



Public Information Meeting

June 2, 2026

Lloyd E. Matheson Centre, Elmsdale

1. **PLN26-004: Proposed Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments, Enfield**
Application from Andrew and Julie Gilby
2. **PLN25-007: Proposed Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments, Enfield**
Application from Portucana Construction Services Ltd.
3. **PLN26-010: Proposed Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Required Future Transportation**
Connections Map

Attendance:

John Woodford, Director of Planning and Development

Lee-Ann Martin, Planner and Development Officer

Darby Sullivan, Community Planner I

Hannah Grosvenor, Administrative Assistant

Connor Wallace, Representative for Portucana Construction Services Ltd, from Zzap.

19 residents, including:

Councillor Garden-Cole, Councillor Mitchell, Councillor Hebb, Councillor Merriam, Councillor Dixon

Notes

1. Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.
 - The meeting was called to order by John Woodford, and began with a land acknowledgement.
2. **PLN26-004: Andrew and Julie Gilby- Staff presentation and overview of application- Darby Sullivan, Community Planner 1**
 - Darby Sullivan presented.
3. Applicant comments
 - The applicant shared a bit about themselves and their intentions.
4. Public comments and questions for staff and applicant
 - A resident felt that the applicant's plan was a good idea.
 - A resident stated that they liked that the applicant didn't plan to build any apartment buildings on the land.



- A resident asked if this application approved, would it apply to neighbouring lands? Staff clarified that this application was site specific.
- A resident asked if the proposed subdivision plan would be made available. Staff stated that the proposed plan was included in the staff report, which was available on the website.

5. PLN25-007: Portucana Construction Services Ltd. - Staff presentation and overview of application - Lee-Ann Martin, Planner and Development Officer

- Lee-Ann Martin presented.

6. Applicant comments

- Connor Wallace, a representative for the applicant, reminded residents he was there to answer questions and to hear their concerns.

7. Public comments and questions for staff and applicant

- A resident, who disclosed they were from 51 Lacey Ann Ave, asked if the proposed road would be abutting the proposed development. Staff clarified the proposed road location.
- The resident asked about the amount of thought put into the capacity of the existing infrastructure. The applicant shared that it takes them 15 min to get out of White Rd when turning left. Staff explained that infrastructure upgrades regarding the intersection were an ongoing project and discussion with the province, and that development has paused until a light is added to the intersection. The municipality is working on an agreement with the province.
- The resident observed that 45 potential units would add an additional 45-90 vehicles coming out one roadway, and questioned if the roads could handle that. Staff explained that they will reach out to public works and municipal engineers to learn if the road is suitable and or if there are other upgrades needed. Staff did not have a traffic impact statement at this time.
- A resident questioned who would be responsible for the lights. Staff explained that it would be a provincial and municipal project, with the developer paying a portion. The resident observed that they have been trying for a long time to get lights at the end of Alderney Drive, and have always been told that is up to the province. The resident expressed frustration with being “stuck with the provincial regulations”.
- A resident asked why the municipality wasn’t pushing back when the province would not do that the residents wished. Staff explained the process of working with the province on applications.
- The resident told staff it was “your damn job,” for staff to push back, and felt that someone was lying. The resident asked if staff was “banging on the table” for residents. Staff explained that they had spent an entire year discussing the road in question, but in the end, the road is owned by the province and they have jurisdiction over it.



- The resident continued, quoting the East Hants tagline, “We Live It,” and stated that “we live in this damn cluster f, and that was not what was sold to us.” The resident suggested that the residents should stage a revolt, and expressed concern about emergency exits in case of fire. Staff reminded residents that council has a rule about how many lots can be put on a road that does not have secondary access.
- A resident stated that they understood a light is required before this application gets approved. They expressed concern about the location of the exit point and the volume of traffic, sharing that it can take 10 minute to drive a block. They predicted that there will be either a backlog on the new street or more traffic going through the subdivision exiting through White or Alderney. The resident was concerned for the safety of pedestrians, particularly kids and pets, and stated, “It’s unsafe to reroute people through a subdivision.” Staff explained that if a traffic impact study was required for this application, it should predict exactly what the resident was predicting.
- The resident wondered if the traffic impact study will look at pedestrian safety and pedestrian volume?
- The resident was interrupted by another resident observing that currently apartment buildings were not fully occupied.
- A resident observed that if traffic is backed up now, it will be even more backed up if this application goes through, and felt that that was a good reason to push back on extending White Rd. The resident asked if the agreement regarding the land sale has gone through, and if recreation space would be part of the design. The resident understood that the developers can make a park or a cash donation, but expressed frustration with the cash donation option, stating that “WE don’t get an answer as to where that money goes.” Staff explained that as part of site plan approval (after, if this is approved) there is a requirement for outdoor amenity space. Connor explained that amenity space is intended to be green space for the residents. The applicant has not yet determined the specific programming; Could be a playset, seating, or a garden. Some of the space will be used to manage stormwater as well, but can be integrated together. The applicant intends to provide the amenity spaces, but they are not yet focused on the design of it.
- The resident also referenced a different application from a former PIM they had attended. The resident wanted to know why the municipality wasn’t enforcing where construction traffic is re: Dorey Lane, and stated that, “if you force all that traffic all on White Rd, there will be more accidents.”
- A resident, who disclosed that they lived on Enfield Road, shared they felt for people who bought in White Estates. The resident shared that they believed the area to be overbuilt, and doesn’t agree with the vision. They stated that developers are in the business to make money, and questioned the quality of



life for those who moved here years ago, thinking they had space. The resident suggested putting all new development by the Sportsplex.

