

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
Public Information Meeting  
Case 22050**

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

---

**Monday, December 02, 2019  
6:30 pm @ Captain William Spry Community Centre**

**STAFF IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Jesse Morton, Planner, HRM Planning and Development  
Iain Grant, Planning Technician, HRM Planning and Development  
Genevieve Hachey, Planning Controller, HRM Planning and Development

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Steve Adams, District 11  
Chrystal Fuller, Applicant,  
Robert MacPherson, Applicant,

**PUBLIC IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Approximately 10

---

The meeting commenced at approximately 6:35pm.

**1. Call to order, purpose of meeting - Jesse Morton**

**Jesse Morton** is the Planner for Case 22050 and the facilitator of the Public Information Meeting (PIM). Jesse welcomed attendees to the PIM and introduced the area Councillor, HRM staff, and the applicant.

Case 22050 is an application to amend the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy and Halifax Mainland Land Use By-law to permit the proposed residential development at PID 00277228 in accordance with modified lot requirements.

The purpose of the PIM is to:

- Identify the proposal site, highlight the proposal and explain the process;
- Give the Applicant an opportunity to present the proposal; and
- Receive public feedback and input regarding the proposal that will be used to prepare the staff report and go forward with this application.

No decisions are made at the PIM, nor have been made up to this point.

**2. Presentation of Proposal - Jesse Morton**

**Jesse Morton** - Gave a brief presentation of the Case, including a brief description of the applicant's proposed development, the requested amendments to the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Halifax Mainland Land Use By-Law (LUB), and the status of the application. The application was submitted by RMP Development Consulting Limited, on behalf of the property

owner FH Development Group, to redevelop a significant portion of PID 00277228 – a large lot near Parkmoor Avenue, Hayes Street and Charlton Avenue.

The applicant requested changes to the MPS and LUB to new permit residential lots in accordance with modified lot requirements: reduced minimum lot frontage, minimum lot area, and minimum setback requirements; and greater lot coverages. If approved, the site-specific amendment could yield approximately 20-30% more lots than are permitted under current regulations (for a total of approximately 234 lots).

The subject site currently contains three zones, the R-1 Zone, R-2 Zone, and Holding Zone. The subject site is designated Low-Density Residential and Residential Development District; there is no existing policy that allows Regional Council to consider this application. Regional Council directed staff to consider amendments that permit new residential lots on the subject site.

### **3. Presentation of Proposal - Chrystal Fuller, Brighter Community Planning & Consulting**

**Chrystal Fuller** - Delivered a presentation that provided background information on the subject site and an overview of the proposed development. Chrystal spoke about a previous application for the subject site (Case 20120) that was denied by Regional Council in 2017, and highlighted the differences between the previous and current proposal.

### **4. Questions and Comments**

**Karl, Parkmoor Avenue** - Karl was involved in the previous application that was rejected by Regional Council. They feel that there are many units (single unit and duplexes) in the area that are not selling as expected; there are subdivisions that were approved, but either nothing has been built or few lots have been sold. Karl believes that there is no demand for the homes that are being proposed. There will also be issues with profitability - people will not buy homes (like those shown in the applicant's presentation) that sell for \$500,000. Further, Karl feels that the subject site's actual homes may be of low quality, and designed for quick sale or rent. They would like more information – What type of construction is being proposed? What kind of siding? Will houses be two storeys? What will the quality be? Will the land be bulldozed?

Karl believes that these properties will have significant drainage problems; there are already drainage issues on this site. There are also wetlands – how will the bog be maintained and protected? Is all of this drainage basin to be mitigated by a pumping station? There is a significant lady slipper population on the subject site, which is a protected species; lady slippers are supposed to be protected and maintained. They're also concerned that the old growth trees will be stripped from the land if the site is developed. This old growth should also be protected.

Karl, believes that the traffic issues will be aggravated: the schools are at capacity, the bus service is being reduced, recreation facilities are lacking. Lastly, they feel like a buffer area, which the Municipal Review Board mentioned during the previous Case's appeal, has not been incorporated. Overall, they feel that the proposal is inadequate.

