



**DISTRICTS 7 & 8 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 27, 2015**

PRESENT: Councillor Jennifer Watts
Councillor Wayne Mason
Mr. Brenden Sommerhalder, Chair
Ms. Katherine Kitching, Vice Chair
Mr. Adam Hayter
Mr. Michael Haddad
Mr. Michael Bradfield

REGRETS: Mr. John Czenze
Ms. Sunday Miller
Mr. Grant Cooke

STAFF: Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant
Mr. Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner
Mr. Paul Sampson, Senior Planner

OTHERS: Mr. Jacob JeBailey, Reign Architects
Mr. Cesar Saleh, WM Faris Group

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

The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee are available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/D78PAC/150427d78pac-agenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. and the Committee adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

- Community Announcements

Councillor Watts announced the dates for participatory budgeting sessions in District 7 and 8.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 26, 2015 and March 2, 2015

The Legislative Assistant stated that the January 26, 2015 audio recording had been reviewed and the minutes were found to be correct. Ms. Kitching asked that future recommendations be projected on a screen or written before being voted on.

The Committee requested the following clarifications pertaining to the minutes:

- Configuration of size in development agreements, page 3 January 26, 2015 minutes
- How the minutes are recorded in terms of who is identified
- Clarification on non-substantive development agreement amendments
- Status of the revised community engagement strategy
- A typographical error on page 4, March 2, 2015 minutes

Regarding configuration size, Councillor Watts clarified that she had seen this in other development agreements. The Legislative Assistant responded that minutes are kept by the Clerk's Office and are not verbatim. He further stated that the request pertaining to clarification on non-substantive amendments would be included in the April 27, 2015 minutes for the record. The Legislative Assistant responded that notification regarding opportunities for public input on the revised community engagement strategy would be forwarded to the Committee. The error on page 4 was noted as requiring an amendment.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Watts that the minutes of January 26, 2015 and March 2, 2015 be approved as amended.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

The Legislative Assistant noted that he would be submitting two briefing notes for the next meeting regarding the Committee's involvement in the Centre Plan and the idea of an annual report to Halifax & West Community Council.

Ms. Kitching requested that Councillors consider providing updates to the Committee on proposals previously reviewed by the Committee which have progressed to Community Council. Councillor Watts suggested that the Committee might perform an informal review every 3 to 4 months. The Legislative Assistant added that information is made available for the public on all cases.

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield seconded by Mr. Haddad to approve the order of business as presented.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

6.1 Correspondence

The Legislative Assistant indicated that three pieces of correspondence had been received and distributed electronically regarding Case 19353. He stated that two were distributed electronically to the Committee and proceeded to distribute an additional paper copy of a third letter.

6.2 Petitions – NONE

6.3 Presentation – NONE

7. REPORTS

7.1 STAFF

7.1.1 Case 19353 - Application by W.M. Fares Group to amend the Halifax MPS and Halifax Peninsula LUB to allow for an 8-storey multiple-unit mixed use development at 2480 Maynard Street, Halifax, by development agreement

The following was before the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee:

- *A staff memorandum dated April 20, 2015*
- *A staff presentation dated April 27, 2015*
- *A letter from Ms. Peggy Cameron dated April 27, 2015*
- *A letter from Mr. Phil Pacey dated April 27, 201*
- *A letter from Mr. Max Haiven dated March 20, 2015*

Mr. Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner, presented Case 19353 as outlined in the staff memorandum dated April 20, 2015. Mr. Harvey also outlined Schedule Q policy, highlighting why the application did not currently fit with Schedule Q. Mr. Harvey stated the input sought by staff from the Committee as described in the April 20, 2015 memorandum.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Kitching asked to clarify if there were limits as to what policies could be sought under the development agreement and whether that included affordable housing or unit configuration. Mr. Harvey responded that there were limitations under the Halifax Charter relative to land use planning matters. He stated that unit configuration was tied to density, which was possible to regulate. In addition, he stated regulation is possible on the number of rooms per units.

Councillor Mason inquired if the development agreement could change the open space requirement. Mr. Harvey responded in the affirmative, that the policy could be changed. He requested that the Committee give guidance on this matter as staff would be writing the policy requirements.

The Committee discussed an approach to making their recommendations. Mr. Harvey suggested that the Committee would be considering the appropriateness of policy changes. Mr. Harvey emphasized that the Committee could comment generally on the application.

The Chair asked for more questions of clarification the development. In response to Ms. Kitching's request for more information on the amenity and open space, Mr. Harvey stated that development agreement as opposed to as of right would allow for a finer degree of control placed on the specific attributes of the site and its surroundings. In terms of the amenity space, he stated that the developer would be able to provide further detail.

Mr. Jacob JeBaily, Reign Architects, suggested that the indoor amenity space would be designed for the tenants as a gym or lounge. He stated this space would be coupled with an outdoor terrace facing Maynard Street in addition to landscaped open space. He described the communal outdoor space as 970

square sq. ft. He described the adjacent lot uses and locations of the windows on the development. He described the minimal setbacks of the buildings, stating that it would meet the street edge on Roberts and Maynard Streets. He highlighted planter boxes that would provide a privacy screen on Roberts Street. He indicated that units on the street would be flexible spaces, which permit live and work situations and not be strictly commercial. He clarified that the entrance to the parking would be on Maynard Street. He stated that an increased setback was being considered along the Maynard Street property line. Regarding affordability, Mr. Cesar Saleh commented that the property owner was in discussion with a non-profit organization to propose a 5% below market value to target senior citizens. He stated challenges in administering affordable housing but that the owner was willing to take on this initiative.

Mr. Bradfield inquired regarding the Roberts Street median between the sidewalk and the road and stated the importance of the green space in terms of snow clearance. In addition to clearance, he commented that having the median extend along Maynard Street would be a safety advantage for the parking entrance in terms of visibility. Mr. JeBailey stated that the area was outside the development site, so it was an issue for traffic engineers.

Mr. Hayter inquired regarding the property on the corner of Roberts and Maynard Street. Mr. Saleh confirmed there was a conditional sale on that property but that the matter was beyond the control of the applicant. Ms. Kitching questioned if a shadow study had been performed. Mr. JeBailey stated that it had not yet been performed.

There being no more questions of clarification, the Chair called for a motion.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Ms. Kitching that the Committee has reviewed the application by W.M. Fares Group to amend the Halifax MPS and Halifax Peninsula LUB to allow for an 8-storey multiple-unit mixed use development at 2480 Maynard Street, Halifax, by development agreement and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and attachments package dated April 20, 2015.

Councillor Mason stated that he would not be supporting the motion. He encouraged the applicant to come back and meet the requirements of Schedule Q.

Mr. Haddad voiced approval for the development. He stated support for the height step back and that the impact on the street would be minimized by this.

Mr. Hayter indicated disapproval for the development, noting issues regarding height and massing. He stated that the development was not within the character of the neighbourhood and did not reflect the needs of the neighbourhood in terms of affordability.

Councillor Watts also voiced disapproval for the motion, stating that the 50 foot height limit should be maintained. She also requested a shadow study be performed. Councillor Watts described how people experience urban areas and asked that planning staff examine issues around open space given the small setbacks. She outlined the ongoing change in the neighbourhood and that consideration be given to the quality of the pedestrian's experience as density on the street increases. Mr. Bradfield voiced concern for the additional height in terms of the existing neighbourhood character.

Ms. Kitching echoed Councillor Watts' statements. She stated that the development agreement would be an opportunity to bring respite from lack of green space in the area. She indicated that she would support the proposal if there were vision and leadership to address certain issues with the proposal, including unit size, configuration, and affordability.

Councillor Watts requested planning staff examine the number and size of units with the development agreement. She requested staff discuss matters that support family friendliness in future development agreements. She further outlined that developments should provide for complete neighbourhoods and a variety of people. Ms. Kitching commented on the importance of having amenity space provided in a development agreement.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

7.1.2 Case 18464 - Application by W.M. Fares Group to amend the Halifax MPS and Halifax Peninsula LUB to allow for a 6-storey multiple-unit residential development at 3631 and 3639 Bright Place, 6100 Normandy Drive and a portion of the former Bright Place street right-of-way off Lady Hammond Road, Halifax, by development agreement

The following was before the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee:

- *A staff memorandum dated April 16, 2015*
- *A staff presentation dated April 27, 2015*

Mr. Paul Sampson presented Case 18464 as described in the memorandum dated April 16, 2015. Mr. Sampson indicated that the proposal had been revised following the public meeting.

Mr. Sampson confirmed that the Bright Place to Bright Street connection was pedestrian only. Councillor Watts questioned the buffer between the townhouse and the property on Normandy Drive. Mr. Sampson responded that the setbacks were at 23 ft. from the podium of the underground parking and 64.5 ft. from the tower.

Mr. Sampson highlighted that one change to the proposal since the public information meeting was the introduction of at-grade level entrances for the townhouses along Normandy Drive. Mr. Sampson confirmed that parking would still be through the podium entrance for people in that area of the building. In response to a question about changes to the overall density and unit configuration, Mr. Sampson responded that a slight reduction in density was achieved while additional units were added along the walkway.

Mr. Hayter requested the materials used in the six storey portion. Sampson highlighted that it would include a combination of cement panels and brick.

The Committee engaged in discussion over the landscaped 65 ft. setback section of the site. Mr. Sampson confirmed that the area would be fenced in and would also feature trees and sodding, although the landscape plan was subject to change. He described the privately accessible amenity space. Mr. JeBailey indicated that the space would primarily be used as a buffer space. Mr. Sampson stated that further details would be worked out later on in the process.

Mr. Bradfield questioned the drop in grade to Bright Place. Mr. Sampson responded that there was a diagonal drop in grade towards Lady Hammond. Mr. Hayter questioned if the view from the backyard had been improved by the change in height. Mr. JeBailey stated that the building was sited directly with the grade, creating an almost two storey perceived change in height.

Councillor Watts commented that changes had been introduced since the public meeting to address a number of issues. She commented that the changes to height might still be a concern to the public. She indicated that the height in the neighbourhood portion of Bright Street would be primarily how people experienced the development. She questioned if the community understood the changes to the development. Ms. Kitching questioned if the public would have an opportunity to comment on changes. Mr. Sampson responded that there would be an additional opportunity at Council. Mr. Saleh added that the applicant had met with neighbours in the area. Mr. Sampson confirmed that the 3 storey height had also been the representation at the public information meeting.

Councillor Mason confirmed the zoning designation of the site was R2. He also inquired regarding the front yard and side yard requirements on the site. Mr. Sampson stated that the front yard was 15 feet and the side yard was 5 feet. Councillor Mason stated that the proposal conformed moderately well to an R2T designation.

Mr. Hayter questioned if consideration had been given to active transportation. Mr. Sampson clarified that the bylaw would require bike parking. Mr. JeBailey added that bike racks along the walkway could be considered.

Mr. Bradfield questioned how many units would be located on the top floor of the development. Mr. JeBailey stated that there were 4 units. Ms. Kitching inquired regarding indoor amenity space. Mr. JeBailey responded that there would be one indoor multipurpose room coupled with the outdoor space.

Questions of clarification drew to an end and the Committee deliberated on their recommendation.

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Mr. Hayter that the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application for Case 18464 and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and attachments package dated April 16, 2015

Ms. Kitching voiced support for the front yard space and consideration given to green space. Mr. Hayter echoed approval for the green space, fenestration, and stated that the neighbourhood's concern for height at the public information meeting has been addressed. He stated that the proposal would be a good step for the Lady Hammond corridor.

Councillor Watts commented on the issue of unit size and requested that staff engage with the developer around that issue. She questioned how the proposal related to the abutting property on Lady Hammond Road. Mr. Sampson stated that the building in reference was owned by a housing association, which used Bright Place as a driveway. He stated that there was no driveway to the property off Lady Hammond Road currently and that access would remain similar to how it was now. Councillor Watts questioned if there would be a fence or trees proposed and requested that staff ensure adequate vegetation and buffering be created in that area. Mr. Sampson stated there was no proposed fence; however, trees may be a consideration.

Councillor Watts requested the results of the shadow study. Mr. Sampson stated that shadowing for the most part remained on site during the summer, while in spring and mid-fall it might affect some backyards of abutting properties. Councillor Watts asked that a more detailed analysis of the shadow study be conducted to address concerns raised at the public meeting.

Mr. Haddad left the meeting at 5:52 p.m.

Regarding height, Councillor Watts requested that the staff report clearly articulate the one storey reduction in height and the additional reduction in height due to a correction in the grade. She asked that the report take into consideration the information on height conveyed to the public at the public information meeting and the changes introduced. Mr. Sampson confirmed more clarity in the report could be provided but that with the information before them, the change in height amounted to one storey. Councillor Watts requested the height of the tallest building. Mr. Sampson responded that height depended on where it was measured.

Mr. Hayter indicated support for the building based on the two storey reduction in height from the one storey reduction and the additional reduction due to the siting of the building with the grade. The Committee further discussed the perceived reduction of one storey due to the grade. Certain members requested the reduction due to grade be made part of a motion, while others stated it should not be conditional because the reduction would be relative to where one was standing.

Councillor Watts voiced support for the proposal, noting that one of the reasons the Committee supported the development was because of the removal of one storey and the grading.

The Committee discussed landscaping. Mr. Sampson stated that the top right corner of Landscaping plan could be examined further because of the discussion around perception in height from that area. The Committee deliberated on a list of considerations with which to amend the motion on the floor.

MOVED by Councillor Watts, seconded by Mr. Bradfield that the motion be amended to include the following considerations:

1. The Committee appreciates the vegetation at the front of Normandy Drive and requests attention be given to amenity space.
2. The vegetation border between the property on Lady Hammond and the development be retained and strengthened, with particular attention to the experience created for the residents on Lady Hammond Road.
3. Consider the inclusion of bike racks such as along the walkways.
4. Create conditions to encourage families.

AMENDED MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The motion now reads:

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Mr. Hayter that the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application for Case 18464 and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and attachments package dated April 16, 2015 with consideration to the following matters:

1. The Committee appreciates the vegetation at the front of Normandy Drive and requests attention be given to amenity space.
2. The vegetation border between the property on Lady Hammond and the development be retained and strengthened, with particular attention to the experience created for the residents on Lady Hammond Road.
3. Consider the inclusion of bike racks such as along the walkways.
4. Create conditions to encourage families.

The question was called for on the main motion.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

8. ADDED ITEMS

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – May 21, 2015 Public Meeting, May 25, 2015 – regular meeting

The Legislative Assistant noted that there had been a change in location and the meeting would now be held at the Kenneth C. Rowe Management Building (Rm 1020), 6100 University Avenue, Halifax.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant