

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
Public Information Meeting
Case 20756**

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

**Monday, September 20, 2017
7:00 p.m.**

Carrefour School - (Gym) 201 Avenue du Portage, Dartmouth, NS

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Leah Perrin, Planner, HRM Planning
Holly Kent, Planning Technician, HRM Planning
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning
Miles Agar, Principal Planner, HRM Planning
Kate Greene, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Program Manager, HRM Planning

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Councillor Tony Mancini, District 6
Tony Chedrawy, property owner
Michael Napier, Michael Napier Architecture, Applicant
Erin Ashley, Michael Napier Architecture, Applicant

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE: Approximately 146

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:08 p.m.

Call to order, purpose of meeting – Ms. Perrin

Ms. Perrin introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator for the application. She also introduced: Tony Mancini - Councillor (District 6); Tara Couvrette – Planning Controller, Holly Kent - Planning Technician, Miles Agar – Principal Planner; Kate Greene – Program Manager; Michael Napier and Erin Ashley, Applicant and Tony Chedrawy, property owner.

20756 - Application by Michael Napier Architecture, on behalf of G2J Residential Holdings, to amend the Dartmouth Municipal Planning Strategy to re-designate 246 Waverley Road, and 2 and 4 Montebello Drive to the Waverley Road Mixed-Use Sub-designation, to allow for consideration of a multiple unit dwelling by development agreement.

Ms. Perrin explained the purpose of the Public Information Meeting (PIM) is: a) to identify that HRM has received a proposal for the site; b) to provide information on the project; c) to explain the planning policy and the stages of the planning process; d) an opportunity for Staff to receive public feedback regarding the proposal. No decisions are made at this PIM.

1. Presentation of Proposal – Leah Perrin

Ms. Perrin provided a brief introduction to the application and then made a presentation to the public outlining the purpose of the meeting, status of the application and the developer's request. Ms. Perrin outlined the context of the subject lands and the relevant planning policies.

1b. Presentation by the Applicant - Michael Napier, Michael Napier Architecture

Mr. Napier gave a brief introduction of the proposal and then explained the status of the application.

2. Questions and Comments

Barbara Moore – Micmac Dr. - She stated she has COPD and this is going to be very hard on her lungs especially during construction. She also had concerns about the zoning being changed from R-1. She stated that there are traffic issues on Waverley Road now and this will only make it worse. She stated during the presentation it was proposed as being a seniors' home and when Mr. Chedrawy came to their house he told them it was not a seniors' home. Homes are becoming harder to sell in the neighbourhood. Taxes should go down because of this development. She stated this is going to make it unsafe for children and people that are living there currently.

Lorna Khan – McCarthy St. – She stated her biggest concern is the integrity of the community and she feels this would be the beginning of a downhill slide. She stated there is already a development further out on the Waverley Road going right out to the 102 bypass which has numerous apartment buildings and would fill the need for apartment buildings in this area. That would be planned development, not pop up development, which in her opinion is what this is.

Todd MacCauley – Micmac Dr. – He would like to know if the owner or the applicant owns property on Micmac Drive. **Mr. Chedrawy** stated he owned 54 Micmac Drive. **Todd MacCauley** stated Micmac Drive has no sidewalks and there are elderly people and children that use the street to walk back and forth to school, use the businesses in the area and access the busses. The challenges with the traffic and no sidewalks makes for dangerous conditions. People are speeding through their neighbourhood at speeds of 70 - 80 easily. 50-some units will not make it any easier especially on Micmac Drive. He would also like to know if this is going to be a seniors' residence or could anyone live there. **Mr. Chedrawy** stated every intention is to make this a seniors' residence. **Todd MacCauley** asked about the intentions for the property on Micmac Drive. **Todd MacCauley** stated there was no intention to do anything with 54 Micmac Drive.

