways and lands. I don't want my tax dollars supporting the infrastructure for a project I don't approve of. This area is too busy already!!! Build elsewhere!!! |
| 351 | I would prefer if this was a nature area where we can visit lakes and hiking trails the mode transportation would be hiking. |
| 352 | I would not want there to be housing in the area, now nor in twenty years. If there were housing, I would say that it came at a terrible cost to the citizens of Nova Scotia. |
| 353 | I would love to be able to tell them that my city council prioritized citizens over big box stores and community spaces for all citizens over badly planned school placements and road infrastructure projects that make no sense. |
| 354 | I would like to tell them that the government didn't prioritize short term goals that undermined Halifax's infrastructure, and instead made the hard decision to do what was right and protect Halifax's natural beauty for future generations. |
| 355 | I would like to see this space remain natural and untouched by people. It would be in the best interest to protect this land from any kind of development. |
| 356 | I would like to see this area maintained as a wilderness area, existing hiking trails protected, perhaps with enhanced signage, parking and washrooms for greater accessibility. No new neighbourhood |
| 357 | I would like to see limited development in the first ~400 m west of the 102. The connection road should be used to access the BMBCL Urban national park. The lands around Charles and Fox Lake should be removed from this SPA immediately. |
| 358 | I would like to see fewer twinned highways and alternative (light rail) transit, no big box stores, local businesses and local groceries, less development on lakes & rivers and affordable homes. Our car-centric urban design needs to come to an end. |
| 359 | I would like to see affordable housing based on income. So that people have a place to live. |
| 360 | I would like to have fully accessible walking paths and as little human impact on the natural environment outside of these designated walking paths, with emphasis placed on the health benefits of "forest bathing" for urban dwellers. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 361 | I would like for the entire wilderness area to be an urban park. |
| 362 | I would hope to describe it as, at least, a wilderness park area that is untouched and left wild. Having green space close to the city is SO important for mental health and public health. |
| 363 | I would hope to describe it as an oasis from the city where no development is allowed. Where wildlife is abundant and people can walk in nature. We moved here to get away from the city not for the city to creep into our peaceful neighborhoods. |
| 364 | I would have to say that the development in this area was a big mistake on the part of the province. |
| 365 | I would envision wilderness area |
| 366 | I would envision this area being its own little community with walkable streets and shops and a mix of housing types. A dense neighborhood with amenities and public transportation. |
| 367 | I would encourage a combination of business, next to bayers lake, single family, duplex, townhouses, low rises and high rises. A school perhaps as well, some park land. Beautiful area close to the city. |
| 368 | I would be very grateful that this development was CANCELLED.<br><br>- Current and planned infrastructure is insufficient, it would cause mayor traffic problems<br>- No proper egresses<br>- Develop other areas in NS, preventing future ghost cities |
| 369 | I would be telling my friend what a shame it was they bulldozed such a beautiful piece of nature for no reason. This is a park that is well used and well loved by the whole community. It makes absolutely no sense to build a subdivision here. |
| 370 | I would be proud of the protection of the Birch Cove Lakes and their traditional canoe route, surrounded by wilderness. I would see a large National Park Welcome Centre off 102 at Kearney Lake Rd with front country & access to wilderness trails. |
| 371 | I would be grateful for the city planners that protected the pristine nature here and opted out of urban sprawl<br>I would tell my friend about the great amenities that Blue mountain birch coves has received since it became a national park. |
| 372 | I would be bragging to my friend about how we had the foresight to develop elsewhere and keep this as an urban wilderness area and point to the trails and canoe rental and Parks Canada booth. |
| 373 | I wish we had playgrounds like the ones I had living in New Zealand. Avalon Park in Lower Hutt, NZ is a great example. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Roads exist, can you please think of traffic, biking isnt done year round because of the cold, we don't live in the netherlands |
| 374 | I wish this area would stay wild and be part of the park as much as possible |
| 375 | I will tell my friend about the great untouched park we have, with minimal invasion of space in the natural area, with only walking and active transport trails through it, allowing hundreds of species of animals to thrive. |
| 376 | I will tell my friend about how building on unserviced land costed the taxpayers and added an hour onto everyone's commute. I will also talk about how the development encroached on Blue Mountain Birch Cove, causing irreparable environmental damage. |
| 377 | I will tell friends that the horrific plan to build on this area was stopped and it is now protected forever as wild nature publically available.  How perfect that no buildings or roads are in this paradise of nature! Only nature lives here! |
| 378 | I want to see the originally proposed National Urban Park plans to be fully realized and this protected area developed only insofar as a maintained wilderness area for public use. |
| 379 | I want to be jealous of how nice and walkable it is. I want there to be a cycling path from a main bike path in Clayton Park that easily connects to the area. I want Vancouver to be jealous that we look like Copenhagen or Oulu (Finland). |
| 380 | I want to be able to say it was stopped from being developed. |
| 381 | I want this land to be a national urban park that all of HRM can be proud of. It is rare and special to have such a large, healthy, intact wilderness area adjacent to a city. Urban sprawl is embarrassing and backwards. Densify housing. |
| 382 | I want the same now as in furure. For the green space to be undeveloped and preserved as an urban wilderness area. Animals, trees and water protected and left  to thrive. |
| 383 | I want rent-controlled apartment towers with walking/biking access to publicly accessible lake front beach space. NO MORE SUBURBAN WASTELANDS. Love you. |
| 384 | I want a park without development - need active transit and alternate routes to the city. |
| 385 | I travel via hiking because the sprawl has not destroyed the boundaries to this wilderness area. |
| 386 | I thought this was supposed to be a wilderness area. |
| 387 | I think this is a bad idea. This impedes on the natural boarder for the Urban Wilderness Park and will destroy ecologically sensitive areas. |
| 388 | I think the environmental considerations are paramount; to keep the wildlife safe and keep the area open for hikers. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 389 | I think its important to preserve the natural lake and surrounding area. it is important within HRM that there are protected areas for natural enjoyment elroy the concerns of lake pollution and silting |
| 390 | I tell my friend there was no development and that the site became an extension of the current protected land |
| 391 | I tell my friend don't move to Halifax ever it's not what it used to be and it's going in the wrong direction, driven by greed. I'm going to loose my home to one of these insane metropolis developments. |
| 392 | I suggest you develop on land that isn't near wildlife preserves. Not much to preserve if you develop on or around it. |
| 393 | I strongly oppose this development. I want to see this area removed as a SPA and protected as part of a National Urban Park. I attended the open house and left very worried about the impacts on biodiversity, waterways, and traffic congestion. |
| 394 | I see more garbage, slower traffic & more tax hikes. Yay! |
| 395 | I see it as a way to connect Bayers Lake with Kearney Lake as an additional route for emergency vehicles and a way to taper off urban development in a meaningful way to connect the light industry and commercial with nature, residence and the highway. |
| 396 | I love how quiet and peaceful it is - I stayed with a couple friends in their quaint home by the water and appreciated the privacy. It was excellent to be in walking distance of an independent grocer and a decent little store that had everything. |
| 397 | I live in an area that is celebrates nature in her element that provides enough space for all creatures to enjoy. I work in downtown Halifax surrounded by buildings and travel home to an area surrounded by trees and birds. It feeds my soul. |
| 398 | I imagine roundabouts instead of street lights, and pedestrian/bike paths connecting the neighborhoods to the parks going under the highway |
| 399 | I imagine one extra lane along the 102 or even possibly rail transit in some capacity. densified housing in existing areas near kearney lake but stopped at washmill lake. I imagine the great wilderness area there to be enjoyed as is for generations |
| 400 | I imagine an area with a wide protected green space for hiking , walking, kayaking and canoeing. |
| 401 | I imagine affordable housing for families to live in this thriving area and not built for elite wealth wanting lakeside private property. I image an easy flow of traffic in and out of the area that has demonstrated clear planning. |
| 402 | I hope to be able to highlight the national urban park and all the unique recreational opportunities that it provides for residents of HRM. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 403 | I hope that the natural beauty of this area will be well preserved. Roads are of special concern. All the roads in this area are currently jammed with traffic at almost any time of day. |
| 404 | I hope that the integrity of the current Blue Mountain - Birch Cove Lakes Wilderness Area is preserved and that it forms the core of a proposed urban national park, the boundaries of which are those of the "conceptual plan." |
| 405 | I hope in 20 years there is no development in the blue mountain area |
| 406 | I hope I say that there are nice parks and public infrastructure there. That there is adequate and usable public transportation options, that the streets are bicycle friendly. That it is a "15 minute neighbourhood", not just endless congested housing |
