

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
Public Information Meeting  
Case 22450**

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

---

**Thursday, October 24, 2019**

**7:00 p.m.**

**École du Sommet, Larry Uteck Boulevard, Halifax**

**STAFF IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Meaghan Maund, Planner, HRM Planning and Development  
Cara McFarlane, Planning Controller, HRM Planning and Development

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Russell Walker, District 10  
Councillor Tim Outhit, District 16  
Farhang Fotovat, Cresco Holdings Limited  
Joseph Daniels, General Manager, Cresco Holdings Limited

**PUBLIC IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Approximately 15

---

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:00 p.m.

**1. Call to order, purpose of meeting – Meaghan Maund**

**M. Maund** is the Planner and Facilitator for the application and introduced the area Councillors, HRM Staff members and the Applicant.

Case 22450 - Cresco Holdings Limited is requesting a substantive amendment to an existing development agreement to allow for the transfer of up to 72 multiple unit dwelling units (162 persons) from their commercial allowable population to their residential allowable population on lands on Hogan Court, Bedford.

The purpose of the Public Information Meeting (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 or have been made up to this point.

**2. Presentation of Proposal – Meaghan Maund**

**M. Maund** gave a brief presentation of the proposal for the subject lands on Hogan Court in Bedford West, Sub-Area 9 in Bedford, outlining the status of the application, the Applicant's request for an amendment to the existing development agreement (density transfer from commercial to residential to allow for flexibility), site context of the subject land, the land designation [BWSPS (Bedford West Secondary Planning Strategy)] and enabling Planning Policies (BW-21D and BW-39C) within the Halifax and Bedford Municipal Planning Strategies

(MPSs) and the Zoning [BWCCD (Bedford West Comprehensive Development District) Zone] within the Halifax Mainland and Bedford Land Use By-laws (LUBs).

### 3. Questions and Comments

**One resident** asked for a copy of the PIM presentation. **M. Maund** will upload it to the website under the Case Details page for this application.

**Brian Doyle, Friesian Court** is concerned that there is one access point for a large amount of density on Hogan Court. Will the already approved park area remain? **M. Maund** – There is not a second access proposed. The numbers are based on sewer capacity which has already been approved. The park areas will remain as originally proposed.

**A resident from Friesian Court** asked if a Superstore would be constructed. **M. Maund** said that the area is zoned commercial and a permit has been issued for a hotel in the area. **Joseph Daniel** pointed out where the business would be located and explained that something is in the works but nothing has been finalized at this point. Two hotels are intended for the site labelled GBC and the GCA labelled area is for a commercial development. There is a permit to construct a 200-unit residential building in the area labelled CMR-1. Density has been paid for through infrastructure. Cresco Holdings is asking for the flexibility to convert potentially unused commercial density to residential.

**Ralph, Friesian Court** is concerned about the roundabout at Hogan Court. **Councillor Outhit** explained that the roundabout close to the Sobeys is municipally-owned but the other two near Highway 102 are provincially-owned and encouraged Ralph to contact MLA, Kelly Regan. HRM is working to improve signage, crosswalk lights, etc. on their roundabout and Councillor Outhit hopes to encourage the Province to do the same.

**Brian Murray, Friesian Court** asked if the density for the proposal includes the numbers for the two hotels? This is concern because of increase in traffic and Hogan Court is already difficult to exit not to mention it is accessed by a roundabout. **J. Daniel** clarified that the density does include the hotels and is already approved. The infrastructure that has been engineered and built to date allows for present and future approved construction. Density is allocated based on many factors. **M. Maund** explained that commercial density (50 persons/acre) is based on sewer capacity. HRM engineers and Halifax Water review the application to make sure it meets capacity.

**Aileen Mair, Amesbury Gate** – Generally, traffic in Halifax is dangerous and on Larry Uteck Boulevard it is dreadful. Emergency vehicles already have difficulty navigating the roads in the area due to traffic. Roundabouts are not used properly which causes a safety issue. Hogan Court should not be accessed by way of the roundabout.

**Janice Zed, Friesian Court** would like HRM and the developers to look at what is above ground when considering density as opposed to underground (e.g., sewer). Traffic is horrific and is very treacherous for school children trying to cross Friesian Court onto Starboard Drive.

**Roger Hamshaw, Kearney Lake Road** is concerned that Hogan Court (currently a dead-end road) will eventually be connected to Kearney Lake Road. Also, when this project originally began, the maximum building height was four-storeys but currently there are two seven-storey buildings and density is getting too heavy. What will be the height of the two buildings on Hogan Court? **J. Daniel** said Hogan Court will not be extended. The apartment buildings are permitted to be up to 12 storeys.

**John Mader, Friesian Court** – Have there been studies done on people coming to and going from Hogan Court based on the density transfer from commercial to residential? Where would the

other the 72 units be? **M. Maund** – The Traffic Impact Statement (TIS) (available on the website) concluded that there would be a slight increase at peak time but not significant. The increase would be at peak times. **J. Daniel** showed the locations of where the buildings would be constructed if this application was or was not approved. If not approved, the other building would become office/retail or another type of commercial building. If approved, there is no guarantee that the density transfer would need to take place, they are looking to have flexibility to do so.

**B. Doyle** wondered if there is a possibility that the 12-storey building may become 14-storeys. **J. Daniel** – there is a maximum height limit of 12-storeys and any change would require a public process.

**J. Zed** asked when the TIS was conducted. **M. Maund** – The original was 2012. Another was done in 2015 (to be confirmed) and the most current in June 2019.

**Mike Kerman, Friesian Court** asked why Cresco is asking for this amendment. **J. Daniel** – Things change over time. The commercial component doesn't use all the density and therefore, instead of trying to put in more commercial, the developer would like the opportunity and flexibility to put that density into residential.

**J. Zed** wondered if the existing infrastructure (access to Hogan Court) will remain in the same location. Will there be any widening? **J. Daniel** – The TIS shows that everything will work with the current infrastructure.

**Chester Robinson, Kearney Lake Road** is opposed to the proposal due to many reasons already mentioned. If a proposal is approved, it should be built to that original plan without amendments. Everyone should voice their opinions, but C. Robinson doesn't feel that it makes a difference. **M. Maund** – The developers, in this case, do have the ability to ask for the amendment and through public feedback and Staff's recommendation, Council will decide whether to approve or deny the application.

**R. Hamshaw** realizes that the density will remain the same but envisions in a few years down the road that Hogan Court will be opened up to Kearney Lake Road. **J. Daniel** made a verbal commitment that they wouldn't apply to have Hogan Court extended beyond its current boundary. **Councillor Outhit** mentioned that the dilemma in many areas is to either build roads to alleviate traffic or don't build to protect sensitive areas forcing residents to put up with traffic.

**B. Murray** feels there is too much density for Hogan Court.

**B. Doyle** would like to see the developer stay with the original plan or not use all of the permitted density. **Farhang Fotovat** explained that the infrastructure is already there and a lot of it is based on property taxes.

**M. Lynas, Friesian Court** is not opposed to the construction, but the residents seem to be worried about the access to and from Hogan Court at the roundabout.

#### 4. Closing Comments

**M. Maund** thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments.

#### 5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:53 p.m.