



**COMMUNITY DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 24, 2019**

PRESENT: Fred Morley, Chair
Gaynor Watson-Creed, Vice Chair
Eric Burchill
William Book
Reg Manzer
Christopher Daly
Councillor Sam Austin
Councillor Lindell Smith
Councillor Waye Mason
Councillor Shawn Cleary

REGRETS: Dale Godsoe
Jenna Khoury-Hanna
Rima Thomeh
Councillor Richard Zurawski

STAFF: Eric Lucic, Manager of Regional Planning
Kasia Tota, Principal Planner
Luc Ouellet, Planner III
Justin Preece, Planner II
Sherryl Murphy, Deputy Clerk

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

The agenda, reports, supporting documents, and information items circulated are online at halifax.ca.

These minutes have received Administrative Approval in the interest of transparency

The meeting was called to order at 11:11 a.m., and the Committee recessed at 1:35 p.m. The Committee reconvened at 1:35 p.m. and adjourned at 2.30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m. in the Harbour East Marine Drive Community Council Meeting Room, 60 Alderney Drive, Dartmouth.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 10, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Cleary, seconded by Bill Book:

THAT the minutes of April 10, 2019 meeting of the Community Design Advisory Committee be approved as distributed. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

The agenda was accepted as presented.

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

The Chair noted that correspondence regarding item 8.1 had been received and circulated to Committee members.

8. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

8.1 Regional Centre Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law (Package A)

The following was before committee:

- A staff recommendation report dated April 3, 2019
- A staff presentation dated April 24, 2019
- Correspondence received from Robin Stewart dated April 23, 2019

Fred Morley, Chair briefly reviewed the work before the Committee for this meeting advising that staff would be providing answers to the Committee questions from the last meeting and background to the issues. Morley indicated that following the staff presentation and Committee discussion, members will identify any observations and/or concerns they wish to put forward to Community Planning and Economic Development.

Eric Lucic, Manager of Regional Planning, advised that the Heritage Advisory Committee had considered the Centre Plan at its meeting held yesterday and put forward a positive recommendation to CPED. Lucic went on to deliver the presentation entitled Follow-up Discussion which was distributed at today's meeting.

Regional Centre Plan Vision Statement

Referring to the agenda provided in the presentation, Lucic began with questions from the last meeting relative to changes to the Regional Plan Vision statement. Lucic clarified that the changes were not to the Regional Plan Vision but to the Regional Centre Plan Vision statement. The presentation outlined the Regional Centre Vision as set out in the Regional Plan and the proposed Regional Centre Plan Vision statement.

The Chair indicated with this clarification they had no further concerns with these changes. Morley indicated that it was recognized at the time of approval of the Regional Plan that the Regional Centre Plan Vision would require additional work to appropriately communicate the vision.

One (1) Hectare or Larger Sites

Kasia Tota, Principal Planner referring to comments/concerns relative to one-hectare sites, pointed out that there were approximately 63 large sites within the Centre Plan area; 13 of these sites are largely vacant while the other sites have existing buildings but still have some development opportunity. Presenting a map of the one-hectare sites, Tota noted that the blue coloured areas are the true development sites as they are largely vacant, while the orange have buildings with some development opportunity. Tota clarified that all these sites were within the Package A area.

Councillor Cleary requested that staff provide the Committee with the proposed zoning for each of the developed sites.

Kasia Tota went on to clarify that any areas designated as Future Growth Nodes are not included in these sites as they were never intended to be subject to the one-hectare development agreement process. They went on to describe how the process for the one-hectare sites would unfold under the Subdivision By-law noting that without subdivision, only one building would be permitted on the site with maximum building dimensions. If the applicant subdivided, other requirements such as additional street connections, frontage on the street and parkland designation would come into play. Tota further advised that development would then proceed under the Land Use Bylaw. They went on to note that if the applicant chose to register the property as a heritage property development an opportunity for increased height could be achieved through the heritage development process.

Members expressed concern that this process may not achieve the outcome desired for densification nor provide the quality of development envisioned on a few sites which might better be zoned CDD.

Tota provided more information on how staff had identified this process as appropriate. They noted that it had been based on the 2017 Centre Plan framework document and zoning these sites as CDD would add significant process to their development.

Density Bonusing

Moving through the presentation, Kasia Tota noted that the approach for density bonusing is based on a new floor area of development rather the height-based system which is rarely used and is not best practice. They went on to clarify that a portion of new development over 2,000 square meters would be subject to bonus zoning regardless of height.

Tota reviewed the table found on page 8 of the presentation and indicated that the Density Bonusing calculation is based on two factors:

- Any new floor area up to 2,000 square metres is not subject to bonusing (pre-bonus), which is aligned with Level 1 Site Plan Approval; this applies to all new developments
- Post-bonus is based on 20% of any new area after the first 2,000 square metres (developers pay bonusing fee on only 20% of floor area over 2,000 square metres)

Discussion regarding policy on public benefit ensued with members seeking an opportunity to have public input to the benefit realized through density bonusing. unity. Note was made that in other municipalities Community Benefit Agreements are in place. These agreements identify the community priorities for use of the funds realized through density bonusing. Staff suggested that a policy of Council (i.e. Administrative Order) in this regard would be the best mechanism to provide this opportunity.

Kasia Tota noted that it would take some time to undertake public consultation and research on what public benefits are needed or preferred in various parts of the Regional Centre. The consultation could

be included in the Package B consultation and/or as part of site plan approval public consultation for larger projects. Eric Lucic pointed out that the staff recommendation included preparation of an Administrative Order (HRM's policy vehicle).

During discussion, Councillor Cleary indicated that the best scenario is to ensure an opportunity to negotiate the best public benefit for the area. Reg Manzer asked whether assigning the public monies to the area in which it was generated would be possible. Staff indicated that this is possible, however, this arrangement may have some challenges in terms of expenditures for public benefit in relation to how quickly benefits can be expected to accrue.

Members expressed concern regarding whether the density bonusing model proposed was more a density tax. Under this proposal we are taxing the density we want, driving up rental costs, and then using the monies toward affordable housing. Councillor Cleary requested that staff provide modelling of the density bonusing for a large and a small site under both the original model and the proposed model for density bonusing for the next meeting.

Kasia Tota indicated that examples of various sizes of developments, and in various value areas are included in the presentation and in the staff report. While the individual cost per property is significantly lower for the larger projects, more developments will have access to and contribute to bonus zoning. This was based on public and stakeholder feedback that the program should be distributed more broadly in terms area.

Staff indicated that the benefit to the proposed process is certainty to both the public and the developer. The intent is to move away from site specific plan amendments and development agreements and that uncertainty. This process will result in development which has not always proven true of the development agreement process. Additionally, this process will be administratively straightforward.

Councillor Austin pointed out that it is important to recognize that this is just one factor in the complex development scenario. Austin went on to suggest that the municipality could opt not to charge this fee and not see one more affordable unit due to the market situation. The Councillor went on to indicate that collecting money, like the Saskatoon Housing Fund experience, will help to provide for affordable housing.

Developer Session Discussion

Kasia Tota advised the Committee that the feedback from industry was generally positive with some mixed opinions on the size of the high-rise tower floor plate. The slimmer forms reduce several effects of larger towers such as wind and shadow, and developers are already moving in this direction.

Following a short break, the Chair reviewed a list of identified concerns/observations to be included with the recommendation going forward to Community Planning and Economic Development, as follows:

- Community Priority setting mechanism to assist developers in identifying local priorities
- The importance of monies collected through Density Bonus process being spent in the area in which they are collected
- The need to clearly articulate the bonus density concept
- The need to raise awareness of the Keesmaat report
- The need to consider the infrastructure requirements before/as we implement the plan
- Suggest that the 'may' language in the Plan be changed to 'will consider' if it can legally be achieved
- Change the Governance Model to provide that a Regional Centre Community Council deal with applications under the Centre Plan
- Inclusion of a Design Manual has been identified as being useful
- Evidence that the process improvements are superior to existing process
- Recognition/Identification of the investments required to make the Plan whole

Community Design Advisory Committee Minutes
April 24, 2019

A brief discussion regarding the agenda for the May 1, 2019 meeting ensued with the following items being identified as matters which should come forward for the next meeting:

1. Keesmaat Report – Staff Response
2. Site Plan Application Process
3. Design Requirements
4. One (1) hectare sites by zone

9. ADDED ITEMS – NONE

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 in the Harbour East Marine Drive Community Council Meeting Room, 11:30 a.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

Sherrill Murphy
Deputy Clerk