| 407 | I hope I can say the prov & munic made wise choice not to overdevelop area. maintained significant buffers between the homes & waterways. Nice area, not densely populated, enough schools, medical services, proper infastucture and lots of green space |
| 408 | I have ready access to public transit and to bike lanes. I have multiple emergeny exits in case of a wildfire. The housing is low density set back from the natural lakes and I can walk to the expanded Blue Mountain national park. |
| 409 | I have lived in this area for 10 years, and can only imagine the horror in 20. It has become so over developed. Our natural land is being stripped of forests, lakes and the eco system and animals that are loosing more and more of their habitat. |
| 410 | I had to move away from the area because the new development caused new traffic issues. We lost our ability to enjoy nature within the city. It brought more problems than solutions. I would tell them that this area used to be beautiful many years ago |
| 411 | I feel like we need to invest in already in place infrastructure, green and public spaces instead of creating new ones. I live close by and feel many of the roads - Lacewood, Dunbrack, Chain Lake Drive are over capacity at peak and off times. |
| 412 | I fear that I would tell them it used to a beautiful wilderness area and was destroyed by greedy developers capitalizing on our desperate need for housing in HRM. |
| 413 | I envision this area as the ecological gem that it is today. I see the integrity of these woodlands and interconnected lakes and riparian areas honored by designating it as a wilderness area. I am proud to show them this beautiful place. |
| 414 | I envision housing elsewhere where there is already infrastructure that does not impede on a beautiful natural space, which would continue to be a gem so close to the center of our city. I would tell her about the beautiful lakes and trails. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 415 | I envision a Nova Scotia that retains the qualities + quality of life that makes people want to live here. Protect our precious, vulnerable wilderness and stop trying to turn HRM into an East Coast version of the GTA. Listen to experts + citizens! |
| 416 | I don’t support destroying the environment. |
| 417 | I don’t agree with the provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Minister of Growth and Development decision to designate special planning areas in the Halifax Regional Municipality. |
| 418 | I don’t agree with going ahead with this development. It overlaps with the boundaries of the future national urban park. This park should not be compromised for this development. |
| 419 | I don't want to see this area developed.  Continue with the promise of the Urban National Park, nothing else. If this project goes ahead, I'd tell my friend that the city doesn't care about the wishes of the community |
| 420 | I don't want a new neighborhood in this area. In 20 years, I hope I can tell my daughter that the community protected this area from insane development when a reckless provincial government opened protected areas to development. |
| 421 | I don't hope to see development on this land. Instead of increasing urban sprawl and destruction of this habitat, a key wildlife corridor and important contributor to flood protection, I hope to see greater urban density and infrastructure to support |
| 422 | I do not want this land turned into a neighbour hood, PROTECT THE COVE, PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT |
| 423 | I do not think this area should be developed. It is a rare and precious urban park that affords mental health-saving greenspace and valuable eco-tourism to the Halifax area. If anything, buses should be utilized to open this area as a national park. |
| 424 | I do not support any development of the Highway 102 Special Planning Area. Any development of this area will have a negative impact on the environment. |
| 425 | I do not envision a neighbourhood there. I envision it to remain as current green space with hiking trails. |
| 426 | I do not agree with this development |
| 427 | I do not agree with developing this area.  It will ruin the lakes and make more traffic and cost a lot putting in water and sewage. |
| 428 | I do believe we need to invest on density where we already have infrastructure built to avoid unnecessary costs to build new infrastructure and impact even more the environment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 429 | I can only imagine telling a friend that this development has created intense congestion and has maligned a wonderful urban wilderness area and that the overreaching development has reduced my property value. |
| 430 | I believe in living and supporting my community. I want to take care of the natural resources and share the paths and wilderness with my family and the generations that follow. |
| 431 | I am very concerned with the over development of the area! We cannot accommodate the people already here! Traffic is a nightmare! The community is being destroyed! |
| 432 | I am so glad they kept this part of the woods untouched despite all the developers who wanted to put in more condos, box stores & shove as many people in without any community infrastructure! Let's go for a hike there so I can show you Nova scotia! |
| 433 | I am proud that 20 years ago the people of Halifax had the foresight to create a National Urban Park which is now the pride and joy of Halifax. It is an unmatched area for anyone who enjoys the outdoors, and is the envy of cities around the world. |
| 434 | I am not in favour of housing in this area. I would describe how nice it is to not have houses directly on the lake such that the hiking trails are preserved. Houses should be well away from the lake with full bike lanes along roads. |
| 435 | I am not for this development |
| 436 | I am hoping that there will not be a community built in this area due to environmental concerns and wildlife habitat. |
| 437 | I am 81 years old and enjoy swimming daily in Kearney Lake. With this massive development lakes and nature will be destroyed.<br>There is already massive development here and if fire breaks there would be no escape for residents in the area. |
| 438 | HRM needs affordable, climate ready housing within serviced areas. Not this. |
| 439 | How well the development integrates and maintains the environment. How little it interferes with the environment. How well transit service is integrated into the community. The connections to trails to the west and to the east. |
| 440 | How amazing it is that Halifax has such a wonderful urban national park that is accessible by public transit and active transportation trails. |
| 441 | Housing close to the city but terrible traffic woes due to the volume of construction for what this area was designed to handle. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 442 | housing and recreational areas exist, but much of the original land was altered. Housing is in areas deemed technically feasible, ecosystems remain constrained. Cars dominate travel, and wildlife existence is doubtful despite parks and trails. |
| 443 | Houses are built too close to each other. Parks and public spaces are too limited with no concern shown for wildlife: no stands of forest to attract and support birds, deer, foxes or raccoons. No inclusion of wetlands for ducks, herons or egrets. |
| 444 | Hopefully it has a good mix of housing, not all tall duplexes or apartments, has single homes mingled in. apartments are set back from the road with greenery in front, not parking lots. It doesn't have curving roads that make parking difficult & crowded. |
| 445 | Homes for seniors 2bed 2bat |
| 446 | High Density, but with really high value placed on preserving natural environment. Not "lets keep a small patch of trees here and there", but real serious effort at keeping an area that makes people go "wow, I'm really out in nature now" |
| 447 | High density residential area so as many people as possible can have access to what this area has to offer. |
| 448 | High density apartments with copious green space and parks between to break up noise and wind and protect animal habitat. Ground level shopping or offies at each building to make it a living community, not just a bedroom community |
| 449 | Hey. I'm so glad they didn't develop this area as now we have one of the best parks in the country. Close to the city but still wild. Dotted with lakes beautiful for swimming & canoeing. So many people use it and love it. Halifax is the best ! |
| 450 | Having a wilderness within HRM would be invaluable. Day hikes, canoe and camping possibilities all within a few mins of the cit6. |
| 451 | Halifax was once a beautiful place until city planners began listening to developers who did not care that these areas were shared by people that cared about each other more than their wallets.That is why I moved my family to a better province. |
| 452 | Halifax is a small city, liveable city with a big heart. |
| 453 | Halifax has this amazing wilderness park in its border that is accessible by transit. We are fortunate that in 2025 the long established vision of this urban park superseded the shortsighted provincial plan to develop it. |
| 454 | Halifax has a unique way of designing communities that are inclusive and green. There are lots of parks throughout the neighbourhoods and lakes with walking trails throughout. The neighbourhood is tucked into the existing landscape. Come on |

| | |
|---|---|
| 455 | Halifax has a national park within access of public transit! What a refreshing and astounding place it is. We are so lucky to have a natural space so nearby. |
| 456 | Green space separates units fr wilderness park. Living units help residents at all income levels to benefit from climate-smart measures: highly energy efficient, heat pumps, public transit, trees, green space, solar, EV chargers. Units are affordable |
| 457 | Green and peaceful - with access to swimming at Washmill Lake, trails to the wilderness and a visitors centre for the National Urban Park.<br>Strict protection of the waterways and wet lands. Potential school and rec field sites. |
| 458 | Great walking trails<br>Mostly low density housing<br>Strong community involvement<br>Environmentally stable entertainment areas suitable for all ages |
| 459 | Great that HRM supported neighbourhoods and housing in already serviced areas and not in areas that are identified for nature protection or intact wild spaces. There's easy access to rapid transit network, so much less congestion and air pollution. |
| 460 | Good road networks for cars and transit, and a separate active transportation route connecting to the peninsula. |
| 461 | For my three children and theirs when they arrive my prefect vision 20 years in the future would be this area to be left an urban park. I would tell a friend that the City of Halifax lost a major opportunity to make a difference. Its Ugly. |
