



**ST. MARGARET'S BAY COASTAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
APRIL 22, 2015**

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

REGRETS: Mr. John Leon

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

OTHERS: Ms. Stacey Hughes, Architecture 49
Mr. Joseph MacKinnon, Pastor, St. Margaret Bourgeoys
Ms. Beth McGee

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/150422smbpac-agenda.php>*

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m., and the Committee adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. at the Tantallon Public Library.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 26, 2014, March 26, 2015 and March 26, 2015 public meeting

Mr. Heniss noted a correction to be made in the attendance record for the November 26, 2014 meeting.

MOVED by Mr. Heniss, seconded by Ms. Kathryn Gamache to approve the minutes of November 26, 2014 as amended and approve the two sets of minutes of March 26, 2015 as circulated.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Additions

6.3.1 Stacey Hughes – St. Margaret Bourgeoys

MOVED by Councillor Whitman, seconded by Jean Mustain to approve the order of business as amended.

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 he had circulated electronically a letter from Ryan A. Barkhouse, as forwarded by Stacey Hughes.

6.2 Petitions – NONE

6.3 Presentations

6.3.1 Stacey Hughes – St. Margaret Bourgeoys

Ms. Stacey Hughes presented a number of slides on the St. Margaret Bourgeoys' site plan, floorplan, and an exterior rendering. These slides are available online and on file.

7. REPORTS

7.1 STAFF

7.1.1 Tantallon Crossroads Follow-Up Amendments

The following was before the St. Margaret's Bay Coastal Planning Advisory Committee:

- *A staff memorandum dated April 15, 2015*

- *A staff presentation dated April 22, 2015*

Mr. Marcus Garnet noted a correction on the memorandum, stating that Residential Environment Zone should read Village Residential Zone.

Mr. Garnet presented the Tantallon Crossroads Follow-Up Amendments as described in the memorandum dated April 15, 2015. He posed a number of questions for the PAC to consider:

- How might prominent sites and special buildings provide a counterpoint to more typical buildings?
- How might a large church fit a "coastal village" theme which is "traditional in a modern way"?
- What is a reasonable footprint?
- What is a reasonable height?
- Should we also allow exceptions for schools?

Mr. Garnet also noted a correction on slide stating that Residential Environment Zone should read Village Residential Zone. The Committee agreed to discuss the properties in turn, beginning with the Church property.

Councillor Whitman stated that he had heard indicated in the community that exceptions should not be granted for other sites, but only the church. The Committee agreed with this statement.

Mr. Joseph MacKinnon, Pastor, St. Margaret Bourgeoys requested to make a point of clarification. He described the difficulty in acquiring the land and permit for the purposes of building the church. He asked for consideration in granting the exception because of the size of the congregation.

Ms. Gamache questioned if there was any remaining land in the cul-de-sac nearby the Church property that could be build on. Councillor Whitman added to the inquiry, questioning if there was a lot between the church property and the school property and who the owner might be. Mr. Garnet responded that he did not know the ownership of the land; however, could find that out.

The Chair questioned the importance of ownership, to which Ms. Gamache stated that it would be difficult to defend the exception if the status of the land in the middle was unknown. The Chair stated that if an additional project came forward, it would need to be dealt with on its own merits and further that making one exception would not necessarily provide for other exceptions in the area.

The Committee discussed the merit in considering that the Church project was in development before the Land Use Bylaws were developed and were not necessarily aware of the changes to the policies.

Councillor Whitman stated he had no concerns with the materials of the Church or pitch of the roof. He voiced support for moving the parking to the rear, and having trees in the front of the property. Ms. Mustain also voiced support for trees in the front of the Church and suggested that this be written into the development agreement if possible. Ms. Hughes responded that upon negotiation, as many trees as possible would try to be maintained, in addition to planting new trees if required.

The Chair commented on statements at the public meeting about following the Tantallon Crossroads plans and not providing an exception. Mr. Murphy stated that there was ample rationale to make the exception and indicated that the Church would respect the new bylaws, and be traditional in a modern way.

