

P.O. Box 1749 Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3A5 Canada

# Item No. 8.2.2 Halifax and West Community Council May 13, 2015

то:	Chair and Members of Halifax and West Community Council Original Signed	
SUBMITTED BY:	Bob Bjerke, Chief Planner and Director, Planning and Development	
DATE:	March 31, 2015	
SUBJECT:	Case 19666: Appeal of Variance Approval - 918 South Bland Street, Halifax	

# <u>ORIGIN</u>

Appeal of the Development Officer's decision to approve a request for variance.

# **LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY**

Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) Charter; Part VIII, Planning and Development

# RECOMMENDATION

The question before Halifax and West Community Council is whether to allow or deny the appeal before them.

#### BACKGROUND

A variance request has been submitted for 918 South Bland Street, Halifax to permit an addition to a single unit dwelling to create a two unit dwelling (Map 1 and Attachment A). In order to facilitate this project, a variance has been requested to relax the required right side yard setback for the existing portion of the dwelling. The remainder of the dwelling and the proposed addition meet all other requirements of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law (LUB).

#### Site Details:

Zoning:

R-2 (General Residential) Zone, Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-Law (South End, Area 4)

#### Zone Requirement Variance Requested

Minimum right side yard:	5 feet	1.5 feet
--------------------------	--------	----------

For the reasons detailed in the Discussion section of this report, the Development Officer approved the requested variance (Attachment B). A property owner within the 30 metres notification area has appealed the approval (Attachment C) and the matter is now before Halifax and West Community Council for decision.

### DISCUSSION

#### **Development Officer's Assessment of Variance Request:**

In hearing a variance appeal, Council may make any decision that the Development Officer could have made, meaning their decision is limited to the criteria provided in the *HRM Charter*. As such, the *HRM Charter* sets out the following criteria by which the Development Officer may <u>not</u> grant variances to requirements of the Land Use By-law:

#### "250(3) A variance may not be granted if:

- (a) the variance violates the intent of the development agreement or land use by-law;
- (b) the difficulty experienced is general to properties in the area;
- (c) the difficulty experienced results from an intentional disregard for the requirements of the development agreement or land use by-law."

In order to be approved, any proposed variance must not conflict with any of the criteria. The Development Officer's assessment of the proposal relative to each criterion is as follows:

#### 1. Does the proposed variance violate the intent of the land use by-law?

It is the Development Officer's opinion that this proposal does not violate the intent of the LUB.

The variance requested is only for a reduction in the right side yard setback. The proposed addition would meet the minimum 5 feet side yard setback required for a two unit dwelling. The existing dwelling is already located at 1.5 feet from the right side yard which is an existing nonconforming setback.

Building setbacks provide separation from adjacent structures, streets, and property lines for access, safety, and aesthetics. The applicant has already received a permit, through a separate application, for an addition to the dwelling which is similar in size and setback to what is shown on Map 2. This established setback, which is nonconforming, allows for an addition provided the number of units does not increase.

The difference between the two applications is that the applicant is now proposing an increase in dwelling units and the addition now has to meet the right side yard setback of 5 feet because of the additional unit. The proposed addition meets the left side and rear yard setback requirements. The front yard setback is not changing. Where the applicant is proposing to meet the minimum side yard requirements with the addition and the existing building has a nonconforming established setback, staff consider this request to be minor and meets the intent of the LUB.

### 2. Is the difficulty experienced general to properties in the area?

In considering variance requests, staff must consider the characteristics of the surrounding neighbourhood to determine whether the subject property is unique in its challenges in meeting the requirements of the land use by-law. If it is unique, then due consideration must be given to the requested variance; if the difficulty is general to properties in the area, then the variance must be denied.

There are 19 properties (including 918 South Bland) within the notification area and these properties have a mix of zoning (R-1, R-2, and C-3A) and land uses (singles, two units, non-conforming uses, and an apartment building). Where there is such a range of zoning and zone requirements, as well as existing uses, it was determined that the difficulty experienced is not general to the area.

# 3. Is the difficulty experienced the result of an intentional disregard for the requirements of the land use by-law?

In reviewing a proposal for intentional disregard for the requirements of the Land Use By-law, there must be evidence that the applicant had knowledge of the requirements of the By-law relative to their proposal and then took deliberate action which was contrary to those requirements. That is not the case in this request.

The applicant has applied for a Development Permit in good faith and requested the variance prior to commencing any work on the property. Intentional disregard of By-law requirements was not a consideration in the approval of this variance request.