- The resident then asked why every proposal gets approved, resulting in the tearing up of the community and the wetlands filled in. They felt that the average person would be unable to afford the rents in these new spaces, and shared that if this housing was truly low income or for seniors, they would be okay with the application.
- The resident continued, stating that, the “community looks like a patchwork quilt”, and felt that the majority of people don’t want it. They again questioned the impacts on the quality of life and the wetlands, and shared that new houses are not going to help the people who are barely surviving, but will instead be filled with people who have the money to live wherever they want. The resident again suggested moving new development to the Lantz rotary, reiterating that “We are full.” The resident ended with expressing their concerns about safety if there were to be a fire. Staff acknowledged their frustration, stating that community building is messy; residents have a right to own and develop private land, the question is what is best to go there? Staff explained to the residents that council didn’t approve everything, and had in fact refused 2 applications last week. Staff agreed that impacts to existing residents are a legit planning concern, which is why the municipality has a rigorous application process. Staff will be sending out letters to external and internal agencies to hear feedback, and are guided by policies. All new applications must be weighed with other policies, such as having a variety of housing options.
- A resident shared that they live nearby to the proposed development, and have near miss accidents all the time. They questioned when the traffic study would be done? Staff clarified that - public works *may* request a traffic study, at which point the developer would need to hire a team to do so. Connor explained that if this application goes through, they would need to apply for site plan approval, which would likely require a traffic study. No permits can be obtained until site plan approval is complete, though the zoning map may change.
- A resident declared that, “It all comes down to greed. You are allowing it.” The resident clarified that they were not opposed to development, but felt that every time they turned around the plan was changed. The resident told staff it was their job to go back to the province and let them know the residents were not happy, stating that they, “don’t care if my tax dollars are tied up for 5 years in court. Don’t just accept no from the province.” The resident spoke too quickly for all details of their point to be recorded. The resident expressed frustration with the high-density zoning, and again clarified that they were not against development, but had safety concerns. They specifically expressed concerns about fire safety.



- The resident also brought documentation regarding plans that have changed. They again requested that staff go back to the province and say the residents do not agree with their decision. The resident suggested this was a common-sense issue.
- A resident asked if this application could proceed without any traffic lights being installed. Connor replied that would only happen if the traffic study indicated it wasn't necessary. Staff clarified that this development would not be built until traffic lights are installed.
- A resident asked for clarification about which property was owned by the municipality. Staff clarified.
- A resident expressed frustration once again about the road that the province refused to allow, stating that the community can't keep making the same mistakes, and it was time for the municipality to dig their heels in and refuse to "swallow the 'no' pill."
- A resident asked if any wetlands were to be filled in. Connor confirmed they would not be filling in any wetlands.
- A resident inquired about studies being done about the additional infrastructure needs. Staff explained that in addition to water studies, staff would ask for feedback from the fire department, RCMP and Centre for Education. Policy requires their comments to be considered.
- A resident asked which school board would be notified. Staff clarified CCRCE in Truro.
- A resident expressed concern about the line of sight if all traffic was to be sent down White Rd.
- A resident spoke again about their frustration with traffic, safety, and the lack of push-back by the municipality.
- A resident shared they would prefer to see R1 zoning in the area. If that can't be done, then townhouses are better than apartments. Sidewalks and lights will help with safety, but they felt that the density needs to be managed.
- A resident observed that the community has grown, citing that White Estates has gone from 10 residents to hundreds, and highway 2 is always busy. The resident asked if the community can handle more traffic, and what the impact of that traffic will be. Staff agreed that those are essential planning questions.
- The resident then suggested that highway 2 should be revamped. Staff explained that the province had done a study on that a few years ago.
- A resident recalled that 30 years ago a service road was proposed parallel to the number two. The resident had concerns that highway 2 would become a raceway, similar to what they have in Sackville.
- A resident asked if the province had a plan for the area between Enfield and Lantz. Staff shared that they did a corridor traffic study. The resident expressed concern about the existing infrastructure, and reminded staff that



the municipality was responsible for that. They felt that the community could not continue the way they have been.

8. PLN26-010: Subdivision Bylaw Amendment- Staff presentation and overview of proposal - Lee-Ann Martin Planner and Development Officer

- Lee-Ann Martin presented.

9. Public comments and questions for staff and applicant

- A resident asked about the time frame for this application. Staff estimate the application would have a public hearing in the fall. Connor clarified that there were still multiple steps, analyses, and studies to be done.
- The resident expressed concern that the road will be permitted and then the province will change their mind, resulting in money lost. The resident felt that this was a frequent occurrence in this community.
- A resident asked if the municipality was going to try to have Lacy Anne Rd extended. Staff clarified once again that the province had refused to allow that, and that the municipality respects their decision. The community is welcome to push back, and all residents have the right to write their MLA about their concerns.
- A resident requested to see correspondence from the municipal government that they could bring to the MLA. Staff shared their email and encouraged the resident to request the specific information they were looking for.

10. Adjournment