| 462 | For BMBLC to stay a protected park that is not considered for development. I envision a provincial government that actually recognizes the value of outdoor recreation and the importance of protecting wilderness areas. |
| 463 | First I want to preserve the nature<br>If we HAD to develop, when we need hiking and walking trails and community centers. No gas stations or big shopping areas. |
| 464 | Few big high rises, mix of mostly single homes with some apartments like Clayton Park West, keep more trees/parkland, don't ruin the nearby wilderness, schools for all levels, the present area already needs them, train parallel to 102 to Mumford |
| 465 | Family housing and recreation and leisure facilities to service the increase in population. |
| 466 | Excellent infrastructure, roads, schools, emergency services. Easy uncontested travel into the city and out to the airport. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 467 | Encroaching on the beautiful Birch Cove wilderness area was deemed to be a bad idea. Pristine natural areas for wilderness hiking, wildlife habitat and old growth forests so close to a major city is extremely rare and should be protected always. |
| 468 | Easy access to places that have grown in the community by transit accessible to everyone. Roads and highways that are safe to drive and for pedestrians to walk. A community with parks, and services that provide health, groceries convenience stores |
| 469 | Easy access from all directions |
| 470 | East Melb. Vic. https://www.google.com/maps/place/Lillydale+Lake/@-37.7673247,145.3560781,16.75z/data=!4m6!3m5!1s0x6ad62e575531fe67:0x2792ac828c00126a!8m2!3d-37.7651416!4d145.3551395!16zL20vMDU2Z3lx?entry=ttu&g_ep=EgoyMDI1MTEyMy4xIKXMDSoASAFQAw%3D%3D |
| 471 | Don't move here. Too many people in too small a space. Insufficient emergency services, traffic planning, transit, and schools are overcrowded and can't meet the needs of students and families |
| 472 | Do NOT developed<br>Is biodiverse & wildlife corridor<br>Has physical & mental health & environmental benefits<br>Development will add urban sprawl, traffic related air pollution<br>Develop on transportation routes with services e.g. Shannon Park & Penhorn Mall |
| 473 | Do not develop this critically important natural and wild area , but do upgrade it for the continued use and well being of our HRM community. |
| 474 | DEVASTING if this occurs. Should be the first urban national park to draw in tourism. |
| 475 | Depends on what comes in the new neighbourhood to specify as a landmark. Can travel by car/public transport as available. Navigation-google/apple maps. NS-famous for conserving nature while still developing. Housing-mix of apt/ detached avail nearby. |
| 476 | Dense urban like build form close to the 102 with some lower density housing farther out and easily accessible by bike or walking to Bayers Lake and other services in the area. You don't need to own a car in the neighbourhood. |
| 477 | Conveniently located near shopping, wilderness parks including walking/cycling trails, hwy access. |
| 478 | Compact housing units with generous recreational/wild areas and shared greenspaces. Land set aside for community food gardening. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 479 | Commercial exterior. Lake and beach access. Trail network to birch cove. Detached homes on Kearney side. Then stacked town homes. Next 10-16 storey. then large park and community plaza in middle W food & storefronts. On bayers lake side 20-50storey. |
| 480 | Close your eyes. This could have been an Urban park like no other. If a pedway was built, imagine the access and health benefits it would have provided. The governments do not see this, they plan for now, not the future of the greater good. |
| 481 | Close to shopping, potential to have a national urban park near if approved, all high density housing, traffic problems, present rec facilities would not meet the increase in population, potential concrete jungle-not good for climate change |
| 482 | Care was taken to maintain access to a unique and loved natural retreat right in the city. Planning ensured no issues with lack of school to serve the increased population or traffic congestion (both serious issues in the area for years). |
| 483 | Busy two lane “rural” road now expected to accommodate previous and current development projects. Rush hour begins at 2:00pm and ends at 6:00 pm. Needs MUCH more planning and preparation for services and safe evacuation plans in case of emergency! |
| 484 | Busier and busier, another Toronto. |
| 485 | BMBCL is on the outskirts of the ever-growing city. BMBCL is essential to protecting our quality of life. Development will be catastrophic. This development is not for the people, but for a friend of the government. Shameful absolutely, shameful! |
| 486 | Blue mountain cove is the largest national urban park in Canada, and the natural space has been respectfully transformed in a way that humans and natural species can cohabitate. |
| 487 | Blue Mountain Birch Cove is a national park, and this development didnt happen because the city realized how important it is to preserve our precious urban forests which can never be replaced. |
| 488 | Better roads for traffic flow. Detached housing available, parks and trails within available for use. Schools and medical clinics available. High consideration around the local environment to have the smallest impact. |
| 489 | Better bus and pedestrian access to Bayers Lake businesses and wilderness areas<br>Protection of the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes park<br>Area primarily known for clean water for swimming, canoe portage routes, hiking, skating, etc. |
| 490 | Before any development is to occur in this area the roads around Bayers Lake Business Park need substantial improvements. More roads and sidewalks. The increased traffic from a development would overwhelm the corner of Lacewood and Chain Lake Drive! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 491 | beautiful wooded area with lots of trails for biking and walking along with beautiful sights and great opportunities to see wildlife and take pictures. typical suburban housing: comfortable family homes |
| 492 | Beautiful wilderness area close to and with easy access to the city. You should be able to take the train or bus or trail system from the heart of hrm and be in pristine wilderness. |
| 493 | Beautiful preserved wildlife park and natural space- no development |
| 494 | Bayer's Lake Business park is the cause of congestion simply because the city refuses to create more ways in and out of the park. The current access points are overloaded and getting worse. Traffic lights that exist in the park don't make travel easy |
| 495 | Based on the proposal, I'm telling my friend it's a cluster-f. It's the worst decision this city ever made. They put in multi unit buildings without considering the impact to traffic and services like schools and healthcare. |
| 496 | Avoid rush hour into the city. Be very careful of reckless drivers; A majority of accidents and unfortunate deaths occur, usually over holidays.<br>No transit. it's just a highway that gets you back into high density traffic when you get off. |
| 497 | Avoid it if it's build up. Water quality will be degraded. |
| 498 | At this rate there will be no parks. Traffic will be at an all time high with no infrastructure to support it. |
| 499 | As we develop and expand highways in the greater Halifax area ,we are not considering preserving natural forest areas which has an impact on the beauty, the ecology of the area and wildlife. we value transportation and development over nature |
| 500 | As I live in Abbington Ave , but have a cottage bordering blue mountain on cox lake , I am very concerned that traffic on kearney lake , larry uteck and especially Hammond plains is already at capacity.<br>My vision would include easier travel . |
| 501 | As dense a possible. Proper planning for roads. No schools to snarl traffic or lower speed limits. |
| 502 | Apartment available with lots of nature surronding and walking trails. Small shops nearby to buy grocery, bakery, cafe, etc. Biking lanes to travel through community. |
| 503 | An urban wilderness area, accessible to the public.<br><br>A focus on the natural beauty... especially Quarry Lake… And not on building mansions for the wealthy on waterfront property, where access to the public is excluded. |
| 504 | An urban community with lots of housing and walkable/cyclable for local shopping. Access to wilderness areas defined with parking available for out of area people. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 505 | All I can imagine is how we dont have the ability to support the people already about to move into the many high-rise units in the works, like schools, social services, and hospitals. The population in halifax is already passed capacity it feels. |
| 506 | All areas identified by the city in the ideal park boundary for the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Wilderness Area remain in their natural state. Preserving this ecologically sensitive future national park can't happen anywhere else in the city. |
| 507 | AFFORDABLE. HOUSING.<br>Also lots of trees and fountains and stuff... like bike lanes, walking paths, forested parks |
| 508 | Affordable, entry level housing for families, businesses within the community, walkable services and accessible transit. |
| 509 | Affordable housing<br>Grocery and other necessities within walking distance - don't make it a food desert<br>Minimal cars<br>Walkable, safe for cyclists |
| 510 | Affordable homes, walkable streets, access to necessary services. |
| 511 | Adequate road infrastructure that was built in advance, not as a result of the neighborhood. New recreational facilities and programs, park areas, maintained and widened roadways and new sidewalks. New schools built to accommodate future growth. |
| 512 | Active cycling transportation and mountain bike paths like in MacIntosh Run.<br><br>Additionally a new indoor civic centre with pool, track and rec facilities. |
| 513 | Accessibility with respect to easy access to major arteries and commutes between different zones in the city. The city is growing and we need to acknowledge that. There’s plenty of wetland development opportunities outside the HRM. |
| 514 | Accessibility to nature and conservation |
| 515 | Access to beautiful walking trails,  open year around to enjoy nature read a book or just have quiet time and a snack.<br>Types of housing duplexes and single family homes.<br>Public transit terminal<br>Schools in neibourhood no bussing required. |
| 516 | about 20 years ago we were very fortunate to create this exceptional urban park where some people wanted to put thousands of housing units. So creating an expanse ot nature right in this great city for all to enjoy. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 517 | AAA transportation infrastructure. Less suburban feel and more urban (not needing to drive everywhere). |
| 518 | A wilderness area that is accessible to HRM residents. Wilderness areas provide unqiue and important places of santuary to city and urban residents that provide many health and wellness benefits beyond “developed” parks and other green spaces. |
| 519 | A well connected diverse community that welcomes people in a variety of housing options. Great access to public transportation, a variety of community hubs, a variety of grocery options. |
| 520 | A well connected community that is pedestrian focused.....a "15 minute community", meaning all you need is access by a 15 minute walk or ride (bike, scooter, etc). Not a "cut through" community that cars take a short cut through |
| 521 | A walkable community, with little to no high rise buildings, plenty of greenery and third spaces, accessible public transport, with public parks and trails. |
| 522 | A vibrant community that values protection of nature and wildlife that are so close in the designated urban national park. It is important that studies be done to minimize environmental impacts. It is well connected with rapid transit options. |
| 523 | A small portion of development be low income housing. A large portion could be condos/apartments.<br><br>Water front parks.<br><br>Do not build many bike paths as Nova Scotia's climate only allows for ~8 months of cycling. Maybe one bike path. |
| 524 | A residential neighborhood does not exist in 20 years as it should not be built here.i value the trees,wildlife and lakes and clean air.Urban density is the solution and affordable housing must be built in the urban areas,with existing infrastructure |
| 525 | A residential mix including affordable and non market housing plus sports fields including a baseball diamond complex and the quarry lands reclaimed |
| 526 | A resident friendly, quiet neighborhood with a meandering streetscape that includes a large green space around the lakes Designed with foot/bike paths that flow between newly established lake front parks and the integrated path network of greater HRM |
| 527 | A pristine national urban park preserved for all. Wildlife/endangered species safely travel/coexist. Highest value of ecological services. Respect for overlap with proposed park boundary. Preservation of sensitive riparian areas/ecological zones. |
| 528 | A planned community with parks and schools and high density so close to bayers lake |

| | |
|---|---|
| 529 | A nice, middle-density neighbourhood that feels walkable with a nice main street through the area with shopping & dining. Mid-rise apartments along a central core or spine, with townhomes surrounding. Ideally transit would allow travel to and from. |
| 530 | A new but old feeling neighborhood like wedgewood where yards a big and streets have kids on them. |
| 531 | A network of bike lanes connecting the entire area, seperate from vehicle traffic. A complete neighborhood, with multi-use properties hosting residential housing and businesses everywhere. Rapid transit to connect to the rest of the city. European! |
| 532 | A National Urban Park Welcome Centre just off HWY 102 at Kearney Lake Rd; a large sign HRM's National Urban Park. A world class paddling route on clean Birch Cove Lakes, Forest schools, a myriad of forest activities to be enjoyed after work & school. |
| 533 | A National Urban Park<br>Wildlife and ecosystem protected<br>Able to take public transportation to area and have walking/ biking trails within<br>No new housing developments in this area |
| 534 | A mixed use space with commercial, institutional, low density residential and green space. As this area borders on the blue mountain-birch cove wilderness area and the 102 is already busy, I think high density residential in this area wouldn't work. |
| 535 | A massive urban development, with many nice and unique high rises, on a grid system.With tons of public transit access. Big wide street to accomadte lots of cars. And a big mix of business and institutions and amenities for all the residents |
| 536 | A housing development in the area would be devastating to: environment, wildlife and all HRM residents especially those who live nearby. Traffic is horrendous now. Improvements to hwy 102 would not be able to handle the increase. Stop the madness!!!! |
| 537 | A great neighbourhood that has all the amenities (shopping, schools, parks, trails, access to highways) close by. Housing available from apartments to single family homes. A well designed area to live that supports many transportation methods. |
| 538 | A great midtown area green spaces tall buildings and commercial commercial space |
| 539 | A gateway for accessing the BMBC wilderness area with limited development. No development immediately on lakes. Ease of public access to the wilderness area. |
| 540 | A dense, mixed-use neighbourhood that, in addition to the usual parks and community centres, is located adjacent to a protected wilderness area that residents are able to easily walk or bike to and has rapid transit links to other areas of the city. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 541 | A connected fifteen minute neighbourhood with townhomes, multigenerational homes, and apartments. Daily needs, transit, parks, and green spaces are all close by, creating a walkable, practical, and welcoming community for all ages. |
| 542 | A complete community that priorities public transportation, pedestrians, and active transportation. A nice charming main Street lined with local businesses. A community that protects and enhances the surrounding environment and natural landscapes. |
| 543 | A community with a focus on nature, but with all the amenities of being in town. Streets that are walkable, with a mix of parks, houses, and low rise condos. Parks and natural areas were kept with original trees throughout the development area. |
| 544 | A community that enhances HRM. One doesn't drain or burden our infrastructure or surrounding established communities. It's well spaced and has proper roadways in and out to fully handle the volume of traffic. |
| 545 | A community center, with walkable services, well connected to other centres by public transit, where cars don’t dominate. |
| 546 | A  densely populated area with many large buildings with ground level retail services and retail. Integration into Bayers Lake, CP West, Bedford West, and transit to move people efficently to and from many areas of the city.  Put a stadium in there. |
| 547 | 250 ch. to answer all this?! I support housing development AND Haligonians rare opportunity for healthy near-urban wilderness. THIS planning area will have negative environmental impacts. We can do better for nature and our city with smart planning. |
| 548 | 20 yrs from now Halifax will have a population of 1 M people and be congested due to a lack of planning for transportation infrastructure to facilitate rapid growth. Property taxes will be through the roof subsidizing discounts HRM offers developers. |
| 549 | 20 years from now all those houses will be owned by landlords and will be way to expensive for most people to own, not to mention it is going to make traffic in the area near where impossible to navigate in a reasonable amount of time |
| 550 | 20 years ago, there was a publicly owned wilderness area, only a short drive from the peninsula. Unfortunately the Houston government prioritized the needs of special interest groups (developers and doners), and the area was destroyed for profit. |
| 551 | 20 years ago the area had lovely natural ecology with clean abundant water & green spaces. Then I would talk about how urban sprawl and poorly planned developments contributed to overpopulation of a region not meant to support the currrent density |

| | |
|---|---|
| 552 | 20 years ago Halifax was a beautiful area with green space and a great place to live. Then the developers got into the politicians pockets.  owning a home is a luxury most can’t afford as single units have been replaced by apartment after apartment. |
| 553 | 20 year in thr future I would advise against moving here 100%. Quality of living is declining rapidly with the influx of immigration without any infrastructure. Our govenrment provincially and federally is a nightmare. |
| 554 | 20 to 50 years from now I hope we expanded our population within the constraints of todays allowable water supply source feeders. Fossil fuel use may only drop by 10% in 20 years, but electrical recharging and mobility is the prime mover soon. |
| 555 | "Oh yeah, this is all new. They made the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Wilderness Area an official National Park 20 years ago, and then built all this up around it. Kind of like Stanley Park in Vancouver! You can't see any buildings when in the park." |
| 556 | "Hey remember when this area use to be a beautiful wilderness area?"<br>"Yeah the government really fucked us over again and again taking away our natural spaces". |
| 557 | " Let me tell you about the wisdom and foresight that the generation had 20 years ago. They decided to preserve all of this as additional green space for all to enjoy. Look at it now. Pure nature for all of the future to enjoy. They were heroes" |
| 558 | ...I would say that this never needed to happen |
| 559 | … the neighborhood that thwarted development of an urban park that would have been of outstanding national significance. The provincial politicians & planners description of the area & their recording of its history & significance ignored the truth. |
| 560 | The area has remained intact as a natural park, focused on low impact recreation and education.<br>The only development is a trail system, washrooms, nature centre, and limited parking. The area is accessible by bus |

**Table 4**
**Online Survey Responses**

| **Question 1** | **1. What is your main connection to the area? (Select all that apply)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Options** | I live near the area | I work near the area | I am a business owner in the area. | Commuter (i.e., regularly use Highway 102 or travel on the streets near the area) | I visit the publicly owned lands in the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Wilderness Area for hiking, swimming, canoeing or to enjoy the natural | I visit Bayers Lake Business Park for shopping, business or other services. | I primarily value the natural environment of the area. | I have no connection to the area. | Other | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | environment | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | 395 | 102 | 20 | 282 | 425 | 412 | 398 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| **Question 2** | **2. Vision: Imagine you are 20 years in the future and are describing the new neighbourhood in this area to a friend. What key features stand out? What housing is available? How do you travel throughout the community and to and from other places? What parks and public spaces would you tell your friend about? What environmental considerations have been made? Please tell us what you would tell your friend.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options** | A well-connected all ages and abilities (AAA) cycling and walking network. | Encouraging a mixed-use town centre with shops, services, and places of employment. | Access to services like schools, daycare, libraries and other community facilities. | High-quality public spaces that promote social connection and community gathering. | Defining a distinct identity and sense of place in the community. | A wide range of residential unit types for a variety of households | Encouraging recreation and active lifestyles. | Better access to adjacent parks and wilderness areas. | Rapid transit with access to employment, shopping and service destinations. | Supporting local economic development and business opportunities. | Protecting and enhancing nature, habitats and wildlife. | Other |
| **Total** | 187 | 85 | 93 | 69 | 18 | 73 | 242 | 271 | 113 | 22 | 435 | 0 |
| **Responses to question 3 are recorded in Table 3 -**<br>**Question: Vision: Imagine you are 20 years in the future and are describing the new neighbourhood in this area to a friend. What key features stand out? What housing is available? How do you travel throughout the community and to and from other places? What parks and public spaces would you tell your friend about? What environmental considerations have been made? Please tell us what you would tell your friend.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Question 4** | **4. Housing and neighbourhood layout are important considerations for any new community. This includes the location, size and types of housing and open space (parks and natural spaces). Please select the option below that most closely aligns with how you think the new community should be designed. Select only one option.** | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Options** | Mostly low-density housing types spread across the site. Open space is concentrated near the Blue-Mountain-Birch Cove Regional Park. | An even mix of housing types spread across the site. Open space is concentrated near the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Park with a few opportunities for open space elsewhere in the | Mostly apartments with some other housing types. There is a large amount of new open space near the Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Regional Park and there are several additional open spaces opportunities throughout the development. | Upgrades to 100-Series Highways | Bike-only lanes | Multi-use trails – shared pedestrian and bike trails | Streets for cars | Bus-only lanes | Enhanced transit access and new routes | Sidewalks for walking/ rolling | Pedestrian Streets | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | develo pment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | 118 | 136 | 124 | 1718 | 1811 | 1375 | 1819 | 1713 | 1432 | 1440 | 1708 | |
| **Que stion** | **6. Commercial Uses are an important part of any community, providing services and amenities. Please select the commercial uses that you most want to see in the new community. Select your top three (3) features.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Grocer y store | Fitness centre or gym | Small-scale retail shops | Big box retail shops | Restau rant or café | Drinkin g establis hment | Banks and financia l instituti ons | Hotel s | Person al service s (ex: salon, chiropr actor etc.) | School | Medic al clinic | Microbr ewery |
| **Total** | 226 | 61 | 149 | 11 | 204 | 27 | 9 | 10 | 55 | 215 | 175 | 22 |
| | (cont.) Offices | Self-storage | Gas station | Veteri nary servic es | Other (75 charac ters) | Other | | | | | | |
| **Total** | 9 | 3 | 28 | 43 | 0 | 165 | | | | | | |
| **Que stion** | **7. Park Features and activities will determine park programming. Please select the features or activities that you most want to see in the new community. Select your top three (3) features.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pickleb all | Basket ball | Picnic Areas | High-quality garde ns and landsc aping | Trails for hiking in nature | Multi-use trails for walking , rolling and biking | Playgro unds | Outdo or exerci se equip ment | Dog Parks | Areas for public events (ex: stage) | Areas for small-scale comm ercial in parks (ex: | Skating Rink |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | restaurants, cafés and coffee stands, food vendors) | |
| **Total** | 22 | 9 | 74 | 67 | 409 | 278 | 77 | 9 | 68 | 20 | 39 | 16 |
| **Options** | (cont.) Washrooms | Public Art Installations | Canoeing / Kayaking / Paddleboarding | Splash pads | Fountains | Beach access to lakes | Unique buildings or features (ex: a pavilion, community gathering hall, monuments, conservatory) | | | | | |
| **Total** | 110 | 12 | 211 | 15 | 2 | 187 | 40 | | | | | |

**Table 5**
**Sticky Notes Recorded at Public Open Houses**

| No. | Written Comment |
|---|---|
| 1 | How are people going to be able to access this planned urban park once this development is accomplished. Access to the urban park is of primary importance and shouldn't be impaired by this special planning area development [illegible]. |
| 2 | What are we leaving for the next seven generations? We cannot make lakes, trees and wildlife. Once gone they are gone. We have the opportunity to leave the largest wilderness area near a major centre. Lets not give it away. |
| 3 | The are millions of federal money that NS has to use by March 2026 in establishing protected and conserved land and water body areas to reach 15% level, where as only 13.7% protected spaces is our present level. Now is the time to legally protect areas already identified such as Blue Mount and Birch Cove lakes. |
| 4 | Carry out a full watershed study of the watershed not just the development area |
| 5 | 1. Build 3 fishways over damns allow sea run fish to access lakes (Atlantic salmon, gaspereau, eel)<br>1. Expand the urban park<br>2. Protect water quality<br>3. Fish passage under 102<br>4. Floodplain study<br>5. Remove special planning area return to HRM council |
| 6 | What an honour and privilege for Halifax to have an urban park of this size and quality. Please don't start the long-time, normal, unfortunate practice of shaving off the edges and little parts for other purposes - this time you're trying to do it before the park has even made it out of the gate! Protect the entire proposed national urban park now and always. |
| 7 | Destruction of nature/wilderness. Urban sprawl. Lack of respect/ appreciation of BMBC national park. The province is pushing this against public interest and the good of our environment. Disgraceful! |
| 8 | The area should be protected forest – but- the use of pristine green space will also affect the already difficult traffic. Who is paying for the infrastructure? HRM? Who will make the money? Developers? Who will be housed? Not the people who don't have cars and work in HRM. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 | Set the establishment of a national where park land as a primary objective – identify the land base and establish acquisition requirements accordingly. This approach will truly benefit adjourning development through enhanced property values and enhances recreational opportunities. |
| 10 | Why doesn't the province develop areas this size outside HRM?<br>The institutions cannot deal with more traffic.<br>In case of forest fires all exit roads lead to the same highway? Egresses are needed.<br>Can HRM guarantee that blasting will not affect neighbourhood lakes<br>Where are the wildlife corridors? |
| 11 | Concerns about traffic conflicts – Parkland Drive cannot accommodate too much more. |
| 12 | Beyond the required green space – there needs to be a substantial buffer between BMBCL Park and any development. |
| 13 | The Stevens group development is less objectionable than the Annapolis Group development. AG goes too deep into the lakes. |
| 14 | Expropriate the Stevens and Annapolis Group lands and build the national urban park in BMBCL and surrounding area. |
| 15 | Concerned about park access. Schools should be planned before building starts. Urban park would be a great asset for the city. |
| 16 | The provincial government should not override HRM. This is wrong! |
| 17 | Protect and create North Americas largest Urban Wilderness Area, NO DEVELOPMENT. |
| 18 | Why is the mayor of HRM not talking about the huge infrastructure cost to the Halifax water and the city? We are facing 10% increase potentially, these costs might bankrupt HRM. |
| 19 | The development area (SPA) is an unacceptable choice of area for housing. These are beautiful lakes and waterways that should be protected because it borders on land being considered by Parks Canada for a National Urban Park. Please have the area remain natural. A quiet, beautiful, forested place. |
| 20 | Create affordable housing. Find somewhere else to build housing! |
| 21 | This is pathetic. The city should hold the line on wilderness areas – like other well-governed cities do. Shame on all of you. |
| 22 | Choose other areas for affordable public rent-controlled housing and apartments such as Shannon Park and Dartmouth Crossing. Leave BMBCL 'as is' in natural underdeveloped state. |
| 23 | High density high rises close to Susie's lake? The beautiful, beautiful land will be ruined, and only reserved for a few. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 24 | Anyone who has walked/hiked/ canoed/ swam/ skated in this area will see at a glance that the boundaries of the SPA are completely nonsensical – running through where could be the crown jewel of Halifax's remaining natural beauty. Never mind who owns the land currently; the priority should be expanding the designated wilderness area to protect it for all. Development should be over a much smaller area abutting the 102 – the notion that has to run through the lakes says everything we need to know about the wilderness area as a priority. |
| 25 | Servicing costs to be paid by developers? Why HRM pay to service this? We have lots of serviced land available for housing. |
| 26 | Clayton park and Clayton west is heavily developed. Do not take away more forest! People, wildlife, and ecosystems need the environment left natural. This development would take away forest opposite to Clayton Park West. Both sides of the 102 highway would be stripped of the natural habitat for animals. |
| 27 | There are no wildlife corridors shown. Developers should have to pay capital cost charges and should pay for schools. Remove the Special Planning Area. |
| 28 | There are millions for protecting this area under the federal money for NS to protect 15% of NS land and water (inland) by March 2026. Spend it NOW securing BMBCL as set out in the HRM regional plan. The work has been done, the money is there, push the province will to the protection! |
| 29 | If 102 Highway was to be upgraded Developer should pay for it. |
| 30 | No development is needed here – there are many brownfields sites available in services HRM areas. The special planning areas are a mistake – the province does not understand the background, history, and needs of HRM. Where will the wildlife go? Stormwater / sewage is already in an overflow mode when it rains heavily – how will existing infrastructure cope? Access to the proposed MUP is key to the healthy community – for all ages who want to follow a healthy lifestyle. Research suggests that the water quality – the Birch Cove / Kearney Watershed is at risk. |
| 31 | I am a concerned citizen in district 10. The development of BMBCL is a grave mistake we would not be able to come back from. We are already concerned in NS about quality and access to water. This development will pollute the waters & reduce the heat shield à most likely leading to those lakes drying up with climate change. We will not be able to come back from this. Please do not build here. We do not need urban sprawl. We do not need expensive 'waterfront' properties. We need affordable housing - maybe chose an area that would benefit with the infrastructure increase like Middle Musquodoboit who can't even get a grocery store to land there. These lands being developed will not bring in money away, instead it will be an expensive mistake. If you want to bring in rich residents make this place more attractive in other ways - affordable groceries, decreased taxes, people off the street and in living spaces, keep the beauty of wild Nova Scotia. We don't want this. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 32 | I live in Wedgewood and I am very concerned with losing wilderness, and the encroachment on the designated wilderness areas. The current NS designation should become larger in this area, not the other way around. The Blue Mountain Birch Cove area is an HRM gem and should be maintained and elaborated as wilderness/parks. If this goes ahead, the noise will be unbearable from the highway and we need noise barriers. The wastewater is causing major smell and pollution of Kearney Lake (at Hamshaw) and bottom of Kearney Lake Dr. and Bedford Highway. The Halifax water needs to be expanded. And we need to focus on building city density in other ways |
| 33 | 20 metres set back from lakes is not enough. This pollutes the lakes that are all connected in this area. There has been issues with 20 metres previously and we cannot put this special, vulnerable area at risk. |
| 34 | These lands should be protected from future generations. |
| 35 | I've spent 20 years fighting for BMBCL. Years ago in the same room I saw the plan for the wilderness park. How sad that there has been no progress since and the same greedy developers are preventing that progress. Once housing is built around one end of those lakes, the pristine nature of all those lakes is gone. |
| 36 | This development is a scam, this will not be affordable and destroy our environment. |
| 37 | When will the additional flood risk studies recommended by the FSC be undertaken? |
| 38 | 1.We have the opportunity of hosting a National Urban Park. One of the only few of the options within Canada. To even think about jeopardizing that opportunity is absolutely insane. 2.Traffic. Are you kidding me? Even if Highway 102 is widened to 6 lanes, and with interchange improvements, immediately dumping a nearly Colchester County sized population on this infrastructure is devastating. Bayers Lake is already at or over capacity regularly. A roundabout is not going to get us out of this. It will be grid lock for hours each and every day. Not even to mention the included demand associated with the widening of Highway 102. |
| 39 | This area has so much more value to everyone who lives in this city left UNDEVELOPED. DO NOT DEVELOP this sensitive ecological area. Housing options in other parts of the city, brownfield sites, which area already services.<br>More environmental assessment is needed and needs to be taken seriously. Where is Mi'kmaq consultation? The Environmental Assessment process?<br>This area has WAY MORE VALUE AS A NATIONAL PARK. This was already decided in 2016, why are we here again? Haligonians want an urban National Park, not more urban sprawl. There is economic value in recreation and tourism and ecological responsibility. LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE. |
| 40 | Reduced setbacks from lakes watersheds for building will degrade water quality<br>No rapid transit plan means more traffic to this area of 102 and more emissions.<br>Using an urban wilderness park, that was designated for that status prior to this becoming an SPA is not in line with our climate goals as a province and will harm endangered species / wetlands. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 41 | Both companies planning areas look really well thought out. Hoping when this is built there is as many multi-use transportation ways as possible. Good luck. |
| 42 | I would rather that BMBC Lakes be supported by the added lands and turned into the urban national park. |
| 43 | I am very concerned about the loss of wilderness area. We should not be pushing it out and out and out. We need large swaths to help with climate change, air quality, and to house our animal population. Development should be pushed further out! Let us have this nice thing! |
| 44 | This development will hurt and pollute our waterways. These developments are not necessary. More transit/ connectivity will reduce traffic. Not creating more urban sprawl. |
| 45 | I am concerned by the quality of water in the Birch Cove Lakes if development proceeds |
| 46 | Among the two sites there will be approx. 45,000 people with only one additional school. Very questionable. |
| 47 | There is too little recognition of the National Urban Park which MUST be protected at all costs. |
| 48 | We need a LOT more protection of the lake frontage. Annapolis is only 20m. even 70m is too little. |
| 49 | I am against putting so many people so close to the wilderness area. Also, the plan proposed by the developer is very homogeneous and more 'Larry Uteck". |
| 50 | No more development on public lands. |
| 51 | The SPA designation erodes the democratic rights of Haligonians. The proposed development erodes the once in a lifetime chance for a wilderness protected area. |
| 52 | The density has doubled over what was published. NOT ACCEPTABLE. |
| 53 | If its going to happen, school and transportation must be considered, not to impact the neighbourhood area. |
| 54 | There is no need for this level of intense high density development at this time. Our area is well served with Seton Ridge development. |
| 55 | Incredible opportunity to live near a wilderness area and walk in it every morning. |
| 56 | Have you considered that we are in a unique position as a city to have easy access (walking, biking, bus routes) for all our citizens to a healthy wilderness area? The research on the importance of those areas for child development, physical health and mental wellness dictates this necessity. This feature is also a selling point to encourage businesses and employers to come to our city, again, a feature not many cities can boast. Once its gone, it's gone. |
| 57 | What will be the impacts on the health and viability of the wilderness area? Appropriate acreage for large animals to support healthy biodiversity. Viability for Natural Park designation. Water quality. How will this impact our municipal taxes? Ex. Cost of water and sewage development in granite? Provincial considerations – where will the kids go to school? Are there other more easily developable sites?? |
| 58 | If we start now we can have more old growth forest in 300 years – in this urban national park. Start now! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 59 | There is no continuous wildlife corridor. |
| 60 | Emphasis on lack of no continuous wildlife corridor. |
| 61 | DON'T let this happen. |
| 62 | 1.Too much traffic already on the 102 West corridor. 2. We have the possibility of a National Urban Park. This 102 West corridor is the 'heart' of the park. Why rob future generations of this legacy? 3. Water quality in surrounding lakes will be adversely affected. Kearney Lake is a world class canoeing lake. |
| 63 | Nosie concerns from highway and future construction at 767 Parkland Drive and nearby buildings/ streets. |
| 64 | Highway noise is becoming unbearable in the neighbourhood surrounding the 102 (i.e., Wedgewood) to the point that spending time outside in the yard is unpleasant. As part of any further development highway sound barriers are critical. |
| 65 | Expand the definition of wetlands or restore the former definition. Expand protective buffer of riparian systems to 30m not more restrictive 20m. |
| 66 | I feel very strongly that his area should be removed from the SPA program. Cramming in development with the population of Truro next to those high-quality lakes makes no sense whatsoever. The traffic is already problematic in the area. We need studies on traffic, hydrology (flooding risk). We should concentrate development with the existing urban service area. As a taxpayer, I do not want to fund this development. I also resent that his area has been removed from the HRM planning jurisdiction in an unprecedented anti-democratic move. My preferred option for this area is to extend the boundaries of the BMBL planned regional/ national park. |
| 67 | All buffers should be at least 100 metres and in public ownership. |
| 68 | An integrated land use planning approach is required (i.e., essential) – to ensure coordination of planning for the Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes National urban park candidate and the overlapping and adjoining private development area (ie highway 102) corridor planning area lands. Identify areas for [illegible]. |
| 69 | The protection for this area has been recognized as necessary and accepted at various levels giving the public the assurance the protection was proceeding. This process of SPA is a shocking breach of trust! |
| 70 | How much of this housing will be affordable? And social housing? Not all types of housing will address homelessness! |
| 71 | Make the National urban park – the original plan – a reality! Build near and IN the city. |