### Appellant's Appeal:

While the criteria of the *HRM Charter* limits Council to making any decision that the Development Officer could have made, the appellant has raised certain points in the letter of appeal (Attachment C) for Council's consideration. These points are summarized and staff's comments on each are provided in the following table:

Appellant's Appeal Comments	Staff Response
A fence was removed from the property and a barn was constructed without a building permit.	The appellant has identified this as a previous concern with a previous property owner. The current application does not involve the barn.
The property has been used for storage of items from other rental properties.	The appellant has identified this as a previous concern with a past property owner. This issue is not applicable to the criteria used for consideration of the proposed variance.
The property contains litter at times and the grass is uncut for weeks.	This concern relates to unsightly premise legislation and this issue is not applicable to the criteria used for consideration of the proposed variance.
Other properties in the neighborhood which are also owned by the owners of 918 South Bland are not maintained very well.	This variance application is for 918 South Bland Street, the maintenance of nearby properties is not a variance criterion.
There have been late night parties by the	Noise complaints are not identified as a variance criterion.

tenants which results in noise complaints and police visits. The appellant has spoken to the property manager and there has not been an improvement in this regard. It is felt that an increase in the number of units will cause this problem to escalate.	Noise issues generated from private property are addressed HRM Land Use Compliance and Halifax Regional Police, and not through zoning requirements.
If the project is approved there will be construction traffic and access over my property without permission. The appellant does not want someone using their land simply because it is not fenced.	Property disputes between abutting owners is not a variance criteria consideration.
A concern has been raised about identifying the appellant to the property owner and they have been attempting to contact which is felt to be unprofessional and unsettling.	A variance appeal is a public process for property owners within the notification area. All freedom of information protocols have been followed for this application.

## **Conclusion:**

Staff have reviewed all the relevant information in this variance proposal. As a result of that review, the variance request was approved as it was determined that the proposal does not conflict with the statutory criteria for refusal provided by the *HRM Charter*. The matter is now before Halifax and West Community Council to hear the appeal and render a decision.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications related to this variance.

# COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community Engagement, as described by the Community Engagement Strategy, is not applicable to this process. The procedure for public notification is mandated by the *HRM Charter*. Where a variance approval is appealed, a hearing is held by Council to provide the opportunity for the applicant and the appellant(s) to speak.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no environmental implications.

### **ALTERNATIVES**

- 1. Halifax and West Community Council may deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Development Officer and approve the variance.
- 2. Halifax and West Community Council may allow the appeal and overturn the decision of the Development Officer and refuse the variance.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Map 1:	Notification Area
Map 2:	Site Plan
Attachment A:	Building Elevations
Attachment B:	Variance Approval
Attachment C:	Letter of Appeal

A copy of this report can be obtained online at http://www.halifax.ca/commcoun/index.php then choose the appropriate Community Council and meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210, or Fax 902.490.4208.

Report Prepared by: Janice MacEwen, Development Technician, 902.490.3244 Sean Audas, Development Officer, 902.490.4402

Original Signed

Report Approved by:

Kurt Pyle, Acting Manager Development Approvals, 902.490.6011

















December 19, 2014

Geoff Keddy & Associates 5357 Inglis Street Halifax NS B3H 1J4

Dear Sir:

# RE: Variance Application #19666, 918 South Bland Street, Halifax, PID #00065110

This will advise you as the Development Officer for the Halifax Regional Municipality, I approved your request for a variance from the requirements of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use Bylaw as follows:

Location: 918 South Bland Street, Halifax, PID #00065110 Project Proposal: Addition to create a Two Unit Dwelling

	Requirements	Proposal
Minimum Right Side Yard	5 feet	1.5 feet (existing setback)

Pursuant to Section 251 of the Halifax Regional Municipal Charter, assessed property owners within 30 meters of the property have been notified of this variance. Those property owners have the right to appeal and must file their notice, in writing, to the Development Officer on or before January 5, 2015.

No permits will be issued until the appeal period has expired and any appeals disposed of.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Janice MacEwen at **490-3993.** 

Sincerely, Original Signed Sean Audas Development Officer

cc. Cathy Mellett, Municipal Clerk Councillor Waye Mason - District 7



Halifax Regional Municipality PO Box 1749, Halifax, Nova Scotia Canada B3J 3A5

halifax.ca

#### December 19, 2014

Dear Sir or Madam:

## RE: Variance Application #19666, 918 South Bland Street, Halifax, PID #00065110

As you have been identified as a property owner within 30 metres of the above noted address you are being notified of the following variance as per requirements of the Halifax Regional Municipal Charter, Section 251.

This will advise you that as the Development Officer for the Halifax Regional Municipality I have approved a request for a variance from the requirements of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use Bylaw as follows:

# Location: 918 South Bland Street, Halifax, PID #00065110 Project Proposal: Addition to create a Two Unit Dwelling

	Requirements	Proposal
Minimum Right Side Yard	5 feet	1.5 feet (existing setback)

Pursuant to Section 251 of the Halifax Regional Municipal Charter, assessed property owners within 30 metres of the above noted address are notified of this variance. If you wish to appeal, please do so in writing, on or before January 5, 2015, and address your appeal to:

Sean Audas, Development Officer c/o Municipal Clerk Halifax Regional Municipality Planning and Development - Western Region, P.O. Box 1749, Halifax, N.S. B3J 3A5 Clerks@halifax.ca

Please note, this does not preclude further construction on this property provided the proposed construction does not require a minor variance. If you have any questions or require clarification of any of the above, please call Janice MacEwen at 490-3993.