**Chrystal Fuller, Applicant** - The original re-zoning application would have produced 345 units, we are now talking about roughly 248 units - 79% of them are single-unit dwellings. The Utility and Review Board reviews decisions of council to see if it is consistent with the Municipal Planning Strategy; the Board does not direct what items must be included in an applicant's proposal. The previous application for the subject site was rejected by Council and the Utility and Review board upheld Council's decision.

**Karl** - The developer's initial request was for roughly 300 duplex units, which was significantly more than was permitted as-of-right (roughly 180 to 194 units). That is a significant difference in density. Karl asked what was at the top of the map, it looks like outlet streets - what is planned at the triangle at the top of the development?

**Chrystal Fuller** - In the 2017 staff report, HRM stated that 194 units were permitted as-of-right. The triangle at the edge of the development is green space. The proposal also contains road reserves. HRM requires that new subdivisions are designed with road reserves so that streets can be connected in the future; even if the streets are never connected you must build them as if they will be. The lot sizes here are consistent with what we are seeing in other nearby developments, like Governor's Brook.

**Stephen, Granby Court** - Stephen asked a series of questions: What is your target market – will homes be targeted towards first-time home buyers or seniors? Will homes contain 2 or 3 bedrooms? Will dwellings be built on slabs or have full basement? What is your intent for the greenspaces? Will existing trees be left standing or will they be cut down? Have any environmental studies been complete, and if so, are they available to the public?

**Chrystal Fuller** - Yes, an environmental study done by a wetland specialist; this is required when a property owner wishes to modify a wetland. Chrystal does not know if that report is available to the public, but they will look into it. In regard to the green space, there are two parks here and those are regulated by HRM. HRM will decide what goes here, the rest of the green space would remain natural.

**Robert MacPherson, Applicant** - The developer has spent a lot of time researching the market and they feel that the entry level homes here would start at \$250,000 - 300,000. The developer is aiming for a mix of housing costs and variety of people; they believe that the starting price of \$250,000 - 300,000 works for many people, especially first time home buyers.

Construction details (e.g., basements or slabs) will be dictated by the property owner and the lot they're placed on. Homes could utilize a walk-out basement if the property is on a slope, a slab if there is a lot of rock, or a split-entry design. Market research suggests that three bedrooms are preferred, so the developer will likely aim for that; however, some custom houses could have more or less bedrooms.

**Karl** - The development on Chambers Hill, which includes duplexes, has experienced declining prices because they aren't selling. Karl believes that lots / homes on the subject site will likely be too expensive – the \$250,000 - 300,000 range won't happen because you could have bidding wars. Is there a way to make sure some of these properties remain at a lower price? What will the cost of the duplexes be? Karl is also concerned about housing quality - What will the quality of these properties be?

**Robert MacPherson** - Robert noted that they've completed market research and they're providing a product that will move on the market. They also clarified that these properties will not be subsidized (affordable) housing, but they will be more cost effective than many other lots / homes on the market.

Robert explained that it is important to have a certain standard and consistency in terms of construction quality and streetscape design. The interiors will range in quality depending on the purchasers and how they choose to customize the interior. Duplexes will likely range from \$250,000 - 300,000 and they will be located in the existing R-2 Zone (meaning that they can be pursued on an as-of-right basis; modified lot requirements are only being requested for single-unit dwellings and townhouse units).

**Karl** - What will happen with the foliage?

**Robert MacPherson** - The developer understands the value of maintaining existing trees. They will keep as many trees as possible, while also meeting the necessary engineering standards.

**Karl** – Is the developer selling lots or lots and homes?

**Robert MacPherson** - The latter.

**Stephen** - How many parking spots will be available on these properties and will the smaller lot sizes impact street parking and snow removal?

**Robert MacPherson** - At this point we aim to have a minimum of one parking space per property, though some may have two. The applicants are willing to discuss this and are here to receive feedback about issues like parking.

**Karl** - Wanted to know how far the furthest lot is from the street and to transit service.

**Chrystal Fuller** - The furthest lot is about 350 meters away from Herring Cove Road, and there are walkways that allow people to get to the street.

## **5. Closing Comments**

**Jesse Morton** - Thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments. Attendees were encouraged to complete assessment cards and reach out to staff if they have further questions.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:50 p.m.