| 72 | Establish an ongoing public and stakeholder advisory committee – to address redeveloping intents and raises what to the establishment of a viable natural urban park and the development of adjoining private land [illegible]. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 73 | Cost of infrastructure outside development? Already are congested into Bayers Lake – tax payer responsibility? Water /w power consumption – we were on water conservation this summer / only getting hotter. Power / electrical infrastructure – future brown outs? |
| 74 | I don't believe the traffic study can possible be thorough. This is a huge # of dwellings. Unless there is FANTASTIC transit (how likely is that?) all residents will need a car each, 2-3 per household! |
| 75 | Animals – already seeking city streets where are they to go – the forest left will not be enough to sustain all critters. Schools – seen proposal for one – our schools are way over populated not enough staff now. 1 school would be not be efficient enough. |
| 76 | The Regional planning should not be negated by SPA list – area of the potential protected and conserved lands and watersheds should be the last places for considerations for developments – whether housing or resource extraction. |
| 77 | Where is the research from local experts and the studies by ecologists being used in this proposed SPA? Bring forward all the material from previous protection process documents. |
| 78 | No! Just no! |
| 79 | No affordable housing. |
| 80 | Remediate the industrial lands into forest instead. |
| 81 | What happened to the notion of a national urban wilderness park? A collector corridor would have a negative impact on the lakes, woods and habitat of natural environment. |
| 82 | I feel the SPA areas are anti democratic as [illegible] and Council have no power or reference [illegible]. |
| 83 | How will this impact our municipal taxes? Ex. Cost of water and sewage development in [illegible]? Provincial considerations – where will the kids go to school?? Are there other more easily developed, viable sites??? [illegible]. |
| 84 | Remove the "Special Planning Area" designation now! |
| 85 | These "special planning area' are undemocratic provincial overreach. Who is going to pay for the installation and upkeep of all of the infrastructure required? It is a burden on taxpayers. |
| 86 | To HRM:<br>1.Concerns: Water availability! I live on Parkland Dr. HFX City had grave water problems (drought) this summer due to lack of rain and all the population explosion. Our summers are getting hotter and dryer due to global warming! That's ot going to change! A huge new projects (the Mount Projects) and this new one will result in thousands more people ruins and consuming our water! What new plans are the city proposing for an additional water supply? 2) Access: the new Mount development is exiting on Lacewood and the Bedford Highway! LAKEWOOD is already too backed up during traffic times am/pm. I sold my house there |

| | |
|---|---|
| | because of this. I couldn't get out of my driveway. Now I live on Parkland Dr. which I exit on the Kearney Lake Rd. this project only has two exists which area already backed up! Kearney Lake and LACEWOOD! Need I say more!!! 3. Schools: I'm a retired teacher. I taught in Calyton Park and Bedford. EVERY SCHOOL in Clayton Park and Kearney Lake is overcrowded with Pods! THERE HAS TO BE A ELEMENTRAY Junior high and high school in this project. The municipality MUST not accept or approve proposals from contractors who do not include schools in their proposals. They should have to cover the expense of schools not the municipality or the city !!!! |
| 87 | Down the road, we need really good bussing not just to get to work but so a person(s) can do without a car. Please plan for this. |
| 88 | The Special Planning Area documents do not have necessary environmental impact studies, wildlife impact information particularly the loss of wildlife corridors and the complexity of the ecosystems. |
| 89 | No to using Green Spaces when Brown Spaces are available. No to using areas outside service boundary when Brown Spaces are available within the urban service boundary. More housing that's affordable, easily serviced and does not damage areas identified for protection. |
| 90 | Don't destroy Sandy Lake with development, a fire hazard. |
| 91 | The services [illegible] not enough for our existing population – roads, hospitals, daycares, etc. this will make everything worse. 102 is already a mess. Need to plan carefully. |
| 92 | We're told that the population is growing so we need to sacrifice our wild lands. But the more people live in the city, the more we need places like this. Where we build matters but so does where we don't. |
| 93 | 20 metres buffers are not enough. National standards and research are increasing for good reason. Larger buffers are better. |
| 94 | Exactly how are wildlife paths and corridors placed? 'The vision' developer chart says the plan 'will not impede the HGN wildlife corridors' but this is not so. |
| 95 | The developers maps call the proposed national urban park a 'regional and a provincial wilderness park' are they not aware of the long-term well-supported plan for the area? |
| 96 | WTF??? |
| 97 | Will there be any affordable (not subsidized) just affordable units for rent or any accommodation for 'not well off' but prospective home buyers? |
| 98 | Needs to be rezoned to R-2 same to the [illegible]. Services are in road frontage are there. |
| 99 | Concerned about destruction of nature. Cost to tax payers. Impact on lakes. |
| 100 | Information on impact to neighbourhood area vulnerability to flooding is inadequate. |
| 101 | The borderline is much too close to Charles Lake! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 102 | How will this development impact the proposed National urban park in BMBCL? |
| 103 | We need affordable housing using brown spaces with areas already services with priority on high density for the present critical need. |
| 104 | This process is in desperate need for wildlife corridor considerations and protection of nature as ecosystem not as parks for people only consideration. |
| 105 | Please save for future generations, the entire proposed park. |
| 106 | It looks like too much of the land is scheduled for future development. That is a big problem [illegible]. |
| 107 | Please remove BMBCL and Sandy Lake as SPAs. The data so far indicates problems with flooding, traffic, cost of infrastructure environmental corridors, and other issues. Vital issues like traffic have been inadequately researched. LRT remains a dream, but will be vital. More deliberate and reasoned deliberations are needed, not a fast track approach. DO NOT PROCEED WITH BMBCL development. |
| 108 | This is a huge development<br>1. study impact on the whole park area/ watershed in area. 2.Ensure very good transit and bike lanes. Current transit is terrible and unreliable, therefore the car congestion will be nuts.3. remove BMBCL planning area until the usual FULL studies have been carried out. RUSHING equals big MISTAKES. |
| 109 | Time in nature is proven to improve physical, mental and spiritual health. We need spaces. |
| 110 | No, to development. Yes, to urban park. There must be a better way. We love our natural spaces. So needed. |
| 111 | Just a bad idea. |
| 112 | Ecological / water conservation / protection is the #1 issue. |
| 113 | The ideal would be to have this land become part of the BCBL Mountain wilderness park – not a densely population development. |
| 114 | A total disaster! 30,000 people / 600+ acres = no way this can work. 2 exists / access points, Infrastructure costs will go to taxpayers. Later if not immediate, Loss of urban national park space, Plus services, light commercial? This can be done better / over.<br>How will HRM cover the costs of the need for good access for 1st responders ex. Wildfires! Downstream water will not be treated by dumping it in a quarry pit. HFX Water must expand to service = taxpayer (no way developer will cover all costs). |
| 115 | I do not trust this so called SPA as in 'Special Planning Area'. Once you allow this dangerous encroachment on BMBCL urban park you are opening the flood gates for pollution, harassment of wildlife, stamps out unique flora, worst of all, not giving the next generation a chance to relax in a park setting listening to the sounds of NATURE! |

| | |
|---|---|
| 116 | I cannot imagine how this population of people can be properly supported. Infrastructure costs to HRM are onerous. Why build on lands that support potential climate changes? We should be building on lands that are considered 'brownfield' or replacing old small buildings (not historic ones please!) with development. There are more areas of the peninsula that should be considered.<br>When we RUSH we make mistakes and using land that could make Halifax UNIQUE, HEALTHIER and more attractive. Once its gone, it will not return to its most valuable state, not my children, grandchildren or great grandchildren's lives. |
| 117 | The development proposals are almost totally high density housing types. No single family housing proposals. No 'missing middle' housing types for young families. This is a major housing gap not being considered. Only 5% of total developments is low density. Enough high rises! More family friendly housing (row housing for ex.). |
| 118 | The chunk of land at the end of this development [illegible]. |
| 119 | With more residents we need housing and transportation. We also need more recreational wilderness areas. |
| 120 | This area is more valuable as protected wild area than as development that won't be affordable. |
| 121 | This should be a National Urban park. Generational opportunity to make a large protected area for residents and tourists. |
| 122 | Convince Annapolis to offer the rest for sale to Nova Scotia Nature Trust in exchange for this travesty of suburban sprawl! |
| 123 | How much of our beautiful woodlands are going to be destroyed? |
| 124 | This land should be taken out of the special planning area and protected for future generations. |
| 125 | Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Slogan – and one of our favourite aspects "hear the quiet". Please don't take that away from us. |
| 126 | This area is protected as a candidate for Regional protected and conserved area. This SPA action in the area is gross provincial overreach. |
| 127 | This should all be a National Urban Park not just the part already protected. |
| 128 | Boundaries are far too close to Charlies Lake and Kearney Lake - will ruin what makes hiking here special. |
| 129 | A fire this past summer in this area with all the droughts could have been a disaster. Next time it likely can be. Do not build here. |
| 130 | Protect it! Generational opportunity lost if not full urban national park is created! |
| 131 | It would be nice if the city HRM, province and private developers could work together to alleviate the traffic problems in Bayers Lake Business Park. More roads, more sidewalks, etc. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 132 | HRM and the Provincial government should rethink the development, and instead preserve the lands and establish opportunities for accessible outdoor recreation. They have a duty to preserve this land for the Health & Happiness of their citizens. |
| 133 | There are better options and better places to develop in HRM and Nova Scotia. This BMBC lakes area is far better suited for usage as a national urban park and outdoor recreation area only including surrounding private lands. |
| 134 | Traffic, traffic, traffic. Board noting congestion will occur regardless. You /we can't add 1000s more to the roads. Transit does not meet the need. |
| 135 | Leave the lands and watercourses in BMBCL and surrounding buffer lands "as is" untouched in natural state. No roads, no buildings, no development. |
| 136 | How much affordable and subsidized housing will be available? We NEED low cost housing! *upvote from me<br>*** *"upvote from me" was written by someone else on the sticky note, indicating support for the original comment* |
| 137 | I don't get any sense that traffic flows (102, Dunbrack etc.) have been analyzed – certainably nothing presented here today. Traffic is already a disaster on these roads during rush hour, and regular accidents on the 102 makes commuting horrible.<br>an additional 10k families using these roads seems…unwise. |
| 138 | Why does the boundary go through the lake? |
| 139 | Save the wilderness park! |
| 140 | I came in with an open mind, but everything I learned today has made me against this SPA development. We have not done proper studies to ensure this won't harm the ecosystem around here. While some have been done, they haven't looked at how this development will impact the rest of the Blue Mountain area. Having a green space like this within our municipality is such a privilege and the benefits to our community are far greater to protect this area, make it an Urban Park for everyone to enjoy for generations to come. Built within the existing service boundary! |
| 141 | This whole area is virtually untouched, pristine wilderness with traditional hunting trails. Composing a new neighbourhood will absolutely destroy this park for future generations. |
| 142 | High density required it seems, however more single family / low density needed in the city to attract families. |
| 143 | The provincial expansion of the #102 is a WASTE is BMBCL goes ahead. HRM cannot afford the 'good' transit necessary to move this many people. Removing bridge tolls increased the traffic volume congestion to new highs. Thanks Tim. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 144 | I am concerned about the increase of traffic! Also, the quality of the water following into and out of the quarry catch basin – water bombs, etc. I recommend all levels of government to get together port funds and buy the Stevens land, use it for recreation development – soccer stadium, ball fields, etc., etc. Save the cost to make all the improvements the city and the province has to spend for this development. |
| 145 | The area should be part of an urban park. The only development should be better public access to the lakes. |
| 146 | Leave the BMBCL areas and surrounding buffer lands intact "as is" untouched in its natural state. |
| 147 | MLA's – why don't you do something to improve the public transit in the area instead of paying $MMMs on highways, over passes and corresponding infrastructure. Put in a (illegible word) better bus service. If you want to have a great capital, build the infrastructure first. |
| 148 | I am concerned that the development itself with compromise the ecological integrity of the abutting wilderness. How will this be mitigated? |
| 149 | Ensure storm water supply to BMBCL waterways / lakes is not interrupted. Lakes need the rain storm water supply to keep healthy. |
| 150 | We have the opportunity to support an Urban Wilderness Park. I understand there is only 1 other in Canada. This is a step backward. Stevens Groups should only use the old quarry area that is a mess anyway. There seems to be no plans for what happens on any Annapolis lands. |
| 151 | Stevens Group Development: maybe. Annapolis Group Development: Definitely NO, it will impact the park to much. |
| 152 | The studies done, from what I learned today are only done within the SPA and not how this development would effect the rest of the park. This is scary and problematic. Also done for impacts of a development and half the density of what the developers were presenting – this feels incomplete and poor planning. |
| 153 | World-class city, Halifax? Really… Take away the good, encourage the bad (sad face drawing) |
| 154 | Traffic!! The 102 highway is already stressed with more traffic then it can handle. The exists are already backed up all the way on to the highway and the traffic during many times of the day is just crawling. Don't add to the congestion of the 102. |
| 155 | I would favor a 'special recreation area' on the Stevens land. Less infrastructure cost making it multi-use fields for sports activities and supporting businesses, baseball, rugby, cricket, football and soccer fields. Make it a central point for mature and pro sports for NS. [personal identifier]  PS. And no immediate need to upgrade Hwy 102. |
| 156 | SLOW DOWN! To the province – listen to municipal planning staff – they know more than you (smiley face drawing). The unprecedented population growth of recent years is slowing down. Focus on sustainable growth. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 157 | The development should not encroach on the wilderness park. The park and the lakes should remain public. |
| 158 | Traffic levels on 102 already are issue – ensure future volume is enabled. |
| 159 | This land / SPA would be much better serve the community as part of the National Urban Park. I strongly oppose (illegible word) the highway west 102 corridor. This feels rushed without adequate science supporting development here. |
| 160 | Develop the land where Walmart is on Mumford Road. Numerous high rises lots of people will live there, no road traffic issues, etc. |
| 161 | Why no wetland maps? Where are the important wildlife habitats? Why weren't these included as part of public consultation? 20m buffer for watercourses is not big enough. How will the losses in ecosystems goods / services be compensated for. |
| 162 | Why is there a need for this area (or any area) to be developed at all? Capitalism demands unending growth, even if its not sustainable. If not for mass immigration, the population of NS would be in decline. There would be no need for development. If not for greedy land owners, there would be no need to build it. This development will continue to strain our already natural resources, water, lumber for construction, destruction of wetland and natural habitat. Once this natural land is gone, we will never get it back. |
| 163 | Why does all the development need to be in Halifax. There are many towns like Truro, Bridgewater, New Glasgow that would benefit from growth. Employment opportunities can easily be directed outside of Halifax, with the corresponding growth in these area. Nova Scotia will be ruined by placing everything in one major location. Spread the wealth! |
| 164 | "Special" planning AKA un-democratic authoritarian. Let HRM make HRM's decisions. |
| 165 | These plans for increased population of ~43,000 people are extremely disappointing. I foresee the only means of access for these dwellings to be a huge increase in roads to 102, into the (illegible word) of the land owned by the Annapolis Group and then into the present "protected" wildlife area. The effect on wetlands, wildlife, and recreational activities appears to be extremely negative. The costs are potentially [illegible]. Who will pay for the increased water, road, infrastructure?? Somebody needs to give their head shake. And, these plans are just the beginning of "development" of this area… where will it all end? |
| 166 | Need to highest standard of [illegible] for waste water. |
| 167 | Are you following the news? A national park will be way more valuable for next generations and the city than short sighted development? |
| 168 | Designate the National Urban Park first, prioritize land for conservation. |
| 169 | Don't take away this beautiful area! We want a National Urban park without building for people to look at. We want to look at nature. |
| 170 | Deeply concerns about what this will do to Kearney Lake. How about traffic for 25k also. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 171 | Putting a Hwy through a park is simply crazy! We know wildlife gets killed on the roads. This urban park is the envy of the rest of Canada. Canoeing in pristine wilderness is a gift. Don't ruin it! |
| 172 | Expropriate the private lands and build the national urban park. BMBCL nation urban park to include all lands in area – public and private. |
| 173 | There needs to be adequate active transportation infrastructure and transit (BRT) to support these new communities. Also, plans for complete communities, with schools, shops, etc. |
| 174 | Wildlife supports our life. The natural systems support our lives, less impact is important. This park is a gift! |
| 175 | The issue isn't whether or not its private land but how we best conserve and protect lands adjacent to water bodies. This is not achieved by high density housing. |
| 176 | Leave wetland and lakes / the watershed as it is – canoeing, walking, swimming deserve to be preserved and wildlife is entitled to habitat. |
| 177 | The 102 will become a perpetual parking lot with the addition of so many more vehicles and still no efficient public transit. |
| 178 | The transportation will not work. |
| 179 | Lakes – protect public access, quality of water can't have fertilizer run off. |
| 180 | The road proposed is only a short cut. Not worth the loss of a quiet park like neighbourhood and the urban park. |
| 181 | Doing this development at the same time as Sandy Lake puts a huge tax bill on us, as WE pay for the infrastructure! Destroying big roads when we should be using mass transit is not wise. Please RETHINK this! |
| 182 | What a fantastic idea. So great to open new areas for families. |
| 183 | Make sure all the lakes keep their water levels and water supplies intact with clean water supply flow and natural outlets for movement. |
| 184 | How about Shannon Park to build affordable public housing. Lots of land there. Leave BMBCL and surrounding lands intact "as is" for outdoor recreation only. |
| 185 | What is the science behind the water management in the Stevens Group dev? How do they plan to filter the water? Currently the stormwater is going through wetlands. How does diverting stormwater affect the water flow to Suzie's Lake and Birch Cove Lake? |