Yours truly,

Original Signed

Sean Audas, Development Officer Halifax Regional Municipality



Halifax Regional Municipality PO Box 1749, Halifax, Nova Scotia Canada B3J 3A5

halifax.ca

cc. Cathy Mellett, Municipal Clerk Councillor Waye Mason – District 7

Case 19666 Attachment C - Appeal Letters 914 South Bland Street Halifay NS B3H 255 29 December 2014 Sean audas, Development officer HRM P.O. BOX 1749 Halifay, NS, B33 3A5 Dear mr. andas This afternoon I received your letter daded 10 days ago Re: variance upp, # 19666 918 South Bland Strol 71D 00065110 I do wish to apped this variance. when there is more time at my disposal I will provide further information. yours truly, **Original Signed** BIECHELE MARLENE Hilroy

Case 19666 Attachment C - Appeal Letters

South Bland Street Copy to Stalifay NS B3H255 Sean andas 09 Jebmany 2015

ilear Councillor mason,

December 29, 2014 De-maled you my appeal of a Vanance applications, 918 South Bland Street.

I purchased my home more than thirty (30) years ago when 918 was owner- accupied a its grunds neat, However some years later, a company ( Demand on Deamand, O believe) bought 918

This first company demolished the attractive fence that had stord between an Backyards & part of the drieway, They Pereched a huge eyesore of a barn for which They had net abtained a building permit. The owners employees worked in the building & played unusually 31 loud music amplified with professional equipment intended for and to riums, luten & arrived at home after work, the framed photes rattled on the walls due to vibrations caused by the constant nois. After a might year

# Case 19666 Attachment C - Appeal Letters

of letters to a City officer (2 believe miss Dorchoe) the owner mas personaled to relocate. 918 may headed by arnold Forsyster who mised The superty te store items from his minerous vental properties m Draythe und a gentleman roho Kept 912 neat 2 Hidy after m. Forsythis death approximately three (3) years ago, 918 was sold to its present owners Mrban Spaces. This third trainess owns four (4) large remotel properties on South Bland Atreet in addition to 918. Since this company acquired The aforementioned truldings, it has appeared that the are unumally lay concerning the appearance of the sister of It is the norm for little by be shown along at least one building, if hat along two on Akrel. I sometimes walked to Alle then and of the street to place litter in my own grubage trags since it was so warryhold. In warm weather their Dopass is typically

(2)

left unant for weeks . Their rooming honor at the corner of South Bland & Onglis has a Stone wall near to + along the ordewalk. They have never removed the overgrown plants that trip up peleodrians of Apter & saw a gentleman struggling to remove his case from roots that had tangled around it & took my own shears, rate + bag a prestan how making that area safe for people walking by, at 918 When their demants had parties, it was not unusual to see four (4) police cans parked there at 2:30 A.M. What is the financial cast to HRM to have four (4) police cruspers with at least one police officer per can dealing with above bylaw issues? about noise problems a Q asked Aken to love the volume -they Acod it. also I spake with Moton Spaces building maintenance person about the more There was no improvement. after all it was not the business owner who last play !

A 918 tecomes a mult - unit rental property, of course the noise -3-

### Case 19666 Attachment C - Appeal Letters

problems will escalate, (mr.) mason, if 918 doubles The size of the Rouse how will the construction drucks and then later the Aenants access their yard without driving one & over a over my property They don't have my permission! as a single, low - income individual <del>setting</del> spite of working the full the to part - time july, sating in womens to Autoning - I did not have fire the financial means to people if Neplace the fence that the paying taxes a that strig of land a cutting the grass of raking the leaves - I do not want someone else using it just because it's there unferced & open. I was quite taken aback when Aold that the amero of 918 had been given my name plane sale property owner to agged." At took Sig (6) trainess daup for HAM'S motice the reach me. yet I had from (4) days in which to reply, Alow fair is this ? - 4-

Early one evening a stranger Knocked at my front door saying he had reantly grend an office down the sheet " It alte alternated to enter my home, enging he had some ideas he thought o'd be inderested in I fartined the door-chain a stall him he could drop a condinate the mailbox. The replied he had no cardo. This encounter was unsetting because he had almost managed to elbow He had at most in any home. As may into my home. As hell, a man saying this name is Heddy has phoned he several times saying the is the architect for 918's owners, He allow for the persuade me to allow him to drop in, I show me the plans for 918. He hyplains 912's owners have been mying him to Aalle Ao me. I realize new that this phone caller is the same talk man who altempted to walk into my tome. This is beyond impropressional; it is unsetting. It is alienating i it is mostling. It is alienating I And you for contraction a We this issue Month of the this

Since vely,

**Original Signed**