



**DISTRICTS 7 & 8 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
January 25, 2016**

PRESENT: Mr. Brenden Sommerhalder, Chair
Mr. Adam Hayter, Vice Chair
Ms. Sunday Miller
Mr. Michael Bradfield
Mr. Joe Metlege
Councillor Jennifer Watts
Councillor Wayne Mason

REGRETS: Mr. Grant Cooke
Ms. Sarah MacDonald

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Ms. Katherine Kitching

STAFF: Mr. Carl Purvis, Acting Supervisor Community Planning
Mr. Timothy Beed, Planning Intern
Ms. Jillian MacLellan, Planner
Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant

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/160125d78pac-agenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m., and recessed at 5:57 p.m. the Committee reconvened at 6:06 p.m. and adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in Halifax Hall, City Hall 1841 Argyle Street.

- Community Announcements – NONE

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 3, 2015

MOVED by Mr. Bradfield, seconded by Councillor Mason

THAT the minutes of December 3, 2015 be approved as amended.

Mr. Bradfield noted a typographical error. Mr. Hayter requested that additional comments be added that were made by Ms. MacLellan on December 3, 2015. The Legislative Assistant agreed to make the amendments to the minutes.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

MOVED by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Hayter

THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

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

7.1 Correspondence

The Legislative Assistant noted there were 15 pieces of correspondence received for Case 19987 and 38 pieces of correspondence received regarding Cases 18966 and 19281 and that these items had been circulated to all members of the Committee.

7.2 Petitions – NONE

8. INFORMATION ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD – NONE

9. REPORTS

9.1 STAFF

9.1.1 Case 19987: An application by Dino Capital Limited to enter into a Development Agreement allowing a multi-unit residential development of 8 and 10 storeys in height (plus top floor common area). The proposed development would contain 176 residential units and 144 underground parking stalls within 2 levels off a single driveway. The proposed development is situated on 26,959 sq. ft. with 57.5% lot coverage at 1034, 1042, 1050 and 1056 Wellington Street, Halifax.

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

- A staff memorandum dated January 25, 2016
- A staff presentation dated January 25, 2016
- Fifteen (15) letters of correspondence received by residents with regards to the proposal. These letters are available on file.

Mr. Tim Beed, Planner, presented Case 19987 as described in the staff memorandum dated January 25, 2016. He described the site context, the history of the project, zoning and designation, Policy 7.7B1 and 7.7B2 requirements, public comments from the public information meeting, design revisions, and the current proposal's key features. He also indicated the proposed unit mix, height and transition, and status of the application in the development agreement process.

The Chair thanked Mr. Beed for his presentation and opened the floor for questions of clarification.

Mr. Bradfield questioned how the proposal was evaluated, noting the applicant's comments made at the public hearing during the approval of the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS).

Mr. Beed and Mr. Carl Purvis responded to a number of questions:

- In response to Mr. Bradfield, Mr. Beed stated the proposed building is being evaluated on the site specific policy as amended by Regional Council. Mr. Bradfield stated concern that the site specific policy was general.
- Mr. Purvis further clarified that Council approved MPS policy for future consideration of the buildings. He noted a number of concessions as reflected in applicant's rationale.
- The policy does not stipulate setbacks, density, or the ability for phasing.
- Staff confirmed that the proposal did not include townhouse units, but certain units had individual gate entries.
- Regarding the proposal's overall adherence to policy, Mr. Beed stated that staff discussion was ongoing.
- Regarding phasing and whether the south wall would have a permanent cladding or temporary sheeting, Mr. Beed responded that this was still under discussion. He noted that staff would accept a recommendation from the Committee on this topic and that time limits could be built into the development agreement.
- There was no specific unit layout provided at this point.

MOVED by Mr. Metlege, seconded by Mr. Bradfield

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application by Dino Capital Limited to enter into a Development Agreement allowing a multi-unit residential development of 8 and 10 storeys in height (plus top floor common area) and recommends approval of the application as contained in the staff memorandum package dated January 25, 2016.

The Committee engaged in discussion over transition, setbacks, separation distance from Century Towers, protection of Gorsebrook Park, wind, phasing, and affordability. Mr. Bradfield commented that the mass of revised proposal had remained the same, or was enlarged. He also stated that transition and setback questions should be considered together.

Staff responded to additional questions of clarification:

- Regarding wind studies, Mr. Purvis clarified that they had not been performed and wind studies were not spoken to in the policy.
- Mr. Beed confirmed access to Gorsebrook Park is from the south side of the park and not from the building; there is no existing public access from the site. He also noted that there was no surface parking abutting the park.
- Confirmed that the Urban Forester would be involved in the assessment of existing trees.
- Shadow studies were performed and included in the package distributed to the Committee.

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

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application by Dino Capital Limited to enter into a Development Agreement allowing a multi-unit residential development of 8 and 10 storeys in height (plus top floor common area) and recommends approval of the application as contained in the staff memorandum package dated January 25, 2016, providing the following considerations:

- 1. The Committee does not support phasing of the development.**
 - a. If phased, the south wall materials are given further consideration (i.e. permanent vs temporary cladding).**
 - b. If phased, and if second phase is not complete within a given time, there is an expiry clause.**
 - c. If phased, policies are preserved and consistent throughout each phase of the development, for example, unit mixture requirements should be met within each phase.**
- 2. 3-4 storey townhouses on front face of the building are instituted (as opposed to facades).**
- 3. Respective heights of the towers be reduced to 8 and 5 storeys north to south.**
- 4. An increased tower separation on North side of the proposal (at least 75 feet).**
- 5. Consideration is given to greenspace and ensuring access to rooftop greenspace.**
- 6. Staff does not permit encroachment onto Gorsebrook Park during construction.**
- 7. Retention of the existing tree canopy both in the park and on the site and that the developer works with the HRM urban forester. Furthermore, a vegetative screen or soft-scaping along the property's podium is ensured.**
- 8. Building materials of at least 40% window to 60% wall ratio.**
- 9. A quantitative wind study be performed.**
- 10. That the three-bedroom units be full three bedrooms (i.e., not 2 bedroom plus den).**
- 11. The Committee supports the inclusion of affordable units.**
- 12. The Committee values diversity of unit mixture as prescribed in the current Municipal Planning Strategy.**
- 13. The Committee strongly values setbacks at the east and west of the proposal.**

AMENDMENT PUT AND PASSED.

The question was called for on the main motion.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The meeting recessed at 5:57 p.m. and reconvened at 6:06 p.m.

9.1.2 Case 18966 and Case 19281: Amendments to the Halifax MPS and the Halifax Peninsula LUB, 6009 and 6017 Quinpool Road, and 2032-2050 Robie Street Halifax

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

- A staff memorandum dated January 20, 2016
- A staff presentation dated January 25, 2016

- Thirty eight (38) letters of correspondence received by residents with regards to the proposal. These letters are available on file.

Ms. Jillian MacLellan, Planner, and Mr. Carl Purvis, Planner, presented Case 18966 and 19281 as contained in the staff memorandum dated January 20, 2016. Ms. MacLellan described feedback from the public consultation. Staff described Case 18966 and 19281 as previously proposed, the revised concepts and provided an analysis of each site. Mr. Purvis noted that these applications had been initiated before the Centre Plan. Mr. Purvis outlined Council's direction for staff to investigate the proposal, as noted in the initiation report. Regarding shadow studies, Ms. MacLellan displayed a shadow study for Case 19281 and Mr. Purvis stated that the applicant had provided a computer model for the revised Case 18966, which showed shadows to be taller and faster.

Ms. MacLellan confirmed the total height of the Case 19281 proposal to be 25 storeys. Regarding why the cases were being considered jointly, she noted that they had been initiated jointly and arrived at Council jointly. The policy will return to Council jointly but the development agreements will be written separately.

Mr. Purvis and Ms. MacLellan gave the number of units, unit size and type breakdown, as contained in the January 29, 2016 memorandum.

Ms. Miller stated concern for shadowing on abutting residential units. Ms. MacLellan responded that the main analysis had been on open space. Ms. MacLellan displayed the impact of shadows. Ms. Miller also questioned wind impact, given other taller buildings in the area. Ms. MacLellan indicated that no wind studies have yet been performed.

Mr. Hayter referenced page 10 of the initiation report regarding the corridor study and questioned what was found in the Robie and Quinpool area. Mr. Purvis responded that the corridor study was predecessor to Centre Plan. He noted the Centre Plan will have a more narrow focus for density. Ms. MacLellan responded that no definitive heights were found in the corridor study. Mr. Hayter questioned the density sought by staff for the site and Mr. Purvis responded that although the site was suitable for density, height and mass would further determine the density. In response to whether a refurbishment was ever considered for the existing building in Case 19281, Mr. Purvis responded that it was not.

Mr. Bradfield stated concern for lack of discussion on height and mass in terms of the site's neighbours and concern for existing and future wind implications. Mr. Bradfield further stated concern for setting a precedent.

The Chair called for any additional questions from the Committee.

MOVED by Mr. Metlege, seconded by Ms. Miller

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the applications for Case 18966 and Case 19281: Amendments to the Halifax MPS and the Halifax Peninsula LUB, 6009 and 6017 Quinpool Road, and 2032-2050 Robie Street Halifax, and recommends approval of the applications as contained in the staff memorandum package dated January 20, 2016

The Committee entered discussion in regards to a suitable height for the proposal. Certain members suggested that the corner was an appropriate area for height but emphasized the proposal could be improved upon in terms of the pedestrian level street wall and skyline. One member noted that the podium should be lowered to 1-2 storeys. The majority stated concern regarding height and further impacts of shadows in the community. Councillor Watts noted concern for the wall facing residents on Parker Street.

The Committee agreed to extend their meeting time until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Hayter commented regarding height that the St. Pat's site may be used as a guiding principle, as determined to be 18 stories. Mr. Bradfield suggested that 16 storeys be the maximum.

The Committee discussed access to the site.

Mr. Metlege recommended that the Robie Street entrances and exits be one way. Councillor Watts stated concern for the entrance and exit to site. She stated that the Robie Street area was not the remedy for pedestrian amenity. She highlighted that more attention was required to pedestrian interaction along the block.

In response to a question regarding the possibility of a roundabout at the corner of Robie and Quinpool, Mr. Purvis confirmed the site would permit any potential future plans.

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

THAT the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the applications for Case 18966 and Case 19281: Amendments to the Halifax MPS and the Halifax Peninsula LUB, 6009 and 6017 Quinpool Road, and 2032-2050 Robie Street Halifax, and recommends approval of the applications as contained in the staff memorandum package dated January 20, 2016, providing the following considerations:

1. **Maximum height of 16 storeys for Case 19281 (Robie St) and 18 storeys for Case 18966 (Quinpool Rd).**
2. **Floor plates should not be expanded.**
3. **A quantitative wind study is performed, also taking into consideration nearby developments and existing buildings.**
4. **Ensure architectural interest at the pedestrian level.**
5. **The North wall of the Quinpool Road proposal (Case 18966) facing the St. Pat's site be aesthetically improved.**
6. **Address concern regarding proposed setback from abutting residents by considering an increase of the setback.**
7. **Ensure consistent setbacks along Robie Street to enhance pedestrian experience.**
8. **Investigate pedestrian interaction along Robie and Quinpool given traffic patterns associated with the hotel, residences, and transit stops to ensure a safe and pleasant pedestrian experience.**
9. **Given parking on the West side of the Robie proposal (Case 19281), use softscaping to act as barrier between parking and abutting properties.**
10. **The Committee appreciates greenspace on roof, amenity space on site, and stylistic and height variation of façade on the East of the Quinpool site (Case 18966).**
11. **The Committee values inclusion of affordable housing.**
12. **The Committee values a mixture of unit types to encourage family use.**
13. **The Committee is concerned regarding the impact of shadows on the immediate residential community.**
14. **The Committee is concerned with the impact of shadows on the Common.**

AMENDMENT PUT AND PASSED.

The question was called on the main motion.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

10. **ADDED ITEMS – NONE**
11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING – February 22, 2015**

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant