

**West Hants Plan Review  
Public Meeting  
West Hants Planning Advisory Committee  
Three Mile Plains Community Hall  
November 28, 2002, 7:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

Chairman Randy Matheson  
Councillor Gloria Shanks  
Councillor Fred Horne  
Ms. Traci Curry

**STAFF:**

Lynn Davis, Director of Planning  
Jane Sodero, Planner  
Velma Macumber, Administrative Assistant

**OTHER COUNCILLORS:**

Warden Richard Dauphinee

**ABSENT:** Councillor Reed Allen, due to a business commitment  
Councillor Norm Clarke  
Mr. Larry Frenette

**GUESTS:** Members of the Public - 7

**Welcome and Introductions**

Chairman Matheson welcomed members of the public and introduced members of the Planning Advisory Committee and Staff. He explained the purpose of the public meetings was to receive input from the public for the plan review.

## **What is the Plan Review?**

Ms. Davis thanked the public for attending the meeting. Ms. Davis explained that the purpose of the plan review is to update all the Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws and consolidate all into one planning document for the entire Municipality. This will reduce the zoning designations and make it easier to administer. Ms. Davis stated that over time the planning documents may have become outdated because of changing demographics and residents' desires for their community, and provincial regulations, and possible changes resulting from events such as the Highway 101 twinning. She advised that there are three planning documents. The Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) sets out Council's and the community's vision and policies for development of the Municipality. The Land Use By-law (LUB) is a regulatory tool that puts the Municipal Planning Strategy into effect. It includes provisions such as zoning and permitted uses. The second regulatory tool is the Subdivision By-law. "Subdivision" means creating lots, subdivision of land whether it is one, ten, twenty or one hundred lots, as well as consolidating or taking from a parcel.

Ms. Davis explained the plan review schedule. The final draft will be ready in May or June 2004. Staff have been working over the last year on background research including reports such as the Statistical Profile which outlines demographics and building trends, and a household survey. Ms. Davis advised that the Committee is meeting with focus groups. This is the last meeting of the first series of community meetings. The first draft of the MPS and LUB will be presented next Fall. In the meantime, the information from the public, the survey and background statistics and public consultations will be used for the next step which is to draft a strategy concept or vision which will form a framework for the new planning documents. The Strategy Concept which will be presented at public meetings sometime in February 2003.

## **Results of Plan Review Survey**

Ms. Sodero presented the results of the Plan Review Survey.

In June 2002, approximately 8,100 surveys were sent out to households in Windsor and West Hants. Almost 600 surveys were returned from West Hants residents, a return rate of 9.4 percent. Overall, there was almost a 10 percent return rate. Three Mile Plains area comprised approximately 6 percent of the total returns from West Hants, another 6 percent came from Garlands Crossing and 6 percent were returned from the Ardoise/Ellershouse area.

Over 80 percent of the respondents from West Hants were over the age of 45. The majority of Three Mile Plains respondents were between the ages of 55-64. In the Ardoise/Ellershouse area, 50 percent of respondents were between 45 and 64. Most of the West Hants respondents worked in West Hants, while over 36 percent of Three Mile Plains respondents worked in Windsor. Of the Ardoise/Ellershouse respondents, 50 percent travelled to the Halifax area to work.

Single family dwellings were the most common type of dwelling for respondents from West Hants. The next most common types of housing were mobile homes and duplexes.

Over 35 percent of West Hants respondents have lived in the same house for twenty years or more, while in Windsor, about 40 percent have lived in their current home for only one to five years. In the Three Mile Plains area, most respondents have lived in the same house for only six to ten years.

Respondents said the major influences in choosing to live in West Hants included the quiet, rural atmosphere, closeness to family, and the cost of land. In Three Mile Plains, other influences were water and sewer services, lower taxes and proximity for shopping.

80 percent of West Hants respondents expressed concerns regarding the condition of streets, roads and sidewalks, pedestrian safety and speed of traffic in their neighbourhood.

The survey asked about encouraging different types of residential development. Overall two types were considered to be acceptable: single family dwellings and senior housing. In the Three Mile Plains area, about 50 percent said duplexes were also acceptable. West Hants respondents felt a variety of non-residential uses such as home occupations and offices were acceptable in residential areas.

Respondents included many of the same factors that influenced their decision to move to West Hants as reasons why they liked their community. Some dislikes that were noted were: poor road conditions, derelict vehicles, lack of water and sewer services, unsightly properties, and speed of traffic.

When asked about commercial development and where respondents did their shopping, most West Hants and Windsor respondents do most of their shopping in Windsor-West Hants. However, respondents from Ardoise/Ellershouse shopped in Halifax because of its proximity. In all areas, most people made clothing purchases in Halifax and New Minas.

Over 60 percent of West Hants respondents suggested that new businesses should locate in existing buildings downtown, existing mall space and industrial parks. Over 30 percent of Three Mile Plains respondents also chose Garlands Crossing and Three Mile Plains as possible locations for new businesses. Over 40 percent of Ardoise/Ellershouse respondents also chose Brooklyn.

Over 60 percent of West Hants respondents felt that they did not need a new mall. Many felt that new businesses should locate in the existing mall, and that the existing malls could be improved or expanded.

When asked about downtown Windsor, West Hants respondents were somewhat satisfied with most aspects of downtown Windsor, although a third of West Hants respondents were not satisfied with parking, condition of buildings, and condition of streets and sidewalks.

Most of the comments from West Hants about commercial development included development in the Town of Windsor, since West Hants respondents view Windsor as their town as well. Some respondents felt there was a need for a large retail store while others wanted to encourage smaller local businesses. There was also a desire to refurbish the downtown area and develop the waterfront area. Respondents felt a wide range of commercial and industrial uses should be permitted in the industrial parks like those which are available in Bayers Lake and Burnside.

About 68 percent of respondents from West Hants felt that residential development should be directed away from prime agricultural land. Over 70 percent of responses from Three Mile Plains/Ardoise/Ellershouse area agreed.

When respondents were asked about municipal services, over 60 percent of respondents were “very satisfied” with fire and police services, and over 50 percent with garbage and recycling.

The survey included questions about recreation programs and composting. According to the survey, West Hants respondents had a low participation rate in recreation programs, however this could be linked to the age of the respondents.

There were different questions on five planning issues in the Windsor-West Hants area. These included protection of heritage buildings, downtown and residential architectural standards and Downtown Windsor revitalization. Most respondents from Windsor and West Hants felt that these were important issues. Over 70 percent felt the preservation of farmland was also very important.

With regard to future development of Windsor-West Hants, over 40 percent of Three Mile Plains respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that development should be encouraged in serviced rather than unserviced areas. Overall, 70 percent “agreed” or “strongly agreed.”

With regard to residential development being limited in areas with poor well water or inadequate ground water supply, 75 percent of the respondents from Three Mile Plains and from Ardoise/Ellershouse area “agreed” or “strongly agreed.”

The question about a by-law limiting the use of pesticides in Windsor found that more than 60 percent of West Hants respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed,” with many adding that a by-law should also be considered for West Hants.

The question concerning the Avon River Causeway was not a yes or no question and the responses were deemed whether they were a yes or no. Overall, 38 percent of West Hants respondents suggested that the causeway should be removed and 39 percent of Windsor respondents felt it should not be removed. In both the Three Mile Plains and in the Ardoise/Ellershouse area there was an even split, between those who wanted to keep the causeway and those who felt it should be removed.

## **Questions from Public on Survey Presentation**

Mary White asked what the Committee intended to do with the information. She also asked if a population projection had been made. Ms. Sodero replied that the responses from the survey are being used to gauge how the public sees development in their area. The survey is just one tool. Ms. Davis explained that the current MPS and LUB are being reviewed. The answers from the survey will be taken into account, along with information obtained from public consultations. Ms. Sodero stated in regard to Ms. White's second question that Staff had done statistical profiles based on the last Census, however population growth is difficult to predict because of all the unknown factors such as the twinning of Highway 101, and the proximity to Halifax. Ms. White asked what is expected for population growth. Ms. Davis advised that one reason for pushing the plan review now is that Highway 101 twinning could result in development pressure. It is important to think about where the people are going to go and how they are going to be accommodated. Ms. Davis stated there are many factors that could affect population growth. She advised that one of the things that affects development here is what HRM is doing and how costly development is there. Ms. Davis advised that we have to be prepared for growth above what has been experienced in the last few years.

