



**DISTRICTS 7 & 8 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
November 23, 2015**

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

REGRETS: Ms. Sunday Miller

STAFF: Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant
Mr. Richard Harvey, Major Projects 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 Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee are available online:

<http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/D78PAC/151123d78pac-agenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m., and adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. in room 201 of the Halifax Central Library.

- Community Announcements

A number of special community announcements were noted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 17th and October 21st, 2015

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Mr. Cooke

THAT the minutes of September 17th regular meeting and October 21st, 2015 public meeting be approved as circulated.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Additions

10.1 Ms. Kitching - Information Sharing

MOVED by Ms. Kitching, seconded by Mr. Hayter

THAT the agenda be approved as amended

Two-third majority vote required.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

- 4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES – NONE**
- 5. CALL FOR DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTERESTS – NONE**
- 6. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE**
- 7. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS – NONE**
- 8. INFORMATION ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD – NONE**

9. REPORTS

9.1 STAFF

9.1.1 Case 19531: Application by WM Fares Group on behalf of Young Development Inc. to amend the Halifax MPS and LUB and enter into a development agreement for a mixed use development (21, 16 and 5 storey buildings) at the north corner of Windsor Street and Young Street.

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

- *A staff memorandum dated November 17, 2015*

Mr. Richard Harvey described the application in terms of its context at Young and Windsor Street, noting that the site was formerly property of the Department of National Defence (DND) but is currently owned by Young Developments. He stated that the site is designated Institutional and zoned Park. He highlighted that a current study is being performed regarding sewage capacity on Young Street, but that

the site does not fall in the area of that study. He stated that to establish another land use, the application required a change to the Municipal Planning Strategy. Mr. Harvey noted that it was common that an MPS amendment process occur where one level of government declares land surplus and sells that land. He further stated that a detailed review stage was currently ongoing with documents being circulated to review agencies, as described in the Public Meeting minutes of October 21, 2015. Mr. Harvey outlined the input sought from the Committee.

The Chair opened the floor to questions of clarification.

Mr. Harvey responded to the following questions of clarification:

- He confirmed that there were no residential units in Building A.
- Regarding the Institutional zone, he stated that it was not exclusive to the Halifax Peninsula Land Use Bylaw (LUB), but also applied to the Halifax Mainland LUB with slight differences across secondary plans on the peninsula. He further clarified that universities had their own zoning and large institutions fell within the zone.
- Regarding the development agreement, he stated that residential and commercial uses would be permitted, and the agreement may list a number of criteria. He noted that the changes to the designation and introduction of the development agreement would occur at the same time.
- Concerning height impact on potential neighbours, Mr. Harvey noted that a service easement runs from Windsor Street west to east and it would be unlikely that there would be a building on that land. He noted a trucking yard to the east of the site that had potential for future land use change.
- Respecting the history of the site, he noted a previous gas station proposal on the site that was unsuccessful and had met with much opposition in the neighbourhood.
- He clarified that there would be no municipal park on the site. Regarding the amenity area, the difference between a public and semi-public plaza would be the developer would have the capacity to deny access or use of the semi-public plaza.

Mr. Jacob JeBailey clarified the following:

- Mr. JeBailey stated that the pedestrian plaza would transition into the parking lot using pavers and there would be no use of asphalt.
- Regarding the ratio of parking units for residential and commercial uses, he stated there would be enough spaces to accommodate commercial and office space. Mr. JeBailey stated parking was flexible and could be commercial in daytime and residential in the evening.
- Regarding the rationale for allocating surface parking versus underground parking, he stated that the developer was looking to minimize surface parking.
- Materials to be used on the plaza would be non-permeable concrete pavers.

The Committee discussed what kind of feedback to provide to staff in terms of policy. They agreed with the premise that circumstances have changed sufficiently in the area to initiate the process and formalized this into the following motion.

MOVED by Mr. Cooke, seconded by Mr. Bradfield

THAT the Committee considers circumstances have changed sufficiently to amend the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw and enter into a Development Agreement.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Mr. Cooke highlighted the traffic work to be done in advance of the proposal, which would be included in the policy.

Mr. Harvey noted that the Committee might take an approach to call out specific criteria such as height, setbacks, property lines and relationship to the street, which planning staff could translate into policy.

