

NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MAY 7, 2003

THOSE PRESENT: Delphis Roy, Chair
Karen Stadnyk
George Murphy
Gloria Lowther
Robert Morgan

ALSO PRESENT: Thea Langille-Hanna, Planner
Jill Justason, Planner
Gail Harnish, Admin/PAC Coordinator
Sandra Shute, Legislative Assistant

Regrets: Tony Edwards
Jan Gerrow
Councillor Goucher
Roddy Macdonald
Ann Merritt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Call to Order	3
2.	Approval of Agenda	3
3.	Approval of Minutes - April 2, 2003	3
4.	Business Arising from the Minutes - None	3
5.	Case 00414 - Amendments to the Bedford MPS and LUB respecting the Mainstreet Commercial (CMC) Zone	3
6.	Case 00532 - Development Agreement - 298 Cobequid Road	6
7.	Status Updates	7
8.	New Business	
8.1	Presentations by Proponents	7
8.2	Sackville Drive MPS and Land Use By-law	8
9.	Next Regular Meeting Date	8
10.	Adjournment	8

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Charles Fenerty Room, Sackville Library, 636 Sackville Drive, Lower Sackville.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The Agenda was adopted as presented.

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - APRIL 2, 2003**

MOVED by Gloria Lowther, seconded by George Murphy to approve the Minutes of meeting held on April 2, 2003 as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

5. **CASE 00414 - AMENDMENTS TO THE BEDFORD MPS AND LUB RESPECTING THE MAINSTREET COMMERCIAL (CMC) ZONE**

A Staff Report dated April 24, 2003 was before the Committee. Ms. Thea Langille-Hanna provided background information and an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. During her presentation, she indicated the following:

- The directive from North West Planning Advisory Committee was to bring forward a proposal for an area-wide policy and a site specific policy.
- Public meetings held.
- Recommendations regarding the proposed Policies C-21 and C-21(a).
- The land use intent of 1091-95 Bedford Highway particularly with regard to the uniqueness of the property in terms of topography and site design features.
- Height provisions in the Mainstreet Commercial Zone.
- The number of stories in the proposed building.
- Compatibility with the Granville Professional Building next door.
- Staff is recommending approval of both proposed policies and the proposed Development Agreement.

Mr. Issam Kadray, one of the proponents, was in attendance for this application.

Gloria Lowther referred to the properties that do not front on the Bedford Highway and asked if they were fairly large lots which could accommodate an apartment building.

In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that there were one or two parcels where that might be possible but some of the parcels have already been developed. She pointed out that a multiple unit dwelling could be anything with three or more units. There may be an opportunity to consolidate a couple lots but they would be isolated situations. With regard to the proposed Development Agreement, the developer would have to meet all the RMU provisions dealing with lot coverage, setbacks, height, number of units, outdoor amenity space, all of which would control density.

Gloria Lowther asked for the exact height of the building from the Bedford Highway grade to the highest point of the peak. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that the proposal was for 38' which is the lowest point of grade on the Bedford Highway to the highest point on the building.

Gloria Lowther asked if Level 1 is going to be below grade, where would the commercial space be. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised there was 639 sq. ft. which could be office space in addition to the Tenant Library and Tenant Exercise Room. There could be a small office that once you enter the building you would have to go down below or there could be more room associated with the commercial use on the main floor.

Gloria Lowther pointed out that the concept plan presented at the Public Meeting had quite a different roof line than proposed at this time. In her opinion, the original roof line was more appealing as far as the Mainstreet was concerned.

In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that the proposal meets all the architectural requirements of the Mainstreet Commercial. It may not have the exact appearance of other buildings along the street; however, there was no wish to duplicate. After the public meeting, the roof pitch seemed to be more excessive than needed and was creating the appearance of a taller building. The roof line and pitch were then changed to match more with Granville Place. Comments from the Public Meeting indicated that there was a concern with the sense of scale when standing in front of the building.

George Murphy asked why there were objections to a residential apartment dwelling on the Bedford Highway.

In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that the Planning document for Bedford clearly states that in the Mainstreet Commercial zone, there could be all commercial but if you want residential, it could be up to 50% of the gross floor area. When this proposal first came forward a couple of years ago, it had close to 30 units in it. Because of the topography of the site, the 50/50 did not work because there was extra space on the back that could be used for residential. That was why the Plan Amendment was requested.

Gloria Lowther referred to the exterior cladding and asked for clarification of the developer's intentions as to the type of exterior. In response, Mr. Issam Kadray advised brick was proposed for the front and Cape Cod siding for the sides. It would be different from Dr. Guam's present building.

Gloria Lowther pointed out that exterior cladding is not one of the provisions required under (d) of Page 11 for Policy C-21. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that a recommendation came forward for the Mainstreet Commercial in the Land Use By-law not long ago to allow alternative materials that have the appearance of natural wood or stone but are new materials on the market. This is not needed in Policy C-21.

