

Charlottetown council rejects apartment complex proposed for Pine Drive

Dave Stewart (dave.stewart@theguardian.pe.ca)

Published: Sep 12, 2016 at midnight

Updated: Sep 30, 2017 at 3:11 a.m.



Coun. Greg Rivard, chairman of Charlottetown's planning committee, says a proposed 24-unit apartment complex for Pine Drive does not fit in with the surrounding neighbourhood. The council asked council to reconsider the proposal after the planning department rejected it. Council s

None

Charlottetown city council has once again rejected a plan to put up an apartment complex on Pine Drive.

Pine Cone Developments, of which Bevan Enterprises is a partner, had asked council to reconsider a decision to reject a proposed 27-unit apartment complex that would fill a lot on a property located between Mount Edward Road and Maple Avenue.

Council rejected the request at its regular public monthly meeting on Monday.

Pine Cone has been trying to get this project, in one form or another, off the ground for years. However, the city's planning and development officer didn't think the latest proposal, or any of them, fit in well with the surrounding neighbourhood which is made up of residential homes.

Pine Cone has an as-of-right to build on the property but needs a building permit from the City of Charlottetown. The city has refused to issue that permit, leaving the developer only one option — to appeal to the Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission.

Wayne Bevan, one of the developers on the project, declined to comment when reached by The Guardian on Monday. He said they would talk about what they want to do and comment later this week.

Coun. Greg Rivard, chairman of the city's planning committee, said council agrees with the planning and development officer.

"One of the big things was it is not harmonious with what is currently in the area. The area is predominantly R1 (residential) and we thought this was, just the sheer scale of this was just too large so we supported the planning development officer's suggestion to reject the reconsideration," Rivard said.

Coun. Bob Doiron, who represents the area, describes the neighbourhood as full of quiet family homes.

"This would be out of character for this area," Doiron said.

As stated before, the developer has come to the city with more than one proposal for the property.

The first application was for a 24-unit complex. It went to a public meeting and residents voiced their opposition, echoing Rivard's comments about the scale of the development. The developer pulled the application before it went to council.

Then, around 2012, the developer proposed a 19-unit townhouse project. Once again, it went to a public meeting where people voiced their disapproval. And again, the applicants pulled the project before council had a chance to vote.

Now, Pine Cone is asking for a 27-unit complex but this time council did vote on it and rejected it after the planning department said no.

Rivard expects the issue will go to IRAC.

"IRAC is going to review the merits of this application in its totality, what their lawyer has argued versus what the City of Charlottetown is saying in its official plan."

dave.stewart@tc.tc

Twitter.com/DveStewart

Charlottetown city council has once again rejected a plan to put up an apartment complex on Pine Drive.

Pine Cone Developments, of which Bevan Enterprises is a partner, had asked council to reconsider a decision to reject a proposed 27-unit apartment complex that would fill a lot on a property located between Mount Edward Road and Maple Avenue.

Council rejected the request at its regular public monthly meeting on Monday.

Pine Cone has been trying to get this project, in one form or another, off the ground for years. However, the city's planning and development officer didn't think the latest proposal, or any of them, fit in well with the surrounding neighbourhood which is made up of residential homes.

Pine Cone has an as-of-right to build on the property but needs a building permit from the City of Charlottetown. The city has refused to issue that permit, leaving the developer only one option — to appeal to the Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission.

Wayne Bevan, one of the developers on the project, declined to comment when reached by The Guardian on Monday. He said they would talk about what they want to do and comment later this week.

Coun. Greg Rivard, chairman of the city's planning committee, said council agrees with the planning and development officer.

"One of the big things was it is not harmonious with what is currently in the area. The area is predominantly R1 (residential) and we thought this was, just the sheer scale of this was just too large so we supported the planning development officer's suggestion to reject the reconsideration," Rivard said.

Coun. Bob Doiron, who represents the area, describes the neighbourhood as full of quiet family homes.

"This would be out of character for this area," Doiron said.

As stated before, the developer has come to the city with more than one proposal for the property.

The first application was for a 24-unit complex. It went to a public meeting and residents voiced their opposition, echoing Rivard's comments about the scale of the development. The developer pulled the application before it went to council.

Then, around 2012, the developer proposed a 19-unit townhouse project. Once again, it went to a public meeting where people voiced their disapproval. And again, the applicants pulled the project before council had a chance to vote.

Now, Pine Cone is asking for a 27-unit complex but this time council did vote on it and rejected it after the planning department said no.

Rivard expects the issue will go to IRAC.

"IRAC is going to review the merits of this application in its totality, what their lawyer has argued versus what the City of Charlottetown is saying in its official plan."

dave.stewart@tc.tc

Twitter.com/DveStewart

Take a moment to take our short survey. On a scale of 1-10, how likely are you to recommend The Guardian (1 being not at all and 10 being very likely)?

Finish Survey