



**NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
JUNE 4, 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Tim Outhit  
Councillor Steve Craig  
Ms. Ann Merritt  
Mr. Paul Russell  
Mr. Brian Murray  
Mr. Kevin Copley  
Mr. Evan MacDonald

**REGRETS:** Mr. Ross Evans

**STAFF:** Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant  
Ms. Erin MacIntyre, Planner  
Mr. Tyson Simms, Planner  
Mr. Carl Purvis, Major Projects Planner  
Ms. Jennifer Chapman, Planner

*The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.*

*The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the North West Planning Advisory Committee are available online:*

<http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/NWPAC/140604nwpac-agenda.php>

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., and the Committee adjourned at 8:35 p.m.*

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 7, 2014 (public meeting) and May 7, 2014**

**MOVED by Councillor Craig, seconded by Mr. Murray that the minutes of April 7, 2014 and May 7, 2014 be approved as presented. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS**

**MOVED by Mr. Russell and seconded by Mr. MacDonald that the agenda be approved as presented. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES -- NONE**

**5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE**

**6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS**

**6.1 Correspondence**

**6.2 Petitions**

**6.3 Presentations**

**6.3.1 Staff Presentation – Follow-up to Presentation at Last Meeting – Planning Process.**

Mr. Carl Purvis outlined the governance framework of planning and indicated the various levels of planning in HRM. Mr. Purvis also described the relation of planning documents and went into depth regarding planning tools such as development agreements and site plan approvals. Mr. Purvis proceeded to illustrate a sample application process. Mr. Andrew Reid then gave a short presentation on the legislative process, and terms pertaining to procedure and operation of the North West Planning Advisory Committee.

**7. REPORTS**

**7.1 STAFF**

**7.1.1 Case 19206: Application by United Gulf to enter into a development agreement to consider CGB (General Business District) Zone commercial uses and the existing Motel use at 771 and 773 Bedford Highway, Bedford**

The following was before the NWPAC:

- *A staff memorandum dated May 26, 2014*

Mr. Tyson Simms presented Case 19206. Mr. Simms indicated the location of the subject property and described the proposal in terms of the Bedford Plan Policy. Mr. Simms explained the nature of a CCDD Zone. He also outlined the proposal's use of existing buildings so that there would be no increase in height. Mr. Simms stated that the applicant identified a variety of intended uses consistent within the neighbourhood during a public information meeting on May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014. Mr. Simms informed the Committee that planning staff has requested more information regarding the applicant's traffic impact statement.

Councillor Outhit stated that he had no major concerns with the concept. Councillor Outhit asked Mr. Simms to further explain the Bedford Plan Policy as it related to the Bedford Waterfront Vision.

Mr. Simms presented an additional slide, describing the Bedford Waterfront Vision Exercise undertaken by regional planning. He stated that the vision represented a separate exercise intended to envision and discuss new policies for the area. Mr. Simms confirmed a statement by Councillor Outhit that the proposal was a stopgap solution and not a long term solution for the area.

Mr. Copley agreed there were no major concerns. He stated that there may be traffic concerns, but that he anticipated traffic would mostly be local.

Mr. MacDonald inquired into whether the Committee would see the revised traffic study.

Mr. Simms responded that if the Committee was interested in seeing the study, this item could be brought back at the request of the Committee. Mr. Simms further explained that planning staff requested more information because they were interested in regards to special retail use. Mr. Simms indicated that the current traffic statement may suffice. Mr. Simms stated that he did not foresee any intense traffic uses arising, as drive thrus would not be permitted in the development agreement.

Mr. Russell pointed out that the traffic statement was incorrect and underestimated traffic levels. The statement identified with the present context, where one motel was closed, and not with the proposed use for the site. Mr. Russell said that traffic would effectively double with the proposal. Mr. Russell also stated that his other concern was parking.

Mr. Simms responded that as the development agreement proceeds, parking would remain as it is, keeping with screening and vegetation.

Councillor Craig stated that the proposal would be a prudent use of an area that is not currently being utilized.

Mr. Murray inquired about the CGB Zone. Mr. Simms replied that the agreement will only apply to the subject property, enabling new commercial uses for the site. Mr. Murray stated that there

was no idea what uses would be permitted on the site. Mr. Murray expressed his concern about the potential of lounges and taverns being introduced.

Mr. Simms referred to the uses that the applicant had proposed and reiterated that if there were uses proposed beyond what the traffic statement indicated, it would have to be looked at again. In regards to lounges and taverns, Mr. Simms replied that those uses were not currently being proposed by the applicant, although they were permitted.

Councillor Craig inquired if other development would occur on the site aside from the Travellers Motel.

Mr. Simms clarified that if there were substantive issues, they would come back to the North West Planning Advisory Committee.

Ms. Merritt commented that the traffic on the Bedford Highway may determine what uses would go into the site due to access and egress.

**MOVED by Mr. Russell seconded by Councillor Outhit that the North West Planning Advisory Committee recommend that North West Community Council approve the proposal as presented, provided there are no significant changes in the ongoing traffic study.**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**7.1.2 Case 19303: Application by HRM to amend the Bedford Land Use By-law to identify 165 and 167 High Street in Bedford as an existing two unit dwelling in the RSU Zone under Part 6, Subsection (e), Bedford**

The following was before the NWPAC:

- *A staff memorandum dated May 28, 2014*

Ms. Erin MacIntyre outlined Case 19303, explaining the history of how the application came forward. Ms. MacIntyre stated that according to recent research, the incorrect designation was confirmed an oversight by staff.

Ms. Merritt confirmed that members had no questions. The Committee agreed that this application highly resembled the oversight in Case 19218 from the May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meeting.

**MOVED by Councillor Outhit seconded by Councillor Craig that the proposal be approved as presented.**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**7.1.3 Case 18306: Development Agreement to enable a personal service use at 932, 938 and 940 Sackville Drive, Middle Sackville**

The following was before the NWPAC:

- *A staff report dated May 21, 2014*

Ms. Jennifer Chapman presented Case 18306, detailing how the current application predates the February 2013 changes to the Planning Advisory Committee's process for reviewing applications. In this instance, the Committee is expected to return to the old procedure, whereby members pass a recommendation on the final staff report to Community Council, which includes a draft of the development agreement. Ms. Chapman described the proposed use and gave the location of the proposal. Ms. Chapman described the current zoning—urban residential, and nearby zoning—commercial. Ms. Chapman described the changes the agreement would introduce to accessing the site. She outlined how the second parcel of the land to the north would remain a landscaping buffer. Ms. Chapman also described the rear location of the parking and its accompanying landscape and fencing buffering. Ms. Chapman presented the proposed signage for the site.

Members of the Committee inquired what the purpose of Lot B was; if it was more than a landscape buffer and if the applicant could develop it as of right. The Committee also questioned the timeline of the development agreement and whether a new property owner would still be subject to the development agreement.

Ms. Chapman responded that Lot B was proposed as a landscape buffer and if the applicant wished to develop it beyond this use in the development agreement or the uses permitted under the current land use bylaw, the applicant would need to return to PAC. Ms. Chapman also clarified that the applicant would have up to three years to commence development and that the development agreement would be carried with the deed.

**MOVED by Councillor Craig seconded by Mr. Copley that the North West Planning Advisory Committee recommends to the North West Community Council that the proposed development agreement be approved as presented in accordance with the staff recommendation contained in the May 21, 2014 report.**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

- 8. ADDED ITEMS – NONE**
- 9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – July 2, 2014**
- 10. ADJOURNMENT**

*The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.*

Andrew Reid  
Legislative Assistant