MOVED by George Murphy, seconded by Robert Morgan to recommend that North West Community Council:

- (1) Recommend that Regional Council give First Reading to the proposed amendments to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law as contained in Attachments A and A-1 of the Staff Report dated April 24, 2003 and schedule a Public Hearing for July 8, 2003;**
- (2) Move Notice of Motion for the proposed Development Agreement, attached as Attachment B of the Staff Report dated April 24, 2003, to enable residential dwelling units to exceed 50% of the gross floor area of a commercial/residential mix use building at 1091-1095 Bedford Highway, and schedule a Joint Public Hearing with Regional Council for July 8, 2003;**
- (3) Recommend that Regional Council adopt the amendments to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law as contained in Attachments A and A-1 of the Staff Report dated April 24, 2003;**
- (4) Contingent upon the adoption by Regional Council of the above Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law amendments and becoming effective under the Municipal Government Act:
 - (a) Approve the proposed Development Agreement (staff will bring this matter back to Community Council for a decision at the appropriate time); and**
 - (b) Require the Development Agreement be signed within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the applicant, from the date of final approval of said agreement by Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever is later, including applicable appeal periods. Otherwise, this approval shall be void and any obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.****

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Gloria Lowther indicated that she still had concerns with the height of the proposed building and had not supported the motion. She then looked for clarification that the proposal was strictly site specific and the height in question cannot be allowed on another Mainstreet Commercial building. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised this is only for 1091-1095 Bedford Highway.

6. CASE 00532 - DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT - 298 COBEQUID ROAD

A Staff Report dated April 28, 2003 was before the Committee. Ms. Jill Justason, Planner provided an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. Subsequently, she advised that staff was recommending approval of the application.

George Murphy referred to the vacant land on either side zoned R-1 and asked if people would have to put up their own fences if the proposed development was approved. As well, he asked for clarification regarding fencing on the rear of the property.

In response, Ms. Justason advised that the intent was for a 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. business. The elevation of the building would fit in well with a single unit dwelling. At the back on Kings Road, the main issue raised at the Public Information Meeting was drainage problems. There did not appear to be any problem with fencing.

Karen Stadnyk asked if the developer would be putting in a landscaping screen at the back as the vegetation appeared to be scrub and large trucks could come and go at the back. In response, Ms. Justason advised that the land uses are limited. Fencing over 6.5' would have to go through Community Council. At the Public Information Meeting, the residents were asked what they felt about fencing and they seemed content with the existing vegetation. Although it is sparse now, it would grow over the next few years.

Karen Stadnyk expressed concern that the minimum 10' requirement in the front might not be enough for runoff over the asphalt. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that the more landscaping buffer at the front, the closer the building got to the back of the property.

Gloria Lowther asked if the property owners of the vacant land on either side were present at the Public Information Meeting. In response, Ms. Justason advised they had been notified but were not present.

Delphis Roy asked if there was enough land in front to allow for a sidewalk. In response, Ms. Justason advised that the 10' landscaping is from the property line back, not from the right of way back.

MOVED by George Murphy, seconded by Karen Stadnyk to recommend that North West Community Council:

- (1) **Give Notice of Motion for the proposed Development Agreement, Attachment 2 of the Staff Report dated April 28, 2003, to permit a community commercial use at 298 Cobequid Road and schedule a Public Hearing for June 11, 2003;**
- (2) **Approve the discharge of the existing Development Agreement registered against 298 Cobequid Road, by entering into the Discharging Agreement shown as Attachment 1 of the Staff Report dated April 28, 2003;**
- (3) **Approve the Development Agreement (Attachment 2 of the Staff Report dated April 28, 2003) to permit a community commercial use at 298 Cobequid Road; and**
- (4) **Require the Development Agreement be signed within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by North West Community Council on request of the applicant, from the date of final approval of said Agreement by North West Community Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever approval is later, including applicable appeal periods. Otherwise, this approval shall be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Robert Murphy asked for clarification on a sidewalk. In response, Ms. Langille-Hanna advised that she did not know on which side of Cobequid Road a sidewalk would be constructed and even if there was one proposed in the near future. She offered to check into it.

7. STATUS UPDATES

7.1 Monthly Status Sheet

Provided for information purposes.

7.2 Decisions of Community Council

Provided for information purposes.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Presentations by Proponents

Robert Murphy referred to the presentation by Mr. Nantes at the last meeting regarding Bedford West. He asked if presentations to this Committee were normally as long as Mr. Nantes'. In his opinion, the presentation should have been shorter to allow for more time for questions from the Committee.

Staff agreed to advise presenters in the future that there will be a limited amount of time for a presentation.

8.2 **Sackville Drive MPS and Land Use By-law**

Ms. Langille-Hanna advised the Committee requested, when the amendments were before the Committee for Sackville Drive, that staff provide an annual review of development taking place along Sackville Drive. She advised that some development has taken place on Sackville Drive since the approvals and offered to provide information at a future meeting.

It was agreed that staff would prepare the information over the summer months and provide an update to the Committee.

9. **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE**

Wednesday, June 4, 2003.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Sandra M. Shute
Legislative Assistant