Brian Stevens – Capistrano Dr. – He is not against development just thinks it needs to be the right development. He feels what is going to happen on Montebello Drive is going to be worse than what is going to happen on the Waverley Road because the main entrance to the building is on Montebello Drive. There are no 'no parking' or 'no stopping' zones so the traffic will be forced through other streets to avoid what is going on, on Montebello. No driveway to pull in for deliveries is going to cause the biggest traffic issue. If you add another 4000 units up the hill and don't put the bypass to the 107, Montebello Drive will be gridlocked. He also feels this may be the last time to get a say regarding this request. He stated there are discrepancies in the proposal. In the report to Council on April 25 it stated the lots were 28, 887 sq. ft. but the proposal says its over 30,000 sq. ft. that changes the coverage of the lot. There is also a drawing, A0 and A100, which has a small square on the back end of Tim Hortons and in the drawings, it makes it seem like it belongs to Tim Hortons and it doesn't. The building is 9 ft. 9 in. from that person's property line which is unheard-of in commercial buildings. In the proposal, policy 232-1 is included as appendix D and, it states that the municipality may not act in a manner that is not consistent with the MPS yet in the letter written to council on April 25 it states that Council may consider an MPS amendment request that are not consistent with the MPS. He would like to know which one is right. He stated if the building had its driveway on Waverley Road and was set back further it wouldn't be such a bad thing. There needs to be other accesses for deliveries. It needs to be changed and can't go as-is. He stated in all his construction years he has never heard that grade in a lot on a driveway is a reason for them to change zoning of a property and one of the rationales for the development as-is, is that it would be too hard to put any driveways for commercial or townhouses use on the Montebello Drive because it's a hill. It is easy to put a driveway on the side of a hill so that doesn't make sense as their rationale. **Ms. Perrin** explained that the inconsistencies were because of staff doing their own assessment of the request, and the applicant's material represents what they've asked for. She further explained that this is a request for a change to the planning policy, and there may be additional opportunities for public engagement on the details in the future depending on Council's decisions in this process.

Mike Spur – Waverley Rd. – He stated for the longest time on Waverley Road they have been promised sewer and water but have been told there is no capacity in the line. The Conrad brothers want to put 50 houses in behind his house and he welcomes that development because he thinks it is a great idea. He stated if there is no capacity in the line there is no capacity for this development.

Alain Boudreau – Rossi Dr. – He has concerns about the development proposal. The construction / demolition phase – for the better part of 2 years, the local residents will be affected by the demolition of the property, site excavation, drilling, blasting, whatever it takes to get through the bedrock and this is the

busiest intersection on the neighbourhood which would be fenced off and blocked by 18 wheelers, dump trucks, compute trucks etc. Road detours, closures, dust noise and just a general nuisance for everyone in this neighbourhood. The only access would be from Waverley Road. Residents will be coming down Montebello Drive turning left. You have residents coming in and out of Tim Hortons turning right, you have residents coming out of the subway complex turning left or right, the pharmacy turning left or right, and you want to add one more entrance to that road within 200 feet. He feels this makes no sense. He feels it is an accident waiting to happen. Rossi Drive is a cut-through street for local residents looking to skip the traffic on Waverley Road so this will make that worse. Rossi Drive has at least a dozen kids under 10 and this will make things very dangerous for them. There are traffic studies that have shown that Waverley Road is at capacity already so he isn't sure why this is even being considered. Unless you are going to expropriate the properties on the lake side and add a third lane he feels this will not work.

Resident – Stated rush hour traffic trying to get out the Waverley Road now is terrible. He stated there is no need for more traffic on the Waverley Road. He stated he is not opposed to the development just opposed to where they are trying to build it because it is going to make the traffic issues worse. The Waverley Road is over max capacity now. This is an accident waiting to happen. Something needs to be done about the traffic. The proposal stated it is going to be 54 units with 56 parking stalls, he wanted to know where all the guests of these residents are going to park and if a household has more than one vehicle where are those cars going to park.

Daniel Cyr – Keystone – He stated that the buyers are really affecting the real estate market in this area and he is finding that many buyers are not buying in the Montebello and Keystone area because they know there is a subdivision coming down the hill. He thinks this development should go to the Port Wallace planning phase #8 way up Highway 118 by Forest Hills.

Maria – Montebello Dr. – She stated over the last eight years she has seen an increase in traffic. They contacted HRM and the outcome was that the traffic was not bad enough because they came back and said you don't need speed bumps or traffic lights. Now there is this development and this will just make it worse. She stated she risks her life every day crossing the road. Her house is losing money and value.

Bert Lafontaine – Keystone – He stated he loves where he lives. Everything is single dwellings, trees, great views, no five storey buildings everywhere. The zoning as it is right now works and that is why everyone wants to live in Montebello and Keystone Village. There is no need to change the zoning. He feels this will be going from the present situation where there is no problem and this will create one. He stated it is a busy intersection already and this building will blind the whole corner and it is at the bottom of the hill in a residential area. He is against this development.

Marie Burrell – Montebello – Stated the traffic is unreal and over the last 20 years it has continued to increase. She stated she doesn't feel safe on Micmac Drive driving or walking. Going up and down Montebello is crazy. She likes the look of the building and she does want to stay in the area but she will require a car to live because the bus system isn't adequate and this is going to make the area very congested.

Chris Fournier – Montebello – He stated it was mentioned that Waverley Road was at capacity. He has lived in the area for 26 years and what he has noticed is that the traffic has been the same for 20 odd years. Lots of cars zipping and skipping and he doesn't see the relevance between this proposal and that, those two don't necessarily coincide. He wanted to know what the difference of adding another building would be if you are already at capacity. He wanted to know how traffic would get worse by adding this building. 100% is 100%. **Ms. Perrin** explained how the traffic study that the applicant provides is reviewed. **Chris Fournier** stated the reason everyone is here is because of a proposal to change the zoning. Changing the zoning could allow for something a little different than this building so what if this building isn't the solution, what if it is 2 storey with 10 apartments or something else. He thinks this is a great solution for people who may want to stay in the area. With a development of this size, only the property directly on Montebello, the property tax assessment after 7 years of completion is going to significantly increase the value of my home 100%. He thinks this is a positive for the area.

Dave Canwell – Capistrano – wanted to know if the traffic survey that was online was done by the developer. **Ms. Perrin** stated it was and HRM reviewed it. **Dave Canwell** stated there was a study done that showed that the Waverley Road was at capacity. He also asked if HRM was going to do a third traffic study. **Ms. Perrin** stated that this traffic study is for this site specifically asking how much traffic would be

generated for a building with 56 units. **Dave Canwell** has concerns regarding traffic, visitors to this building, garbage trucks on Waverley Road. He feels there are a hundred things that are going to make that whole section a nightmare. He stated he isn't against development but it has to be smaller, it has to be looked at a little better, and there has to be more driveways.

Maria – Montebello Dr. – Stated that HRM said the residents all have a perception that traffic is high but how can all these people just have a perception. To cross the road to get her mail she risks her life because of the amount of traffic and the way people speed up and down the road.

Sheila Martin – Micmac Dr. – She has been there 27 years and the traffic has not always been this bad. When her daughter was younger she could play across the street and cross the street with no worries. Now it takes, sometimes during rush hour traffic, 25 minutes to get out of her road to get anywhere. Her fear is that when they start building there will be trucks dropping off supplies and everybody is going to drive up Montebello to avoid the traffic and make traffic on Montebello worse. She is concerned that emergency services will not be able to get in and out of the neighbourhood in a timely manner because of all the increased traffic. Everything is going to be shut down because of all the increased traffic. The apartment right there is a bad idea.

Resident – has concerns about deliveries on Montebello and guests coming to the apartment building. There is nowhere else for people to park and no parking signs will be going up across the street because those businesses are not going to allow non-customers to park there. Shift workers are going to be affected by the noise this development will cause. Building a 54-unit apartment building does not foster a community atmosphere it fosters single people living, which is fine if it is a seniors' home, but what happens 10 years from now when that turns into younger people who want to party all the time which will affect the neighbouring residents. If this goes through it will start a precedent.

Philip Webber – Belvedere Dr. – He is in favor of public engagement, he thinks the advertisement of this was poor. He wants to know how you can make it only seniors' housing. **Ms. Perrin** stated any developer can choose to market their development however they like but from the municipality's perspective they look at uses, so this would be a residential use. **Philip Webber** stated he can't get his head around 54 units with 56 parking spots. He doesn't understand the traffic. This development will not improve the traffic.

Patrick Stubbart – Garshan Rd. - He stated in 2004 there was a staff report done by Parks and Rec. that said Shubie Park should not have an off-leash park. In 2007 went from the staff report saying there should not be an off-leash park to taking 13 acres of Shubie and turning it into off-leash. This was never approved by Council, it was put there as a pilot project and now they are trying to do an administrative order to sneak it through and approve it as it is. He feels a lot of the traffic is coming from that.

Tom Shabone – He owns the pizza place and he feels traffic is an issue and thinks the city can probably do something to assist with the traffic. The building could be downsized a bit and there are solutions to problems you just should look at different options. He supports his community and he feels as a small business owner it's tough. He believed development is good and it will help businesses in the area. He stated he did a petition at his shop and got 400 signatures in support of this project but he was not aware of most of these concerns.

Barry Wolfe – McCarthy St. – He stated the MPS speaks to sanitary issues. There was a predesign done in 1970 and work done in 1980 which said limited infilling along Waverley Rd. There has been infilling all along with homes built etc. There are all kinds of apartments in R-1 zones, for example; 319, 309, 267B, 268 A&B, and 257 in an industrial place on Waverley Road. He then quoted Page 15 of the MPS and page 52 regarding land use intent. He stated if the sewer / water system was at capacity in 1980 it must be pretty close now and you are going to put in a big subdivision up the end of the highway something has to be done first. The intersection at Montebello, the sidewalk narrows at the intersection. Development has knocked the sidewalks down. There are fire hydrants and a driveway within 100 feet of the intersection. He stated the city documents state you can't have a driveway within 100 feet of an intersection and it is 20 feet 6 inches away. There is only one sidewalk going up Montebello and the other side you can't get up the street because there is a garage there that parks their cars on the road. It is not very well laid out. There are fire hydrants with signs on them that are not accessible to emergency services. It is a nice neighbourhood and he feels this is going to ruin it.

Resident – He wanted to thank Tony Chedrawy for showing an interest in the community. He thinks the

size of the building is way too big. He wanted to know if there could be another meeting. The people of the community have identified the issues and they would like something good. Council is the one who is going to approve this and they are the ones who will be responsible for whatever goes there.

Dave Clarke – He stated if this goes through that is going to allow anyone in the mixed-use area to build apartments once the industrial goes. He stated there is a vacant lot at the end of his court where another apartment building could go, he wants to know where it stops.

Liz Campbell – Belvedere Dr. – Stated she received an email from Councillor Tony Mancini about tonight's meeting and if you want to stay updated get added to his list. She also wanted to note that it will also be going back to Community Council for public hearing where you can go again and have your say.

Ms. Perrin spoke to the different opportunities the community would have to have a say.

Anne Van Iderstine – Micmac Dr. – Stated that given the 2009 plan the Waverley Rd designation does have some mixed-use designation in the area and she was wondering when the properties were purchased and what the need is for having this kind of a unit at this location. She does believe there is a need for multiple unit dwellings for seniors but does not think that this would be a great location for seniors to try to get in and out of. The developer is intending this to be more for seniors but the Province's direction for seniors is to have more in-home care which would require more home care and more people coming and going to the building so she questions the 17 trips a day it would be much higher. She questions if this is the best location for this kind of residence. She doesn't think it will make this location more walkable.

Ginny Conrad – Braemar Dr. – She loves the community, walking along the sidewalk, using the lake, she likes that there are no high-rises that block the views. She wanted to be clear – this meeting is to change the by-law that would allow more than a residential use. She wants to know what was meant by more than residential. **Ms. Perrin** explained it isn't necessarily more than residential. She explained that the request from the applicant is to consider a multi-unit building here, an apartment building on this site. The approach that staff have taken is that there is recent policy in the area, and maybe something different would be appropriate for this site. **Ginny Conrad** stated that to her that is kind of vague, it could be anything and she finds it hard to go along with that. **Ms. Perrin** explained there is some criteria in the policy that needs to be followed. **Ginny Conrad** wanted to know if the change would be just for that property or other properties along the Waverley Rd. **Ms. Perrin** explained the proposed change is just for this site but other properties already have that designation.

Robert Daniels – Waverley Rd. – His concern with the development is the height and footprint of the building. He stated there is no other building in this neighbourhood with this height and there is no building in Burnside with this height so why should they be allowed to be built here. He likes to go to these businesses on the Waverley Rd and when this is done he feels you will not be able to park there because all the excess parking from this building will be on those lots. Reduce the height, reduce the footprint – go ahead and build it. He would like the city to tell the residents what they are going to do to fix the traffic problem on Waverley Rd. before this guy builds a building.

Mike Wade – Rossi Dr. – He said he loves this neighbourhood. He stated he is a little disappointed to find that a policy that was put into place in 2009 is quickly being scrapped. Council should have had the guts to say that they are going to stick to the policy that they implemented 8 years ago. He doesn't feel too much has changed in the last 8 years to warrant a land use designation change of this area. There hasn't been enough development to warrant that. He stated that Mr. Napier said he asked for the designation to be changed and Council agreed to it and Mr. Wade stated he is very disappointed in that. **Ms. Perrin** stated that Council haven't made a decision. Council has said 'let's go out and talk to people' and that is why we are here tonight. **Mike Wade** stated that the feedback the city is getting here tonight is that the designation that was in place and put in place by Council back in 2009 is correct and to change that designation now would be wrong.

Peter Connor – Braemar Dr. – He described living in the area for years and how it changed. He stated that the history that he described was one of change and change is ongoing. Whether the policy struck in 2009 still stands in 2017 and how they relate to the Port Wallace area are open to review and that is why everyone is here tonight. We have to respect the fact that as societies evolve and learn about aging populations, change is not easy but that fact is the world is changing and technology is around and a lot of us are aging and we need to think about what the future holds and how we are going to be able to afford

the infrastructure. Does the road system, does the capacity predate the development or is it the other way around or do they work in harmony? He agrees they are at capacity and it needs to be addressed. He feels they have to keep an open mind and if they keep the status quo they will never advance.

Des McGinly – Appian Way – Stated everyone is here for money, Staff is getting paid to be here, Mr. Napier is getting paid for the contract that he has with Mr. Chedrawy, Mr. Chedrawy will make some money with this development if it goes through and the business owners will make money. The more units they get in the area the more money they will make. For most people their house is their major investment and the capital in our houses is what people will need when they retire. People will sell their houses and hopefully have some money to sweeten their last few years. What will this development do to us? It is going to have a negative impact on the community. It has been said by the realtor, people are not buying houses on Micmac Drive right now because people are afraid of what is going to happen. The residents are here to protect what they have and he doesn't feel the city and taxpayers should be burdened with more expense to increase the sewage / water capacity and other infrastructure that has to go along to accommodate this development. He feels they are fine the way they are and they would like it to stay the way it is.

Michael Napier made his final closing statement answering questions on layby lanes, driveway locations, the traffic study, lot grading, building size and guest parking.

Closing Comments

Ms. Perrin thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments.

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:19 p.m.