The public meeting recessed at 7:30 p.m.

The public meeting reconvened at 7:46 p.m.

## **Existing Planning Documents**

Ms. Davis explained there are four separate Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws. She advised that Area One is the southeastern part of the Municipality, south of the Kennetcook River extending from the eastern boundary of the Municipality, and including the Highway 101 corridor area as far as Windsor. Area Two covers the part of the Municipality north of the Kennetcook River, including the Shore area. Area Three is the southwest part of the Municipality extending past Windsor on Highway 14 toward Martock, Windsor Forks and Vaughan to the county line. There is a separate Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Falmouth and another separate one for Upper Falmouth.

The Falmouth MPS is the oldest planning document and was adopted in 1976 and last reviewed in 1986. It was adopted to address the rapid residential growth that Falmouth was experiencing in the 1970's and 80's. The intent of the planning strategy is that Falmouth is to develop as a predominately residential community within very defined servicing boundaries.

The Upper Falmouth MPS and LUB were adopted in 1989 at the request of the farming community in the area. Its intent is to protect prime agricultural land in Upper Falmouth.

The Area Two & Three MPS and LUB were adopted in 1994. It is a very simple two-issue strategy developed to protect the water supply area for Falmouth and prevent undesirable land use. There is a Water Supply Watershed zone and the rest of Area Two and Three is zoned General Use, which allows any residential, commercial and industrial uses, except new landfills. This restriction on landfills was put in place in order to stop a landfill from Halifax coming to the area. There is no protection or identification of prime agricultural land.

Area One has the most complex MPS and LUB with 31 zones, which makes it difficult to administer. The Area One MPS makes a clear distinction between urban and rural. The urban designation is the Growth Centre which applies to the Three Mile Plains/Hillcrest Drive serviced area. The idea is that most of the more intensive non-resource uses will be directed to the Growth Centre. The rural designation applies to the Village designation of Brooklyn, and eight Hamlets including Ellershouse, Newport Corner, Sweets Corner, Newport Station, St. Croix, and Newport Landing. The remainder is the resource areas. This includes an agricultural designation which applies to three agricultural priority zones, a forestry resource zone, mineral resource zone, and a combined resource zone. The intent of the MPS is to concentrate development in the serviced Growth Centre, and to a lesser extent in the Village and Hamlets, thereby protecting the resource areas, and preventing scattered development.

The Three Mile Plains/Hillcrest Drive Growth Centre is on the western side of the Windsor Town limits, with Highway 101 being a boundary. It includes Garlands Crossing, Dill Road and northeastern part of the Windsor Back Road, Denise Drive, Mountain Road and Panuke Road. It extends east to just beyond Reid Shanks garage on Highway 1. There are several residential zones within the Growth Centre. The majority of residential land is zoned Growth Centre Residential (R3). The Single Detached Residential (R1) zone allows single family dwellings, churches and day nurseries. The Two Unit Residential (R2) zone allows duplexes, semi-detached dwellings and any R1 uses as well. The Growth Centre Residential (R3) is more open than R1 or R2, and also allows mobile homes, churches, cemeteries, non-licensed day nurseries, household livestock operations. Household livestock allows for a small number of livestock based on the size of the lot; e.g., one animal unit for the first full acre and an additional animal unit for each additional full half acre, not to exceed a maximum of eight animal units per lot. R3 allows recreational uses and existing agricultural uses. The Multiple Residential (R4) zone permits more than two units as-of-right, as long as the building is less than three stories in height. There is provision to permit apartment buildings more than three stories in height by development agreement. Property can be rezoned to R4 if it is serviced and on an arterial or collector road.

Mobile home parks are permitted only in the Growth Centre by development agreement, provided the lot is located on an arterial or collector road, and serviced.

There are several commercial zones. A commercial core area is zoned General Commercial (GC), and located in the Garlands Crossing area around the Downeast Restaurant. It covers a large area and cannot be rezoned. The GC zone allows a wide range of commercial uses, as well as a full range of residential uses including multi unit dwellings as-of-right, R1, R2 and R3 uses. Outside the commercial core area, new highway commercial uses, such as those dependent on high traffic flow like hotels and service stations, are permitted by development agreement, on an arterial or collector road. New local commercial uses, which are small

scale commercial no more than 1,000 sf. in floor area, such as craft shops, antique shops, professional offices and video stores, are permitted by development agreement as long as they are compatible with residential uses. The Residential/Business (RB) zone applies to existing businesses in conjunction with a residential use. It is similar to home occupations, but without the size restrictions. Uses such as service shops like printers, tinsmith and machine shops are permitted.

Chairman Matheson excused 8:05 p.m. and Councillor Shanks took over the Chair position.

Ms. Davis advised that home occupations are small scale businesses permitted in a home in any zone. There is a size limitation of 500 sf. in the Growth Centre and no more than 25 percent of the floor area of the house. A home occupation can be located in an accessory building as well as the home. There is a restriction on the number of employees.

There are several industrial zones. Existing resource industries such as Mason's were zoned Resource Industrial. New resource industrial uses are permitted by development agreement, provided there is frontage on an arterial or collector road, and the use is not obnoxious and compatible with other uses. The Local Industrial (LI-1) zone permits home based industrial uses in conjunction with residential uses, such as auto body shops, excavation and landscaping operations, service shops and transport depots. New local industrial uses are permitted by development agreement provided the use is compatible. There is no requirement for frontage on an arterial or collector road.

Commercial entertainment or recreation businesses such as camp grounds, theme parks and race tracks, are permitted by development agreement. The property must be located on an arterial or collector road, and the use must be compatible with adjacent uses.

The final zone is the Agriculture Resource zone which applies to existing active agricultural land. Its intent is to protect active agricultural areas with the understanding that they could be eventually considered for more urban type of development. The zone allows dwellings up to two units, agricultural uses, and existing intensive livestock operations, but not new ones. No new house is permitted within 500 ft. of an existing intensive livestock operation. No new intensive livestock building is permitted within 1,000 ft. of a residential, commercial or institutional building. The zone provides some protection in terms of setting large lot frontages. The required frontage for a dwelling is 140 ft. This would discourage major subdivisions.

Ms. Davis asked the public for comments.

### **Questions and comments from Public**

A question was asked to clarify the frontage for lots zoned agricultural. Ms. Davis stated that the agricultural zone is intended to protect agricultural uses. One of the ways to protect them is by discouraging subdivision of land. It requires 140 ft. of frontage for a lot for residential use.

A question was asked about the designation of Ellershouse. Ms. Davis stated that Ellershouse is in a Hamlet designation. In a Hamlet designation there are four zones; Rural Residential (R6), Hamlet Commercial (C1), Hamlet Industrial (M2) and Rural Resource (RR). The Hamlets are intended to provide locally oriented services, such as churches, community halls, and schools, and limited residential development. The intent is to maintain the rural nature of these areas.

Mary White asked if there was a limit on the number of household livestock in a Hamlet, and if chickens are permitted to run at large. Ms. Davis advised chickens are permitted and that the Municipality has an Animals at Large By-law. Residents are required to keep their animals on their property. Ms. White expressed concerns regarding the cleanliness and smell of dog pens, and whether the Committee was going to review those by-laws. Ms. Davis advised that the Planning Committee deals with the Land Use By-law and the Municipal Planning Strategy which cannot regulate cleanliness or upkeep of a property. Those matters might perhaps fall under the dangerous and unsightly provisions of the Municipal Government Act. The Land Use By-law does regulate the location of any new business or new commercial kennels.

Mary White asked if she could set up a business in the Hamlet of Ellershouse as long as it is no more than 25 percent of a dwelling or lot. Ms. Davis replied the requirement is 25 percent of the floor area of a dwelling, plus there are other requirements as well. A garage or accessory building can be used of a total of 1,000 sf. There are also restrictions on the type of business can be operated. Auto repair shops and auto body shops are not permitted as a home occupation but offices, B & B's and antique shops are allowed. There are also restrictions in terms of signage used and what can be stored outside.

Mary White asked if four zones in Ellershouse is complex, and whether they could be consolidated into one zone. Ms. Davis replied normally there is need to allow for some separation of uses. Sometimes commercial or industrial uses are allowed by the development agreement process or rezoning. There is more control if using a development agreement, but sometimes it is a more complicated process. There are four zones in the Hamlet, overall there are thirty-one zones in Area One. The Growth Centre has four or five separate commercial zones which is a lot. The Committee will be reviewing the zones and perhaps may be able to reduce the number.