Councillor Watts highlighted mobility issues on the site. She questioned how people would access the site, relationship to transit, and the cumulative impact of density. She stated concern for the lack of porosity in this area, lack of greenspace and public parks relative to increasing density in the area.

The Committee agreed on providing these issues as feedback for staff's consideration.

MOVED by Councillor Watts, seconded by Ms. Kitching

- THAT given the changing context of the area containing and surrounding this site,**
- a) planning staff review mobility and transportation issues related to the proposal, recognizing current difficulties for pedestrians and motorists, and lack of porosity in the area; and**
 - b) Given the lack of greenspace nearby, that staff review open space and note the Committee's concern for lack of greenspace in the area.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Mr. Cooke

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application by WM Fares Group on behalf of Young Development Inc. and recommends approval of the application as contained in the staff memorandum package dated November 17, 2015 and recommends approval.

Mr. Bradfield stated that given potential traffic increases along Windsor Street and Young Street, Buildings A and B could be setback further and include foliage or vegetation to make a more amenable pedestrian experience. He also suggested that a reconfiguration of the cantilevered portion of Building A could be an option to provide further protection to pedestrians.

The Committee discussed potential pedestrian amenity and integration of appropriate transit infrastructure.

Councillor Watts questioned whether public access was confirmed and if there could be a mechanism in the development agreement regarding diagonal access through the site. Regarding mechanisms, Mr. Harvey responded it would be a matter of easements and taking ownership. As an alternative to the diagonal path, Mr. Harvey suggested attention be paid to the street right of way along Young Street as it was less complicated and compromising.

The Committee discussed the height of the proposal.

Mr. Cooke indicated that the height was appropriate for the area, while Mr. Bradfield suggested that the nearby Monaghan Square development be taken as maximum. Mr. Hayter echoed concern for the proposed height.

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Mr. Cooke that the motion be amended as follows:

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application by WM Fares Group on behalf of Young Development Inc. and recommends approval of the application as contained in the staff memorandum package dated November 17, 2015 and recommends approval with the following considerations:

- With respect to the street wall of buildings A and B along Windsor and Young Street, to ensure a wide and attractive buffer with pedestrian-specific amenities and public space.**
- To ensure appropriate transit infrastructure is integrated where needed.**
- To consider a protected or segregated bike lane.**

- The Committee values maintaining porosity on the north side of the site so that potential future right of ways could be acquired or linked.
- That staff consider future use of the east property and incorporate setbacks at building C if deemed appropriate.
- The Committee values retail at ground level on both sides of building A.
- To address wind tunnel concerns and ensure that appropriate studies be carried out.
- The Committee values use of pavers over asphalt in the existing public amenity space.
- Given the Committee's concern about the height and arrangement of Building B and C, to consider the height's effect in terms of precedents, density, aesthetics, and views.
- To consider a reduction in the overall height or stepping down at building B.
- To consider whether the proposed 14 units of 3 bedrooms are sufficient for families.
- That the final bedroom counts be included in the development agreement and changes to it be considered substantive.
- To explore the opportunity to examine feasibility for district energy throughout the site.
- Given the Committee's concern that the charcoal cladding of building A and B appears too industrial, to examine the cladding in terms of aesthetics.
- Given the Committee's concern for energy efficiency, to examine the curtain walls and window walls and consider a window wall of 40% and standard wall ratio of 60%.
- To consider application of the principles of Solar City 2.0.
- Consider the Committee's concern for curtain walls and window walls on all buildings regarding energy efficiency, such as a 40-60 ratio.
- To consider removal of the overhang on Building B; furthermore
- Given the changing context of the area containing and surrounding this site, that
 - a) planning staff review mobility and transportation issues related to the proposal, recognizing current difficulties for pedestrians and motorists, and lack of porosity in the area; and
 - b) Given the lack of greenspace nearby, that staff review open space and note the Committee's concern for lack of greenspace in the area.

AMENDMENT PUT AND PASSED.

MOTION AS AMENDED PUT AND PASSED.

10. ADDED ITEMS

10.1 Information Sharing

The Committee held a discussion regarding past cases they had considered and methods of obtaining updates on subsequent recommendations on those cases and their current statuses.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – January 25, 2015

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant