



**ST. MARGARET'S BAY COASTAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
March 26, 2015**

PRESENT: Councillor Matt Whitman
Mr. Michael Murphy, Chair
Mr. Vic Heniss
Ms. Jean Mustain
Ms. Pamela Lovelace

REGRETS: Mr. John Leon
Ms. Kathryn Gamache

STAFF: Mr. Marcus Garnet, Senior Planner
Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant

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

*The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the St. Margaret's Bay Coastal Planning Advisory Committee are available online:
<http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/smbcpac/150326smbcpac-pim-agenda.php>*

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. and was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. and introduced the members of the Planning Advisory Committee. He outlined the format of the meeting and the ground rules.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

2.1 Tantallon Crossroads Follow-Up: To consider amendments to the Planning District 1 & 3 Municipal Planning Strategy and the Planning District 1 & 3 Land Use By-law within the Tantallon Crossroads area

Mr. Marcus Garnet presented the proposed amendments to the Tantallon Crossroads Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and land use bylaw (LUB). He outlined the aim of the Tantallon Crossroads MPS and LUB to create a mixture of uses and housing types, education and healthcare facilities, with limited sized buildings and traditional design including pitched roofs, facades orientated to the street and measures to protect ground and surface water. Mr. Garnet introduced two properties in relation to the amendments and noted that the third property, 5434-5444 St. Margaret's Bay Road, Schedule P, would not be considered any further as part of this initiative, following a request by the owners. He stated that the first property was Church property and the second was the Superstore property. Mr. Garnet introduced the site of the Church and indicated it was zoned village residential. Mr. Garnet stated that the Church had been granted a development permit but it had expired while the new zoning rules had been implemented. He highlighted a number of barriers in the land use bylaw, including but not limited to building footprint, height, roof pitch, doors, display windows, covering, and facade. He stated that the Church was working on accommodating the MPS and LUB in terms of parking location at the rear instead of in the front.

Mr. Garnet posed the following questions for feedback related to the amendments:

- How prominent sites and special buildings could provide a counterpoint to more typical buildings?
- How might a large church fit a "coastal" village theme "traditional in a modern way"?
- What is a reasonable maximum footprint and height?
- Should similar exceptions be allowed for schools?

Mr. Garnet introduced the second property, the Superstore property. He indicated that the Superstore was not currently proposing any new development. He outlined a number of requirements in Schedule N to guide the consideration of any future development agreements for new or expanded buildings. The aim of Schedule N is to guide any future expansions to improve the proportions between buildings and the street.

Ms. Stacey Hughes, Architecture 49, and representative of the applicant for the St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Parish, presented an overview of the Church's architecture and described the background of its development. She presented the colour palette of the Church's stained glass and the materials. She outlined the site concept. She stated that inspiration was taken from historic Maritime churches and the legacy of St. Marguerite Bourgeoys as a pioneer missionary. Mr. Joseph MacKinnon, Reverend, St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Parish, also spoke regarding the background of the Church.

Mr. David Wimberly, described the process to develop the Tantallon Crossroads plans. He voiced approval for the Church's architecture but also indicated he would like to see it conform to the existing guidelines. He stated that he would rather see the proposal go back through a larger planning process to gain wider involvement and consensus by the public. He voiced opposition to flat roof structures and the idea of permitting schools or other sites to be exempt from the pitched roof rule in the Tantallon LUB. He also indicated he would not support the exception to the Superstore property.

Mr. Murphy invited speakers from the floor.

One member of the audience questioned what the next steps in the process would be. Mr. Garnet responded that next the Planning Advisory Committee would deliberate on the proposal and make a recommendation to Community Council, and then subsequently Community Council would make a recommendation to Regional Council.

Mr. Gary Gallant, of Kingswood, questioned if there would be an effect on the church if no exception was granted for the schools and if the two could be considered separately. Mr. Garnet responded that the two were not interdependent.

A member of the audience questioned where the parking would be and how much.

Ms. Hughes responded that parking was initially in front of the church; however, as part of the planning strategy they have been asked to reconsider this with parking in behind the church. She stated that the Church was in the process of redesigning parking and there would be 130 parking spaces.

Ms. Shari Johnson, outlined that she had been part of the process for creating the Tantallon Crossroads plan. Ms. Johnson indicated 44 non-profit organizations were involved in the process and highlighted the length of the process. She stated that the difference in height for the Church property was nominal and she voiced the community's desire to avoid concrete. She also stated that schools were an inappropriate comparison for the Church and that it would set a precedent outside the current bylaws in place.

Mr. Jerry Boulis questioned if the Church had previously received a development permit. After receiving confirmation, he stated this fact for the record.

Mr. Paul Dunlop indicated his property abutted the Church development. He questioned where the parking would be in relation to his properties and he voiced concern for parking up against his property. Ms. Hughes answered that the parking would be in the direction of the cul-de-sac and that there would be a considerable buffer of trees.

Mr. George McDaniel questioned the length of the review process, stating that he hoped to break ground in the spring. Mr. Garnet indicated that the aim was to get the proposal to Council for June.

Mr. Jerry Boulis commented that the community would need to accommodate places of worship for a growing community and that the size and scale of the building was indicative of the community. He suggested that this should have been anticipated by the planning committee when the guidelines such as pitched roofs were set.

Ms. Shelly Webb, Hackett's Cove, indicated the effort undertaken by the parish community should be given special consideration. She stated it was unfortunate the bylaws had changed during the design of the building. She voiced approval for the building's aesthetic. Ms. Webb voiced concern for Schedule N and the consideration being given to the second property. She also indicated the Church property should be taken as a single issue and not taken together with schools or other issues.

Mr. David Wimberly commented that a long process had been undertaken to achieve a specific purpose. He questioned the special treatment for this church instead of going through a process for the whole community.

Mr. Ben Young, indicated that the Church had been caught in bad timing. He highlighted the work of volunteers and voiced concern for engaging in a 12-18 month process. He asked for the public's support in approving the proposal.

Mr. Rick Hattin, of Seabright, questioned if the Church had any intention for creating a public space. Second, he highlighted wastewater runoff concerns, indicating that the Hubley Mill Lake was a serious issue and should be looked at closely. Third, he asked Mr. Garnet to distinguish between a sensitive development agreement and ordinary development agreement. He also commented on the lack of detail for the Church's proposal.

Mr. Joseph MacKinnon stated that he wished the Church to become more a part of the community and the church hall be made available. Ms. Hughes responded that all runoff was managed on-site and that they had a cistern to collect water. She indicated LEED principles were used in the design. She also indicated that they possessed the environment permit but could circulate additional information if requested. Regarding wastewater, Ms. Hughes stated that this has been managed by engineers, and that she was comfortable it was being managed on site. Regarding runoff across Hubley Mill Lake, she stated that engineers were aware of the issue and designed the site to take it into consideration. She indicated more information on runoff management could be provided later on.

Mr. Garnet distinguished between sensitive development agreements and ordinary development agreements by listing criteria to do with footprint, massing, orientation, form, height, and groundwater supply. He further stated that language in a sensitive development agreement would emphasize site context in adjacent properties, continuity of walkways, entrances, and human scale.

Mr. Wimberley questioned the end result of a sensitive development agreement. Mr. Garnet responded that it would create greater intimacy of street and façade.

Mr. Jim Campbell commented that the Church should be grandfathered in.

Ms. Shari Johnson stated that the location of the building was a benefit. She stated that treatment of this amendment should be considered as a common amendment and not an exception to the bylaw.

Mr. Doug Poulan stated that no public consultation had been held for the Sir John A MacDonald High School or fire hall properties. He emphasized that the exception to the bylaws should be made for the Church.

Ms. Beth McGee, of Seabright, indicating disapproval for the way the amendments were brought forward and indicated more consultation was required.

The Chair called three times for any further questions. Mr. Wimberley questioned if more detailed plans would be posted publicly. Mr. Garnet indicated that information would be made available on the website.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The public meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant