

**DARTMOUTH LAKES ADVISORY BOARD  
MINUTES  
APRIL 23, 2003**

**PRESENT:** Mrs. Audrey Manzer  
Dr. Ron Beazley  
Mr. Pierre Clement  
Ms. Catherine Lunn  
Mr. John Osborne  
Mr. Robert Bell  
Dr. K. Hellenbrand  
Dr. Don Gordon

**ABSENT:** Dr. Hugh Millward (regrets)  
Councillor Cooper (regrets)  
Ms. Christine Hoehne (regrets)  
Ms. Stephanie Bird  
Dr. Paul Hines

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Kurt Pyle, Development Officer  
Ms. Lynne Le Boutillier, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. HRM Water Resource Management Study ..... 3 - 8

**2. HRM WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

A special meeting was called of the Board to deal with the above noted study.

The Chair reviewed with the members a letter from Mr. Sheppard, Manager, Environmental Services dated February 25, 2003 which was drafted following staff's meeting with the Chairs of the three Watershed Advisory Boards February 21, 2003.

It was noted that the new deadline for submissions was May 1, 2003. The Board will review the minutes for today's meeting at their regularly scheduled meeting of Wednesday, April 30 to ensure they reflect the Board's desired input concerning the report.

The four areas on which the WABs should focus their comments were reviewed. They are as follows:

- C What is your impression of the overall quality and comprehensiveness of the report?  
Does this document meet the needs of HRM at this time?
- C Which recommendations do you agree with?
- C Which recommendations do you not agree with?
- C Which policies should be given priority for immediate implementation?

Additional comments may be submitted.

It was noted that a further joint meeting of the WABs is tentatively planned for Wednesday, June 4<sup>th</sup> and there will be opportunities for further input through public consultation sessions associated with implementation.

**WHAT IS YOUR IMPRESSION OF THE OVERALL QUALITY AND COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE REPORT?**

- C Very comprehensive and of good quality.

It was noted that all the comments which the Board members made at the February 26<sup>th</sup> meeting had been captured. A copy of these minutes will be attached to the Board's submission.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

- C No table of acronyms. There are too many used, especially if a table isn't provided. For example I/I (inflow & infiltration).

- C The recommendations need to be extremely clear. If there is any confusion, the text in the body of the report should be able to clarify.
- C While the Board gives approval in principle of the report, the Board desires to see the final details. It was felt that all the recommendations need to be fine-tuned to better reflect relevant passages in the main text before they become policy. The Board wishes to see any wording of the recommendations before they become policy.
- C Referring to Chapter 5, Watercourse, Wetland and Coastline Protection, it was felt that there should be reference, somewhere in the report, that whoever is responsible, private or public, for ensuring that buffer zones are maintained.

What is to be done with existing situations related to buffer zones? How will existing situations be addressed? They should not be forgotten. Recommendation that existing buffer zones have to be maintained be added. New recommendation to read as follows:

**All existing buffer zones be maintained and enhanced where possible.**

- C There is a need to put some teeth into the enforcement of buffer zone requirements.
- C Where ever possible the Board would prefer public ownership over private ownership of buffer zones.
- C It was felt that references to wildlife habitat appears to have been left out.
- C Error noted in the Cost Implications for HRM section of Recommendation 5-4. The reference should be to Section 5.4.5 not 5.4.4.
- C Chapter 6 - Service Boundaries - Recommendation 6-3, second to last sentence, change word 'draft' to 'tentative'.

When discussing this chapter, it was recognized that there are a number of good recommendations, but concern was expressed about the time line for their implementation. They might not come on stream fast enough. Time is of essence in light of the quantity and speed of development in HRM.

- C Clarification is required of Recommendation 7-10. The Board questioned what the intent was. While it is recognized that clarification can be obtained from the discussion section, the recommendation needs to be more clearly stated.

It was noted by a member of the Urban Development Institute, that the development industry and HRM's engineering department have proposed color coding of the pipes to identify clearly which pipes are for storm water or sanitary sewers. New subdivisions have to pipe storm water separately, but errors have been made in connections.

- C Recommendation 8-2, Stormwater Management - It was felt the recommendation is not reflective of the discussion in the report, i.e. there is no reference to 'more stringent requirements', etc. It is recommended that the recommendation be rewritten as follows:

**It is recommended that HRM identify particularly sensitive watersheds and apply a more stringent stormwater management approach.**

- C The Summary of Recommendations should better reflect discussion in the main text, as people will tend to more frequently use the summary rather than the main text. (Refer above noted example.)
- C Referring to Section 8-3 - Stormwater Management there is a need to emphasize the first steps which need to be taken to reduce sedimentation and contamination in terms of the proper procedures to be followed to minimize their release off site. Also, in cases where these procedures don't work well and sediments and contaminants can't be handled on site, there should be some sort of treatment of run off contained in the recommendations, i.e. sediment traps, engineered wetlands, etc.
- C 8-3, bullet 4 - The sentence be changed around to read:
- The importance of natural systems and emerging technologies be considered and emphasized for water resource management.**
- C 8-4 - It was felt that the wording is not clear. It needs to be fine-tuned.
- C Referring to Chapter 9-1 - Performance Measurement, it was felt that the various elements should be paid for by the developer versus 9-2, which is funded by HRM. Clarification required. It was noted that the cost implications to HRM should reflect \$125,000 in the table. This figure was inserted incorrectly opposite 9-3.
- C Recommendation 9-1 should refer to recommendation 9-3.  
Bullet 1 of the recommendation - What standards are being looked at?  
Bullet 5 of the recommendation refers to 'valid methods'. What methods are these?

- C Recommendation 9-2 - How do the 50 to 70 sites get selected? A good overall mix of lakes should be included, i.e. ones with residences on septic systems, pristine lakes, lakes with residences which are serviced. There is a need for more clarification of lakes to be tested.
- C During discussion of Section 9, it was noted that a lot of money can be spent on monitoring programs. If such studies are not well planned and the information not used, you are essentially wasting money. There should be staff within HRM who could review all the information. Perhaps a Technical Advisory Committee should be established to overview monitoring plans and recommend improvements. These individuals could be drawn from universities and the provincial government to help HRM staff with their overview.
- C Recommendation 9-4 - What role would the WABs have in the annual review proposed? It would be nice to have a full day, annual meeting at which HRM staff summarized the water quality monitoring results, explained what they meant and plans for the next year. The WABs could make recommendations re priority areas. This would be the ideal set-up.
- As an alternative, report cards be generated each year following determination of the objectives. The report cards would identify whether the objectives are being met, and if not, why not.
- C Cost implications for HRM associated with 9-3 and 9-4 should be reflected in the \$30,000.

**AMONGST OTHERS WHICH RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU AGREE WITH MOST ESPECIALLY:**

- C** the emphasis on buffer zones
- C Chapter 7 - Wastewater Management - Recommendation 7-4 - The Board felt public education associated with septic systems is very important, so people know how to look after their systems. There is a huge need for a public education program dealing with septic systems.

**WHICH RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU NOT AGREE WITH?**

While not necessarily disagreeing with the recommendation(s), the Board felt the following recommendations needed wording changes:

- C 5-1 - reads poorly/doesn't read correctly.

Remove the words 'where appropriate' from the end of the first sentence.  
Insert the word 'natural' before the word 'vegetation' in the second sentence.

- C 5-2 - replace the word 'general' with 'minimum' in the first sentence. Perhaps in addition to degree of slope, soil types be taken into consideration.
- C 5-3 - the need to state very clearly what 'valid reasons' are. It was noted that in the case of existing lots which might become unuseable if a 20 m buffer zone was required might be a 'valid reason', for example. This criteria should not be left up to Regional Council to decide upon. Perhaps the recommendation should be left out in its entirety.
- C 8-15 - While a mixed use designation is recommended, it was felt that no residential should be permitted.
- C Recommendations 8-9 which relates to redevelopment of existing uses being permitted within the 1:20 floodway appears to be contradictory to Recommendation 8-12. Will this be allowed by development agreement or not? One recommendation says it is permitted by development agreement, the other not at all! Clarification was sought pertaining to these two recommendations. It was noted that there is very little discussion of this section (8-6 to 8-16) in the report's body.
- C Recommendation 8-14, associated with development contrary to the Floodplain Protection guidelines, contains another loophole. Even with a hydrotechnical study carried out by a qualified person indicating no impact, any decision should be at the discretion of Council to allow such an intrusion. It was noted that this would essentially take a property out of the Floodway Zone and rezone it to Floodway Fringe Zone, thus it is essentially a zoning change.
- C others captured in earlier portion of minutes

**WHICH POLICIES SHOULD BE GIVEN PRIORITY FOR IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION?**

The Board identified the following recommendations as their priority. They are not necessarily listed in order of priority, however.

- C Chapter 5 - Watercourse, Wetland and Coastline Protection  
Recommendation 5-1  
Recommendation 5-2  
It was felt these two recommendations should be given the highest priority.

It was noted that the Board has been emphasizing the need for buffers for many years with respect to watercourse protection.

- C Recommendation 5-4 which relates to restoration of natural systems a priority but a lesser one than the recommendations associated with buffer zones.
- C Very high priority should be given to recommendation 8-1, Stormwater Management. However, the focus should be on all development, including as-of-right development. The Board felt that having standardized guidelines across HRM was desirable. The Board could summarize what it looks for when reviewing an application.
- C Recommendation 8-3, fifth bullet "developers be required to investigate the cumulative effects of existing and future developments on the downstream environment", should be given priority.

Having completed the review, it was requested that a draft of the minutes of the meeting be circulated as soon as possible so that the Board's input can be finalized at the April 30<sup>th</sup> regularly scheduled meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Lynne Le Boutillier  
Legislative Assistant

attachment (extract from February 26, 2003 minutes)