

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
Public Information Meeting
Case 22485

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

Thursday, October 17, 2019
7:00 p.m.
Saint Margaret of Scotland Anglican Church Hall

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Meaghan Maund, Planner, HRM Planning and Development
Maggie Holm, Principle Planner, HRM Planning and Development
Holly Kent, Planning Technician, HRM Planning and Development
Cara McFarlane, Planning Controller, HRM Planning and Development

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Doug Hubley, Applicant / Property Owner

REGRETS: Councillor Lindell Smith, District 8

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE: Approximately 22

The meeting commenced at 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 HRM Staff members and the Applicant.

Case 22485 - Application by Doug Hubley requesting to rezone lands at 3620 Highland Avenue, Halifax from R-2 (General Residential) Zone to the R-2T (Townhouse) Zone to allow the construction of a townhouse building.

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 3620 Highland Avenue, outlining the status of the application, the Applicant's request for a rezoning (R-2 to R-2T Zone), site context of the subject land, the land designation [Residential (RES)] and enabling Planning Policies (Section II, 2.2, 2.4, 2.7 and 2.8; and Implementation 3.1.1) within the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and the current zoning [R-2 (General Residential) Zone] within the Halifax Peninsula Land

Use By-law (LUB).

3. Questions and Comments

Rick MacKay, Highland Avenue (adjacent to the site) - The setbacks would determine if the address would be on Normandy Drive. **M. Maund** said it would be decided at the permitting stage by HRM Civic Addressing and depend on the site plan. **R. MacKay** does not want to see the 70-year old pine tree come down. The area is solid rock. Any privacy will vanish. It is a big change for the area, how will the neighbourhood be compensated? **Doug Hubley** mentioned that the existing building will be replaced with either a four-unit apartment building (as-of-right) or a townhouse building with three units (if rezoning is approved). There will not be any blasting. The townhouses will be built slab on grade and be a much better option than an apartment building. **R. MacKay** is concerned that more properties in the area will follow suit. **M. Maund** clarified that a minimum amount of frontage and setbacks are required to build townhouses.

Marjorie Murray, Rosemeade Avenue found that the city was very restrictive with their property which is located on the corner of Rosemeade Avenue and Normandy Drive. The city would only allow a single unit dwelling (a basement door was not permitted) on the property and their civic address had to be on Rosemeade Avenue. They were also required to provide drainage from their property to the street to avoid the neighbours properties from flooding. M. Murray is concerned about on-street parking because currently this causes a problem for them accessing their driveway. A three-unit townhouse will require three driveways which will take away from on-street parking. **D. Hubley** – Each townhouse will have a garage; therefore, there won't be additional on-street parking. **M. Murray** is also concerned for the safety of the children in the neighbourhood with a school in the area.

One resident mentioned that the this will add to the heavy traffic presently in the area.

Pam Carney, Highland Avenue asked which street the front doors will be facing. **M. Maund** reminded the audience that the scope of this application is to rezone the property. The R-2T Zone requirements will control the layout of the property at the permitting stage and the address will be determined by Civic Addressing. During the preliminary review stage, Development Engineer provided feedback on access points onto the property but will be determined and finalized at the permitting stage. **D. Hubley** said the driveways will likely be off Normandy Drive.

Barb asked for clarification on how many townhouse units the applicant was proposing. **M. Maund** explained that the applicant's proposal was originally for a four-unit townhouse. Currently, the property is zoned R-2 which does not permit townhouses; therefore, a rezoning is required. If approved, the R-2T Zone requirements will allow the applicant to build a three-unit townhouse.

Tony Webb, Normandy Drive (across the street from the subject property) would prefer that the townhouses be privately owned. **D. Hubley** plans to have them as residential units. **M. Maund** – HRM does not regulate ownership. They could go through a subdivision process to sell them off individually.

Donald d'Entremont, Highland Avenue – Does HRM have control as to whether the units are short-term rentals or if they become an Airbnb? D. d'Entremont is also concerned about control after ownership changes. **M. Maund** – If a property is rented for less than 30 days, it is considered a commercial use which is not permitted in the area under the residential zone.

Brian Adams – A rezoning is a generic change and there are no set plans. The developer has the opportunity to change their intentions at any time which makes it hard to think productively of this process without having a defined image of the final concept.

One Resident asked how this proposal fits in with the Centre Plan. **M. Maund** explained that this property falls within Package B of the Centre Plan which has not been rolled out yet.

B. Adams asked about the underground water service along Normandy Drive. **M. Maund** explained that no structures are permitted to be built on top of that water line easement.

Barb – What are the next steps? Will the public have a chance for more input? **M. Maund** explained the rest of the process and the public hearing would allow for the public to voice their opinions.

A resident mentioned their concern for people with accessibility issues with regards to the traffic and on-street parking in the area.

4. Closing Comments

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

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:43 p.m.