

PENINSULA COMMUNITY COUNCIL
AGENDA

March 3, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Jerry Blumenthal, Chair
Councillor Dawn Sloane, Vice Chair
Councillor Sue Uteck
Councillor Jennifer Watts

STAFF: Ms. Karen Brown, Municipal Solicitor
Ms. Sheilagh Edmonds, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER	4
2.	HRM Governance & District Boundary Review Process - Presentation and Question and Answer Session	4
3.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	8
4.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS	8
5.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES / STATUS SHEET	
5.1	Status Sheet	8
5.1.1	Neighbourhood Downzoning	8
5.1.2	Mitchell's Enviro Depot Update	8
5.1.3	CN Property Maintenance	8
5.1.4	Peninsula Place Flooding	8
6.	MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION:	8
7.	MOTIONS OF RESCISSION:	8
8.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS:	9
9.	HEARINGS	9
9.1	Public Hearings:	9
9.1.1	Case 01295: Rezoning of 2692 Connaught Avenue, Halifax	9
9.2	Variance Appeal Hearings:	11
9.2.1	Variance # 15809 - 1119 Rockcliffe Street, Halifax	11
9.2.2	Variance # 15828 - 5762 Harbourview Drive, Halifax	13
10.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS:	15
10.1	Correspondence:	15
10.2	Petitions:	15
10.3	Presentations:	15
11.	REPORTS	15
11.1	Staff Reports:	15
11.2	Committee Reports:	15
11.3	Members of Peninsula Community Council:	15
12.	MOTIONS:	15
13.	ADDED ITEMS	15
13.1	Information Report January 29, 2010 - Halifax Common - Economic Generation Analysis of 2009 Concerts	15

14.	NOTICES OF MOTION:	16
15.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	16
16.	NEXT MEETING:	16
17.	ADJOURNMENT	16

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Councillor Blumenthal at 6:33 p.m. in Halifax Hall, City Hall.

Councillor Blumenthal advised that prior to the regular agenda items, a presentation would be made on HRM's Governance and District Boundary Review Process. He turned the meeting over to Mayor Kelly, Chair of the District Boundary Review Committee, and Committee members.

2. HRM Governance & District Boundary Review Process - Presentation and Question and Answer Session

Mayor Kelly welcomed all those in attendance and introduced the following Committee members: Councillors Blumenthal, Dalrymple, Outhit, and Rankin. He advised that Councillors Mosher and McCluskey sent their regrets for this meeting. Mayor Kelly provided an overview of the review process the Committee was undertaking, and added that, following a video presentation, the floor would be opened to members of public for comments and questions.

A video presentation of approximately 20 minutes was given, and Mayor Kelly opened the floor to anyone wishing to provide their remarks or ask questions.

The following people spoke:

Mr. Bruce Devenne, Lower Sackville, spoke about the need to reduce the size of Regional Council. He provided statistics on the ratio of population versus Councillor representation for the cities of Vancouver and Toronto in comparison with HRM, noting that Vancouver is represented by 10 councillors and Toronto is represented by 44. He advised that if HRM's ratio was used against the City of Vancouver, the City would have 35 Councillors instead of 10 and Toronto would have 153 Councillors instead of 44. Mr. Devenne suggested that HRM be divided into five wards—Halifax, Dartmouth, the area east and north of Dartmouth, Bedford /Hammonds Plains/Sackville/Beaver Bank, and the area west and south of Halifax, with two councillors per ward. He indicated that this would reduce the size of the Council and save millions of dollars per year. Mr. Devenne concluded by advising that the City was \$30 million in debt, it will be facing a \$40 million bill for the Canada Winter Games, and it is overgoverned, so now was the time to get control of spending and to make cutbacks.

Mayor Kelly clarified a point raised by Mr. Devenne concerning the cost of the Canada Winter Games. He explained that the Games are a program funded by the Federal Government, the Province, and the Municipality and there is no debt. With regard to the \$30 million debt, Mayor Kelly advised that this is a challenge and Council will be dealing with this during the budgetary process.

Ms. Valerie Payne, representing the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, addressed the issue of the governance structure and size of Council. She advised that the Chamber

supports a smaller Council and noted that, although this is a means to an end, the ultimate goal is to make Council better. She noted that the Chamber has recently reduced the size of its Board of Directors and has resulted in huge improvements. Ms. Payne pointed out that a smaller Council will make it easier to work together, and to be more focussed and cohesive. She suggested that the perception is that Council does not seem to be operating toward the common goal of making Halifax a better place, but rather, each Councillor operates with their individual goal and agenda, with their own districts in mind. Ms. Payne emphasized the importance of getting the structure of Council right, adding that if the structure is not done correctly it won't matter what the size of Council is. Ms. Payne concluded with the following points:

- Council should be reduced to 15 members
- The Councillors role should be to act as a member of the board of directors for the City; and to use their leadership and time to think of the City as a whole and what is best for all citizens.
- To understand and know what the responsibilities are of management and the board.
- Council needs to work together and debate the right issues at the right time.

Councillor Outhit asked Ms. Payne on her views of the role of Community Councils. In response, She advised that the Chamber feels they provide a good role and that they could be better utilized.

Mayor Kelly asked Ms. Payne whether she supported a higher ratio of MLA/public representation or if she felt the ratio of Councillor/constituents should be higher.

Ms. Payne advised that the governance structure needed to be established first before that question is considered.

Mr. Hugh Pullen, Halifax, advised that his experience with HRM Council and the former City of Halifax Council, has shown him that the Councillors are leaders in their districts and whenever there has been an emergency in their area, it has always been the local Councillor that has taken charge. Mr. Pullen also pointed out that there is a very large segment of the City's population that do not know how government works, and their only real contact they have with the City is through their Councillor. Mr. Pullen advised that he was in favour of a smaller Regional Council, but that there is a place for a subordinate level of community councillors, in particular, they would be representatives that the public can easily reach to find out how to make contact with the administration of the City.

Mr. Sam Austin, Halifax, suggested that one of the negative aspects of municipal council is that it does not have a policy network of people to support and generate ideas, and staff often fill this void. He noted that part of the role of Council is to inject some humanity into the process, and suggested that a smaller Council would mean less ability for that to be done. This would result in a Council that would be more remote from residents and, in his view, it would be less democratic.

Ms. Catherine Kitching, Halifax, advised that she moved to Halifax from Ottawa approximately 10 months ago and part of her reason for wanting to settle here was the size of the City and the feeling of community and citizen engagement. She added that she has been very impressed in her dealings with Councillors, noting that she was surprised when she received a response back from a Councillor on the same day she sent it, and they have been very friendly to deal with. Ms. Kitching suggested that the population would not receive better representation if the Councillors were representing two to three times the constituents. She added that she was open to the idea of more efficient ways for Councillor representation, such as the suggestion by the previous speaker of a subordinate level of Councillors, but would recommend maintaining the current ratio of Councillor to constituents. Ms. Kitching noted that HRM was a very diverse community and expressed concern that a smaller Council may not represent the concerns of all.

Ms. Beverly Miller, Halifax, advised that she had been on the citizens committee for the last district boundary review process, and that she was disappointed there was no citizen involvement this time. She added that this presentation was useful but there has not been much citizen debate and there was too much information presented tonight. Ms. Miller indicated that Community Council should be reviewed first and if it were made more efficient and provided more power, then perhaps the size of Regional Council could be reduced. Ms. Miller noted that the presentation did not address the citizen relationship to their Councillors, and information on the Councillors' workloads was also missing, as this was very important information to provide, e.g. the number of Committees a Councillor sits on, the number of e-mails and phone call, etc. Ms. Miller pointed out that this information would enable the public to consider the impact on a Councillor if their constituency was increased. Ms. Miller also pointed out that the Councillors' salaries account for a very minimal percentage of the overall budget and therefore, any concern over the costs associated with the number of Councillors should not be a consideration. She added that if the number of Councillors were reduced it simply means that the workload on the Councillors would increase substantially, and she advised that Councillors do not have the same staffing resources that the representatives have at the Provincial and Federal Levels.

Mr. John Blanchard, Halifax, advised that he felt the Councillors' salary load on the overall budget was minuscule and it would not be an advancement to reduce Council representation. He added that the only argument for a reduction in the number of councillors is that it would provide an efficiency, but the only efficiency would be less argument within the constituencies. Mr. Blanchard advised that if, for example, the Peninsula districts were amalgamated into one district, it would only reduce the number of views being put forward, and would not improve the debate. Mr. Blanchard also pointed out that if the number of Councillors are substantially reduced, then the Municipality will lose the information base and additional staff would have to be hired in order to provide the information to make a sound decision. If additional staff were not hired then Councillors would be making decisions without all the information needed to make an informed decision. Mr. Blanchard noted that he lived in Montreal during the time when their municipal amalgamation occurred. Since this time, however, they have essentially re-created the affected boroughs that were there before amalgamation. He

noted that they were brought back by a community council type structure. In summary, Mr. Blanchard advised that he believed that the efficiencies people are looking for are not found in reducing the number of councillors, but rather could be found in the actual structure the City is operating within and the staff groups themselves.

Councillor Outhit requested Ms. Sara Knight, Solicitor for the District Boundary Review Committee to clarify the comment of citizen involvement referred to by Ms. Beverly Miller.

Ms. Knight advised that in approaching the public participation aspect of the District Boundary Review it was determined that this forum was the best way to get the broadest amount of participation rather than through a citizen committee.

Further to this, Mayor Kelly advised that this has been the fifth meeting to date and close to 300 individuals have attended the meetings or have been part of the process.

Mr. Level Chan, Halifax, advised that he felt it was important to focus on the role of Council as the City's representative and, as a result, it is important to note that this role is not dependent on the number of constituents each Councillor is representing. Mr. Chan added that there should be greater empowerment of Community Councils to deal with the issues that are at a local level and that there should be better communication to the constituents about the powers of Community Council and this will lighten the load on the overall Regional Council.

Ms. Bobby Johawks, Halifax, advised that she was not well enough informed on the impact that Council's size and boundaries would have on the City to make a decision on this matter. She suggested that Councillors could best serve their citizens by choosing the right topic on their agenda and showing leadership through action.

Ms. Jennifer Barry, Halifax, spoke in support of maintaining the current number of Councillors. She added that it is important in this process to not only consider Council's decision on where its residents live, but also in where they work. She advised that the majority of HRM residents come into the downtown on a daily basis even if they don't live here; they either come in to work or use the services in the downtown. Ms. Barry indicated that focus should be more about where people are on a day to day basis.

Mr. Graham Hicks, Halifax advised that he did not believe Council should be reduced from its current size. He noted that prior to amalgamation there were 24 Councillors in the County of Halifax, and with the remaining areas there was approximately 60 Councillors in total. Mr. Hicks pointed out that from this number, the entire HRM is being served by 23 Councillors and that everything seems to be working fine and he felt that the Council size should be left as is.

Mayor Kelly called three times for anyone else wishing to speak. There were no further speakers. He thanked everyone for coming out this evening and noted that this was the first phase in the process.

The meeting recessed at 7:34 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at approximately 7:45 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Uteck, seconded by Councillor Sloane that the minutes of February 8, 2010 be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Addition:

- 13.1 Information Report January 29, 2010 - Halifax Common - Economic Generation Analysis of 2009 Concerts.

MOVED by Councillor Uteck, seconded by Councillor Sloane that the agenda as amended be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES / STATUS SHEET:

5.1 Status Sheet

5.1.1 Neighbourhood Downzoning

No update. To remain on the Status Sheet.

5.1.2 Mitchell's Enviro Depot Update

No update. To remain on the Status Sheet.

5.1.3 CN Property Maintenance

No update. To remain on the Status Sheet.

5.1.4 Peninsula Place Flooding

Councillor Sloane noted that a private and confidential information report was submitted to Peninsula Community Council at an in camera meeting held earlier on this date, and that Peninsula Community Council had requested that staff provide monthly updates until the issue is resolved.

6. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION: None

7. MOTIONS OF RESCISSION: None

8. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS: None

9. HEARINGS

9.1 Public Hearings:

9.1.1 Case 01295: Rezoning of 2692 Connaught Avenue, Halifax

- A staff report dated January 8, 2010 was submitted.
- First Reading of this matter was given at a meeting of Peninsula Community Council on February 8, 2010.

Mr. Luc Ouellet, Planner 1 provided a presentation on the application by Christopher and Shanna Trenaman to rezone 2692 Connaught Avenue, Halifax from a R-1 (single family) to R-2 (general residential). In his remarks he advised that the purpose of the application is to permit the re-establishment of the basement apartment, which was removed when it was determined that the apartment was not an authorized unit.

Mr. Ouellet outlined the reasons why staff felt the proposal was in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood, as contained in the staff report and advised that it satisfies the applicable policies of the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy, and therefore staff were recommending approval.

Mr. Ouellet responded to questions from Community Council.

In response to a question by Councillor Watts concerning potential uses of the property if it were zoned R-2, Mr. Ouellet advised that the zoning permits up to four units. However, this is dependent on the lot area and, in this situation, the size of the parcel would only allow up to two units, permitting a duplex or something of this nature.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Eric Thompson, Halifax, advised that he was a resident of the area and was concerned with the potential that all of Connaught Avenue, from Chebucto Road to Bayers Road, could be rezoned to R-2. Mr. Thompson added that he was also concerned about the possibility that a lot of the homes could be converted over to the type of flats, as seen in the south end of Halifax. He pointed out that this application is not a contract development and once it is signed then either the current or future property owners have the opportunity to change the external appearance of the building to something drastic.

Mr. Jack Smith, Halifax, indicated that he was a resident of the area and was completely surprised with the application as he was not aware of it and that he came to Community Council this evening for another matter. Mr. Smith advised that he concurred with the comments of the last speaker. He also pointed out that this situation was a result of someone making a mistake.

Mr. Rick Tully, Halifax advised that he was resident of the area. He made reference to the Municipal Planning Strategy regarding the aspect of maintaining the integrity of the existing neighbourhood and advised that it was a very stable neighbourhood with long term residents, and he was concerned about the precedent that would be set if the property in question were rezoned to R-2. Mr. Tully added that residents rely on the City to protect them from changes in neighbourhood design and he asked Community Council's consideration of this point.

Mr. Chris Trenaman, the applicant, pointed out that the basement apartment has been in existence for the past 50 years, therefore, approval of his request would not result in any significant change. Mr. Trenaman advised that he grew up in the Westmount Subdivision and, in his opinion, his property was distinct from the rest of the subdivision for the following reasons: it was isolated; it was situated on a corner; there is only one neighbour; and he faces properties that are commercial and R-2 across one street and apartments on the other side. With regard to the potential of this case being precedent setting, Mr. Trenaman noted that if his application was approved, similar meetings such as this would be required for any further requests.

The Chair called three times for any further speakers; there being none, it was **MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Uteck that the public hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

Councillor Watts asked staff to clarify the potential for similar requests to come forward in the future.

In response, Mr. Ouellet explained that this portion of West End Halifax falls under the Residential Environment Designation that permits rezoning applications to be made and this would include the entire Westmount Subdivision. He added that the possibility is there for applications to be made, however, staff generally tend not to support applications that are mid-block on streets that are entirely R-1. In the past, corner lots such as this application have been supported by staff.

In response to a question by Councillor Sloane, Mr. Ouellet advised that there is no policy which would allow this application to occur through Development Agreement.

MOVED by Councillor Watts, seconded by Councillor Uteck that Peninsula Community Council approve the rezoning of 2692 Connaught Avenue, Halifax, as shown on Schedule A of Attachment A of the January 8, 2010 staff report, from R-1 (Single Family) to R-2 (General Residential).

Councillor Watts advised that she supported this application for the following reasons: there has been no complaint from the neighbour in terms of the use; there is adequate parking; and the responsiveness of the current property owner to come forward and address the situation once he found out that the basement was not permitted with the current zoning. She added that she does not view approval of this application as a slippery slope to R-2 zoning in the area and is comfortable with her decision, given the particular circumstances of this home and the intention of the current homeowners.

Councillor Watts noted that she would not support a redesignation of any other part of this R-1 area in the subdivision.

Councillor Uteck indicated she was aware that homeowners are fearful that applications such as this may lead to rooming houses and large flats, however, she pointed out that there are regulations—Gross Floor Area Ratio—on the Peninsula which stipulates the maximum number of rooms you can have in a house, depending on its size. Councillor Uteck advised that she supports this application because the apartment has been in existence for approximately 60 years; the homeowners were upfront with staff once it was determined that the unit was not permitted. She added that she concurred with Councillor Watts that, if the property had been further in the street, she would not be supportive.

In reference to the basement apartment, Councillor Sloane advised that she would vote against the application due to her concern over illegal uses. She added that she does not blame the current homeowners.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9.2 Variance Appeal Hearings:

9.2.1 Variance # 15809 - 1119 Rockcliffe Street, Halifax

- A staff report dated February 22, 2010 was submitted.

Mr. Andrew Faulkner, Development Officer, reviewed the staff report outlining his decision to approve an application for a variance from the requirements of the land use bylaw for the property at 1119 Rockcliffe Street, Halifax. Mr. Faulkner noted that the land use bylaw for the area in question permits lots of a size between 5,500 and 7,000 square feet a maximum Gross Floor Area of 3,300 square feet or a Floor Area Ratio of 0.55, whichever is greater. The property is 5,919 square feet in area. He advised that the property owner is proposing to renovate and construct additions to an existing single family dwelling and that the habitable space behind the garage in the basement is the portion that has increased the gross floor area past the maximum allowed. Mr. Faulkner noted that three appeals have been submitted.

The Chair reviewed the Rules of Procedure for appeal hearings, and opened the hearing.

Mr. Aaron Bishop addressed Community Council and advised that he was the property owner of 1119 Rockcliffe Street. Mr. Bishop advised that his above-ground home is in accordance with the Bylaw and there was really no need for him to apply for a variance, however, he wanted permission to finish his basement, and this is the reason why he applied for the variance. He added that the neighbours have appealed the above ground portion of the home, however, he pointed out that this portion of the home is not in question. Mr. Bishop went on to note that, whether he finishes his basement or not it

will have no impact on the neighbours. He explained that he spoke with his neighbours advising them of his intentions, and the response from most was very positive and welcoming.

Mr. Bishop referred to the appeal letters and responded to concerns raised in regard to: character of the house in relation to the neighbourhood; the size of the house; invasion of light and privacy; and the impact on the property values on neighbouring homes.

In closing, Mr. Bishop reiterated that the neighbours are appealing a home that meets the City bylaw, and that the only aspect under consideration is the basement. He added that wanting to finish his basement to provide a play area for his children has no impact on the neighbours.

Mr. Clyde Evans, Rockcliffe Street advised that he welcomed a new family to the street and the improvements to the house, however he was concerned about the size of the house. Mr. Evans suggested that the property in question was not undergoing a renovation but that it was actually a demolition and construction of a new large house. He added that the proposed house will be almost three times larger than the existing house and is 30 percent over the maximum allowed by the City's regulations. Mr. Evans also noted that the lot size at 5,990 feet is at the smaller end of the range of houses that can have a 3,300 square foot house; and further, a lot size of over 9,000 square feet would be required to absorb this house according to the City's regulations. He pointed out that a second garage, verandas and balconies also add to the total size of the house. Mr. Evans advised that he felt the house was over-sized and will impact on his enjoyment and use of his own home which has been in his family for over 70 years and he asked Community Council to refuse the variance.

Mr. Alan Kitz, addressed Community Council and advised that he was speaking on behalf of Janet Kitz, a resident of Rockcliffe Street. Mr. Kitz advised that he concurred with the remarks of Mr. Evans and added that all the houses that were shown in the staff presentation were homes on larger lots on the other side of the street and no attention was drawn to the homes to the north of the proposed building which are as small, if not smaller. Mr. Kitz suggested that this has been taken out of context, and the proposal is a large proposed dwelling on a lot that does not have a great deal of square footage.

Mr. David Walker, addressed Community Council and indicated that he was representing his son, Andrew Walker, one of the appellants, who was unable to attend the meeting as he was out of the country. Mr. Walker read the submitted appeal letter which advised that he did not have sufficient time to respond to the appeal; his request for an extension was ignored; and that he feels his right to appeal has been compromised.

Mr. Walker requested a response on why the letter from staff that was dated January 13, 2010 was postmarked January 22, 2010. Further he pointed out that it was received on January 28, 2010 and with the deadline for appeal being February 1, 2010 it did not give him the 14 days to prepare his appeal which is stated in the HRM

Charter.

In response, Mr. Faulkner advised that this was something he could not respond to this evening, but he would look into the matter. Mr. Faulkner indicated, however, that this evening's hearing was the opportunity for the appellants to present their concerns.

Mr. Walker continued reading through the submitted appeal letter, with Mr. Faulkner responding to questions in regard to points of concern about the variance and variance appeal process as raised by Mr. Walker.

The Chair called three times for further speakers; there being none, it was **MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Watts that the appeal hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

Mr. Faulkner responded to questions from Community Council.

Councillor Watts requested comment from the Solicitor regarding the remarks by the last speaker on the timelines.

In response, Ms. Karen Brown, Solicitor, advised that the HRM Charter sets out a prescribed time that an appeal must be filed and it appears the appeal was filed within appropriate timeframe by three parties. With regard to the process, she explained that if a property owner objects to a process issue, this would be a separate issue, as this Community Council was dealing with the merits of the appeal based on the criteria set out in the Charter.

MOVED by Councillor Uteck, seconded by Councillor Sloane that Peninsula Community Council uphold the Development Officer's decision to approve the variance.

In moving the motion Councillor Uteck advised that there appears to be confusion over Gross Floor Area Ratio (GFAR). She explained that GFAR was implemented four years ago to stop the quasi-rooming houses from developing. Councillor Uteck added that this has worked however it has also penalized families. She noted that when this house is completed it will be the same house, but that the neighbours will not see the portion of the basement that they will tunnel out. Councillor Uteck pointed out that this is the only issue before Community Council, adding that the issue of height is not something Community Council can control because everything else the homeowner is intending to do is within the Land Use Bylaw and is legal. The variance pertains to a crawl space behind the house.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9.2.2 Variance # 15828 - 5762 Harbourview Drive, Halifax

- A staff report dated February 22, 2010 was submitted.

Mr. Andrew Faulkner, Development Officer provided the presentation outlining why he refused to grant a variance from the requirements of the land use bylaw for the property at 5762 Harbourview Drive, Halifax. He explained that the proposal was to remove an existing single family dwelling and replace it with a new single family dwelling with attached garage. The application for variance was to vary maximum lot coverage from 35 percent to 38.5 percent and increase the maximum gross floor area permitted from 4,500 square feet to 7,908.75 square feet, an increase of 75 percent more than permitted. Mr. Faulkner advised that in his review of the application he determined that it violates the intent of the land use bylaw because to increase the lot coverage and gross floor area by an additional 75 percent is not in keeping with the existing neighbourhood; and the difficulties associated with this proposal are general to the properties in the area. He added that the owner has applied for variance prior to construction, and there has been no intentional disregard for the requirements of the land use bylaw

Mr. Faulkner responded to questions from Community Council.

The Chair reviewed the Rules of Procedure and opened the hearing.

Mr. Mike Foran, advised that he was the owner of the property in question and that he currently lived on Young Avenue. The purpose of the application was to have a bigger house for his growing family and it would enable them to stay in the neighbourhood. Mr. Foran circulated photos of the streetscape noting that there is a mixture of styles of homes, and that the scale of his proposal was in keeping with the neighbourhood and will not have a negative visual impact on the street. He explained the reason why it exceeded the square footage was due to a bedroom on the main floor, which will be for his elderly parents. Mr. Foran added that his intent was for his family to live in the home, and that he believed he has maintained the character and added value to the home.

A woman addressed Community Council, identifying herself as the neighbour next to the property in question. She expressed concern that granting the variance would result in the beginning of the change of the neighbourhood.

The Chair called three times for any other speakers; there being none it was **MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Uteck that the appeal hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Uteck, seconded by Councillor Sloane that the decision of the Development Officer be overturned and the variance granted.

In moving her motion in favour of granting the variance, Councillor Uteck advised that the regulations in regard to the Gross Floor Area Ratio will ensure that the footprint remains the same. She added that she felt it was important that families who want to come to the area are not penalized, and that this house will be in keeping of the character of the street.

Councillor Watts noted that a letter had been submitted from John Morehouse and Janice Wiscombe supporting the Development Officer's decision. She noted that they have expressed concern about sunlight being blocked to their property. Councillor Watts referred to the site plan and noted that the main part of house in question sits back further on the lot than the homes beside the property.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The meeting recessed at 9:10 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:16 p.m.

10. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS:

10.1 Correspondence: None

10.2 Petitions: None

10.3 Presentations: None

11. REPORTS:

11.1 Staff Reports: None

11.2 Committee Reports: None

11.3 Members of Peninsula Community Council: None

12. MOTIONS: None

13. ADDED ITEMS

13.1 Information Report January 29, 2010 - Halifax Common - Economic Generation Analysis of 2009 Concerts

- An Information Report dated January 29, 2010 entitled Halifax Common - Economic Generation Analysis of 2009 Concerts was submitted.

Councillor Watts advised that she had questions in regard to the information report and that she would like staff to respond.

Mr. Mike Gillett, Senior Civic Event Coordinator, responded to questions, clarifying the following points:

- the exact numbers in regard to attendance at the concerts is the confidential information of the promoter.
- with regard to the economic impact, staff also take into account the people who book hotels, shop, go to restaurants, buy gas etc.

- economic generation numbers come from Events Halifax and they use a formula that is used country-wide.
- support for the concerts on the Common is in the form of policing, parks services and electrical staff; fencing; other types of support would be in the form of his own resources as a site manager.

Councillor Watts pointed out that although there is a positive impact economically with the concerts, there are businesses that are negatively impacted by the concerts, and she advised that it was important to keep this in mind as it is also part of the economic analysis storey.

Councillor Watts requested that staff provide more detailed information in regard to the economic analysis numbers for each of the concerts held last year. She stated that the information could be e-mailed to her because there would not be another Community Council meeting in advance of staff providing their report to Regional Council, if it was going to Council by the end of the month.

Councillor Sloane asked that staff also follow up and find out if the City of Moncton deals with their concerts in same confidential manner as Halifax, or if they deal with it in public.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION: None

15. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Hugh Pullen, Halifax, made reference to three buildings in the area of Beaufort Avenue and Roxton Road in the south end and noted that one of the properties is tied up in court with estate issues and the other two were bungalows which were demolished and replaced with three-storey homes that were, in his opinion, cheaply constructed. Mr. Pullen expressed concern that these units may end up as student housing and he questioned if there were any design controls as he felt they were totally out of character with the area.

Ms. Beverly Miller, Halifax, noted that a concern she had with the Gross Floor Area Ratio was that it could create the tendency for people build houses that are higher than what was traditional. Ms. Miller also expressed concern with the information report submitted on the economic analysis of the Halifax Common concerts, advising that it lacked the essential information which had been requested.

16. NEXT MEETING: April 12, 2010

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:44 a.m.

Legislative Assistant