A public member asked who would be on Municipal Staff to answer questions on zoning. Ms. Davis said the Development Officer administers the Land Use By-law. Any specific questions the public has about permitted uses, the Development Officer, Doug MacInnis, is the person that you would deal with. He administers the Land Use By-law, he issues the permits as required under the Land Use By-law and authorizes the use.

Ms. Sodero said in terms of the animal control issue that would be the By-law Enforcement Officer, Gary Lunn.

Andrew Swinamer stated he lived at 79 Old Halifax West Road, and has been doing automobile repairs for the last four years. It first started out as a mobile business. He stated in order to get a safety inspection registration for his garage, he has to have the Municipality's authorization, but apparently the business is not permitted. He asked what he should try to do, rezone or wait until the Plan Review is done. Ms. Davis said one of the things that he can do is to request the Committee to consider his situation in the Plan Review and see if they can find a way to accommodate the use that he wants for his property in the new MPS and LUB. He asked the Committee to consider this a formal request.

A member of the public asked about road frontage considerations for the size of building lots on services. Ms. Davis said in a serviced area, 70 ft is usually the frontage standard. He noted that in this area and a lot of rural areas the lots are very deep. In the past it was common to have one lot with road frontage, and one behind. Is it controlled more today? He stated he understood that the lot size is controlled, and noted that shape and size of lots vary in this area. He commented maybe the restriction does not fit with lots that are deep. In the past, road frontage lots have been sold and all there is now is small parcels with little or no frontage, just a lane. Ms. Davis advised there is a provision in the Land Use By-law that allows for lots on a right-of-way under limited circumstances. The Subdivision By-law states that if there is a lot that existed since August 6, 1984, and its boundaries have not changed since that date, except if there were lots that were created with the required frontage, you can subdivide that lot, creating one new lot on a right-of-way. There is also a provision that states only one main building is permitted on a lot; for example, one house. If it can be proven that the lot could be subdivided meeting all requirements, then a second house can be located on that lot. For farm properties, more than one house is permitted as part of the farm operation.

Warden Dauphinee commented about an issue that came up at other public meetings about the separation distances between new barns and dwellings and neighbouring properties. He asked Mike Oulton if he had this problem. Warden Dauphinee stated the barn has to be 1,000 ft. away from the house. Ms. Davis said this is only if the house is on a separate lot from the farm property. There can be more than one farm dwelling on a lot as long as the dwellings are for people who are part of the farming operations and those houses do not have to meet the separation distance from a barn. In that case, if a new barn is built, 1,000 ft. is not required, however, if the house is on a separate lot, even if used by family member, the separation distance applies because the separate lot could be sold off to someone who is not working on the farm. Mike Oulton said there was not a problem for him specifically.

Ms. Davis advised that in some areas the farm operation is already surrounded by other existing dwellings and neighbouring properties. There are many long and narrow lots that make it difficult for people who want to put a new farm building on their property to meet the separation distance requirements.

Ms. Davis asked the public if there were any concerns about the large area zoned General Commercial in the Growth Centre. This includes the Tongue Hill area where there are a lot of residential uses. She asked if residents are happy with that situation as there could be a commercial use next to a residential lot. Commercial uses are permitted as-of-right and the zone allows a wide range of uses.

A member of the public stated he did not have water and sewer services and asked whether it would be coming to his area. He commented that a question was asked on the survey about concerns of the community and he stated lack of water and sewer services. Ms. Davis advised that the matter of water and sewer services in different areas does come up quite frequently. Council has had requests from residents from Brooklyn for sewer and water. Mount Denson residents have asked for water. Warden Dauphinee advised that Newport Station has requested water and sewer services. The Council has had studies done, and even if they get infrastructure monies, the residents' share of the cost is quite a lot. Council does not want to force anything on residents that would make it difficult to live in their homes, but Council does deal with these requests.

Warden Dauphinee advised that Council, the Committee and Staff want to know what the public wants in the future. The Council wants good growth. Ms. Davis advised that if the residents of an area want sewer and water, and if the Municipality is in agreement, they try to find a way to grant that request. The Municipality tries to obtain whatever infrastructure money may be available through the Province and the Federal Government to bring the costs down as much as possible for the residents. Warden Dauphinee stated that Ms. Davis was correct.

A question was asked about comments made at other public meetings. Ms. Davis stated what she found at the meetings was that the comments were mainly specific to the particular area. In Brooklyn, the main topic was the issue of water and sewer. Others were concerned services could lead to development pressure and disrupt the rural nature of the area. There were concerns expressed about protecting agricultural land.

In Poplar Grove, there were concerns about the Agricultural Priority One (AR-1) zone, and the Gypsum Company mining operations and the Municipality's lack of control over it. Warden Dauphinee commented the matter is a big concern for many people. Ms. Davis advised that mining operations are regulated through the Province. The Municipality has the AR-1 zoning to protect agricultural land, but yet the Gypsum Company can go ahead and mine the land, and there is nothing the Municipality can do.

In Upper Vaughan, the area is zoned General Use. Residents of the area expressed concerns regarding private road development and development around lakes. Suggestions were made that the Municipality have more controls to protect water resources.

In Centre Burlington, there is no protection for agricultural land. Residents expressed concerns to have protection for agricultural land.

Ms. Sodero advised that in Falmouth, there were concerns regarding how dense Falmouth would be permitted to get and if single family dwellings were the only housing type permitted. Ms. Sodero noted from the survey many respondents indicated there should be senior housing. Ms. Davis advised that Falmouth allows no multi-unit dwellings. Two unit or semi-detached are only permitted by development agreement. This is very different from Three Mile Plains.

Ms. Davis advised that in Scotch Village, residents voiced concerns regarding agricultural uses and zoning, and whether there is enough flexibility for farmers to expand operations.

Ms. Sodero advised that the survey comments seemed to refer to seniors group homes versus large nursing homes. Sylvia Kehoe advised that there is a senior home in Falmouth, and there was no way it could have been stopped because it was done by the Provincial or Federal Government. Ms. Davis advised that comments made in the survey indicated that senior housing was not something people wanted to prevent, it was acceptable.

Discussion was held regarding options for people to stay in their homes versus senior housing.

Ms. Curry mentioned the idea of cluster development, that there could be separate homes on one lot, and therefore less property maintenance for seniors. Gladys Manning home was permitted by development agreement. But grouped dwellings are not permitted in Falmouth, resource areas, or the Village. They may be possible in the Growth Centre on an arterial or collector road. Anything more than two units is only permitted on arterial or collector roads.

A question was asked about developing a parcel of land with no frontage. The resident asked why in the first place did it have to be on an arterial or collector road. Ms. Davis said the reason multiple units are only permitted on an arterial or collector roads is related to traffic flow and emergency services. A member of the public commented he did see a problem with delivering services on a dead end street or road. He stated he felt it was a little restrictive because of parcels of land that cannot be used because they do not have road frontage.

Ms. Davis advised that people are very anxious to see development happen but the key thing from the survey was that the rural atmosphere was very important to them. Ms. Davis noted that the current policies try to direct urban development into the serviced areas. But the building statistics show there is an equal amount of development happening in unserviced areas instead of the Growth Centre.

A member of the public stated he would like to see something put in place so land can be accessed and used. Warden Dauphinee commented that many areas are land locked. Ms. Davis advised that is one of the reasons right-of-way lots are permitted. However, the opposite view is that this creates disorderly development and it is difficult for emergency response.

Ms. Curry said that some of these areas, when the lots are quite small, perhaps only three to five acres, may not be all that useful to farmers. But once they are developed with several homes along the front, each has the opportunity to call and complain about farm activities. She also pointed out that the experience in other counties suggests that the idea of opening up some of those areas may not actually reduce development pressure on farmland. But we may be able to preserve large areas of farmland if we allow development in areas where the farmers have said development is already too close and the parcels are too small to be useful for farming.

Ms. Davis stated that there is a need to prepare for growth and yes, there is agricultural zoning for a large part of the Municipality, however, in the other part there is no protection. There is a need to identify areas of value for agriculture, and to find ways to protect the land. The Committee is meeting with farmers on January 16, 2003, to get their expertise on what is needed.

## **Adjourn**

Councillor Shanks thanked public members for coming to the meeting.

The public meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.