



Planning St. John's

EngageStJohns.ca Report

425 Blackmarsh Road (Welland Street)

Visitors Summary

City Of St. John's from: 17 Mar'25 to 21 Apr'25

DAILY MONTHLY



Highlights

TOTAL VISITS	MAX VISITORS PER DAY	NEW REGISTRATIONS
296	122	0
ENGAGED VISITORS	INFORMED VISITORS	AWARE VISITORS
4	63	248

Types of visitors:

- Total visits: unique sessions (may be the same person visiting multiple times)
- Aware: visited at least one page
- Informed: has taken the "next step" from being aware and clicked on something
- Engaged: has contributed to a tool (comment or question)

Comments (verbatim)	What is your overall feedback of this application?
<p>The unanswered question is - what happens to the remainder of the 425 Blackmarsh Road property - which presumably is large enough for a multi-story apartment building? This proposal appears to represent the thin edge of a wedge...</p> <p>With the majority of council expressing attitudes such as "people should realize is that the economics of building these buildings is changing. It's getting very, very expensive and there is going to be a need to have higher buildings", and, "the future is density", it's increasingly apparent that residents such as those living along 56-70 Welland Ave and 420-430 Blackmarsh Road are not going to have a meaningful opportunity to protect their residences if a new proposal is brought forward - 34 New Town Rd being the most recent example. The same goes for my residence o [REDACTED] if a</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

<p>developer eyes the land behind it along another road - "develop and densify" at all costs, regardless of residents' interests.</p> <p>At-large council members and the mayor consider the "D & D" model for the city as a whole, having lost touch with individual wards in their commitment to an overarching approach. The best possible solution is to eliminate all the at-large, mayor, and deputy mayor positions, divide the city into multiple small wards, and have the mayor selected by councilors following the election, in a Consensus Government model.</p> <p>A choice among "support", "opposed", or "mixed" isn't relevant if one believes that the system is fundamentally flawed. Choosing an option gives tacit support to the existing situation. As your commenting protocol forces a response to this question (which it should not!), I must select "opposed".</p>	
<p>This is a deep, empty and large lot, and only multi housing units should be built on this site and it should be developed as a whole. Perfect spot for one bedroom apartment buildings or more attached, lower cost attached housing similar to those attached to 56 Welland area, i.e. smaller, affordable privately owned houses. Give more information on what this statement means - what does R3 Zone include? "The applicant is proposing to create a new lot with a Single Detached Dwelling; however, if the rezoning is approved, any uses within the R3 Zone could be developed on the</p>	Oppose

<p>site." If one huge house is being proposed here - I oppose as this location offers bus service, shopping and schooling close by for the many who need these services. Thanks for this opportunity to engage.</p>	
<p>I question if anyone would purchase a detached home in this location, with no immediate idea of what the large parcel of land behind it might be used for.</p>	Mixed
<p>Disappointing that our regulations are driving this development to go from Apartment to a single family dwelling. That's the opposite direction that's needed in this city. This points to an issue with regulations (i.e. setback requirements, parking minimums, etc) that need updating.</p>	Mixed