MOVED by Councillor Whitman, seconded by Ms. Lovelace that the Committee has reviewed the application for the Tantallon Crossroads Follow-Up Amendments and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and package dated April 15, 2015, with consideration to the following matters:

1. **The proposed development be restricted to 18 Scholar Road – St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Church Property.**

The Committee discussed how the church fit a “coastal village” theme which is “traditional in a modern way.” Ms. Mustain commented that the Committee’s support for the proposal is based on this fit. Ms. Lovelace added that the Committee should support the community’s desire to avoid concrete structures, but also recognize the Church property as an exception.

Mr. Garnet presented the Superstore property. He described Schedule N requirements, as outlined in which would enable an existing building that is already considered too large the ability to expand only if by increasing the height, or coming closer to the street to improve the sense of enclosure from the street.

Councillor Whitman questioned if expansion could include a detached building. Mr. Garnet responded that in the affirmative, but also stated that this was already possible through as of right development.

Mr. Garnet stated that as per Schedule N, outlined in the Planning Districts 1 and 3 Land Use Bylaw, new buildings would have to comply with the new zoning, maximum setbacks, pedestrian-orientation, and building footprint provisions. Mr. Garnet added that any expansion to the existing building would have to reduce the front setback or increase the building height. He highlighted that the façade would have to include display windows, awnings and doors. He stated that Policy CV-6 would also apply, as set out in the Municipal Planning Strategy for Planning Districts 1 and 3. He summarized the policy by listing the following provisions: footprint siting, massing, building orientation and form support open space; landscapes and relation of buildings to the surrounding site; consideration of human scale; views from the public right of way; concealment of parking, loading and storage; effects on groundwater; and, storm water management.

Ms. Mustain questioned what would occur if Council did not approve the proposal. Mr. Garnet indicated that other buildings could be expanded in the front and behind but not expanded towards the street. He stated that a variance might be requested. The Committee asked the following questions of clarification:

- How much land is owned in behind by the Superstore
- What would be the impact or limit if the property was not added to Schedule N
- What would the risk be based on the Committee’s decision

Mr. Garnet responded that there was a large quantity of land owned in behind the property. He responded that failing to add the property to Schedule N would be limiting in the sense that Superstore would not be permitted to expand towards the street. He also clarified that if not added to Schedule N, expansion in the front would only be allowed to occur through separate buildings. Mr. Garnet indicated that the risk may not be large—Canadian Tire, currently listed in Schedule N, would be able to expand toward the road; however, the Superstore property would not be allowed.

The Committee agreed to hear a submission from a member of the public.

Ms. Beth McGee, St. Margaret’s Bay Stewardship Association, stated that before the construction of the Superstore building, a reduction in height had been negotiated through initial meetings. Ms. McGee voiced concern for allowing the height to be increased.

Mr. Heniss stated that because of the Land Use Bylaw, the Superstore property was already permitted to a higher height than its current form.

The Committee held a discussion on whether to recommend the Superstore property be included in Schedule N or not. Certain members agreed that the zoning should be consistent and if the Canadian Tire was included, Superstore should also be included. Other Committee members voiced disapproval, stating that as the Canadian Tire’s inclusion in the Schedule had been an error, the Superstore property should not be included in Schedule N.

MOVED by Councillor Whitman, seconded by Ms. Lovelace to amend the motion as follows:

That the Committee has reviewed the application for the Tantallon Crossroads Follow-Up Amendments and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and package dated April 15, 2015, with consideration to the following matters:

- 1. The proposed development be restricted to 18 Scholar Road – St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Church Property.**
- 2. The Superstore property is permitted to be added to Schedule N for consistency.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Whitman left the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

8. ADDED ITEMS – NONE

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – August 26, 2015

Mr. Heniss stated concerns around PAC process and attendance in the Committee. He also inquired about vacancies on the Committee. The Legislative Assistant responded that there were currently two vacancies and applications to the Committee could be made via the municipality's website.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant