

COMMUNITY DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES

May 1, 2013

PRESENT: Ms. Dale Godsoe, Chair  
Mr. Fred Morley, Vice Chair  
Mr. Eric Burchill  
Mr. Geoff Le Boutillier  
Mr. Bill Book  
Ms. Joanne Macrae  
Mr. Peter Moorhouse  
Councillor Lorelei Nicoll  
Councillor Gloria McCluskey  
Councillor Waye Mason  
Councillor Jennifer Watts

REGRETS: Dr. Gaynor Watson-Creed

STAFF: Mr. Austin French, Manager, Planning and Infrastructure  
Ms. Jane Fraser, Director, Planning and Infrastructure  
Ms. Susan Corser, Project Co-ordinator  
Mr. David McCusker, Manager, Traffic and Infrastructure  
Ms. Kasia Tota, Community Design  
Ms. Sheilagh Edmonds, Legislative Assistant  
Ms. Krista Vining, Legislative Support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.....	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS .....	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES/DEFERRED BUSINESS: None.....	3
5.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS .....	3
5.1	Correspondence: None.....	3
5.2	Petitions: None .....	3
5.3	Presentations: None .....	3
6.	REPORTS .....	3
6.1	Staff: .....	3
6.1.1	Review of Draft Regional Plan (Draft 2 of Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5 to be circulated).....	3
7.	ADDED ITEMS: None .....	10
8.	NEXT MEETING DATES – May 6 <sup>th</sup> (Special Meeting) and May 25, 2013 .....	10
9.	ADJOURNMENT .....	10

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:48 a.m. in Halifax Hall, City Hall.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None**

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

**MOVED by Councillor McCluskey, seconded by Mr. Book that the agenda be approved, as presented. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES/DEFERRED BUSINESS: None**

**5. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS**

**5.1 Correspondence: None**

**5.2 Petitions: None**

**5.3 Presentations: None**

**6. REPORTS**

**6.1 Staff:**

**6.1.1 Review of Draft Regional Plan (Draft 2 of Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5 to be circulated)**

The following was circulated to the Committee:

- Revised Draft Regional Plan Draft 2 of Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5
- Submissions from Committee members outlining their comments and suggestions for revisions to the Draft Regional Plan:
  - Councillor Mason dated April 22<sup>nd</sup> and April 23, 2013
  - Geoff Le Boutillier dated April 23<sup>rd</sup>, April 25<sup>th</sup>, April 30<sup>th</sup> and May 1, 2013
  - Councillor Watts dated April 9<sup>th</sup> and April 24, 2013
  - Fred Morley dated April 23, 2013
  - Dr. Gaynor Watson-Creed dated April 3, 2013

The Chair advised that the Committee would review the revised chapters today to determine that the objectives are correct, and try to avoid wordsmithing unless it changes policy. As well, the Committee's objective is to take the next three meetings and work through the body of the report. The Chair further highlighted that staff is asking whether the revisions capture the Committee's feedback to improve the plan.

## Chapter 1: Introduction Review

Several members emphasised that the Committee's bench mark for the Draft Regional Plan was closer to being able to move forward for public consultation.

Ms. Jane Fraser, Director of Planning and Infrastructure, provided an overview of the timeline schedule for the RP+5:

- May 1<sup>st</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Community Design Advisory Committee (CDAC) review of Draft Regional Plan
- May 15<sup>th</sup> CDAC Community Engagement Orientation – review of Phase 3 Community Engagement Plan and preparation for launch of Draft Regional Plan
- June 3<sup>rd</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> Phase 3 Stakeholder/Citizen Engagement
- June 13<sup>th</sup> Community Planning and Economic Design Standing Committee (CP&ED) check-in on Phase 3 Community Engagement; update on process and work plan (remaining steps)
- June 19<sup>th</sup> CDAC check-in on stakeholder and citizenship consultation; CDAC direction on changes resulting from Phase 3
- July 2-16<sup>th</sup> Regional Council Break – no meetings
- July 17<sup>th</sup> CDAC presentation of final report and Draft Regional Plan (including outcomes from Phase 3 Community Engagement); deliberation and final recommendations to CP&ED on amendments to Regional Council
- July 24<sup>th</sup> Heritage Advisory Committee presentation of final report and Draft Regional Plan; deliberation and final recommendations to Council on amendments to Regional Plan
- August 8<sup>th</sup> CP&ED presentation of final report, Draft Regional Plan, and recommendations from CDAC on amendments to Regional Plan; deliberation and recommendations to Council on amendments to Regional Plan
- August 13<sup>th</sup> – September 6<sup>th</sup> Regional Council Break – no meetings
- September 10<sup>th</sup> First Reading and setting of date(s) for Public Hearing

Mr. Fraser clarified that the reason the dates for the stakeholder and citizenship engagement were not currently in the public domain, was because staff was waiting to confirm the dates with the Committee.

Ms. Fraser also pointed out that the Special Events Advisory Committee would have an opportunity to review the Draft Regional Plan and provide feedback to the Committee. As well, should the Committee want to have First Reading given at Council's August 6<sup>th</sup> session, a special meeting of CP&ED would be required in advance of that date.

The Committee agreed that moving to Regional Council the first week of September for First Reading was satisfactory.

Ms. Fraser indicated that should the Committee be able to accomplish their review of Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5 today, staff would then bring forward Chapter 6, and any other materials that may need to be reviewed, at their May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The Committee continued with their review with the following suggestions and comments being made:

- Greenbelting should be defined in the Introduction, not as a recognition of corridors and pathways and green practices, but clearly as a method of directing growth (referred to in Mr. Le Boutillier's email dated April 30, 2013)
- Conceptually it is important to recognize that there is a sense of hierarchy that open space is beneath greenbelting when it is a part of greenbelting; stronger wording should be used on Page 2

Mr. Austin French, Manager, Planning and Infrastructure, indicated that his understanding was that the Committee had reached a consensus that the growth control is identified in the Generalized Future Land Use Map (Map 2) for growth boundary. Staff is not recommending that greenbelting be used as a method of control.

- Page 4, fourth bullet - Sustainable Solutions: further clarification is needed on how communities will be shaped, as well as on the approach to the boundary
- Suggested wording around greenbelting: *to introduce the concept of greenbelting as a means to direct growth, which includes open space planning as part of the arsenal;* with the use of Map 2 for reference

Ms. Fraser expressed concern that the above wording for greenbelting could build expectation that HRM is using greenbelting to contain growth. Whereas, staff's recommendation is that there be service boundaries and a number of different green spaces for this use. She commented that to use wording "*to introduce the concept of greenbelting*" would have an expectation that HRM is going to do traditional green belting. She commented that the language needs to be clear so that the public has understanding and clarity of what is being done.

- Suggestion was made that the third bullet under Sustainable Solutions should have a statement about the service boundary; the service boundary is going to define whatever it is around growth and the fourth bullet would indicate that HRM is introducing a concept of greenbelting to shape communities and enhance open space planning

The Committee agreed that Generalized Future Land Use Map (Map 2) is an illustration of greenbelting and asked staff to look at the wording around greenbelting within the service boundaries, defining what is happening in the rural designations and what happens in the green zones.

Mr. French advised that Map 2 directs growth in HRM and is regulated in terms of containment of service growth, and guided by the Urban Settlement Plan. He indicated that the recommendation under Section 1.3 seemed out of place because it addresses the first five year plan review; but understood that the Committee was looking for a statement to "confirm and maintain".

Further points made:

- Reference was made to Stantec Consulting's Presentation of Study given at the Committee's April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, which focused the draft plan on the fiscal imparity of taking some of the measures being proposed; observation was made that this was not included in the draft plan, which could be a missed opportunity upfront to frame some of the conversation around fiscal constraints as the Regional Plan is designed to achieve some fiscal objectives, which could be helpful in strengthen the wording
- Insertion of the word "*timeliness*" before cost-effective decision-making (Page 1 first bullet under Principles); which would help frame the definition from the fiscal side
- Reiteration was made that the word "*timeliness*"

Mr. French indicated that the reason the above suggestions were not included in the original draft plan was that the Principles of the plan should be maintained; however, he could not see any concern with adding the word "*timeliness*", but that the message is implied under the plan. As well, Mr. French indicated that staff could look into incorporating the points around fiscal constraints.

In response to questions raised the following clarification was provided by staff:

- When the redraft of Chapter 3 is completed the objectives will be outlined; one of the objectives will be to meet HRM's targets
- Page 2 - Environment and Energy: policy has not been changed but rather during the revision the Energy section included under Environment
- Sections 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 (Pages 7 and 8): staff will be referencing Statistics Canada's adjustments to Census data
- Page 9: descriptions will be added under Sections 3 and 4

Additional suggestions made by the Committee were:

- Provide a short summary of the statistics to assist with the public's understanding
- Page 4, second bullet under Enhance the Regional Centre: the following wording be add "*and other strategies including a sensible capital plan for the Regional Centre*" should HRM not be able to achieve density bonusing

## Chapter 2: Environment and Energy Review

Staff clarified that the word *Energy* had been mistakenly omitted from the title of Draft 2 and would be corrected.

During the review of Section 2.1.1 – Objectives, suggestion was made to use the following wording: "*use greenbelting to help direct sustainable growth and protect lands of ecological and environmental significance; lands suited for renewable resource extraction; and lands suited for parks, trails and corridors which provide recreational and educations opportunities*", as referenced in Geoff Le Boutillier's email dated April 30,

2013. Upon further discussion and clarification from staff, it was noted the word "foster" be used in place of "*direct*".

Ms. Fraser reiterated her concern around the expectation of greenbelting being used as a method of containment.

Additional suggestions made by the Committee:

- Move Section 1.3 - The First Five Year Plan Review in front of Section 2.1 – Objectives to set the context of the review. Introduce the concept around greenbelting in different places (ie. Sustainable Solutions section, Environment section and the use of the Map 2); at the time of public consultation should the public feel the concept of greenbelting is not clear enough then direction could be taken from there
- Provide a definition/ledged (perhaps through the use of colour coding) on Map 2 that outlines items such as: where development will take place, where there will be no development, limited development in the urban zone, service boundary, etc.; and that Map 2 be provided for the Committee's review at their May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting

Reference was made to correspondence received from Armco dated April 7, 2013, and other correspondence received from members of the public, regarding the confusion around the definition of greenbelting.

Further suggestions made:

- Include the word community groups/non-profit groups under Section 2.1.1
- Page 16, E-26: replace the words "*may consider*" from the title with "shall consider"

In response to a question raised regarding the recommendation for Section 2.3.3. - Riparian Buffers, Mr. French indicated that further clarification could be provided as a preamble in relation to the method of repairing riparian buffers.

Staff further provide clarification on the definition of the 1 in 20 year and 1 in 100 year floodplains, noting that this is defined in the glossary, as well as, there will be hyperlinks for key terms when the plan is posted online.

Request was made that Section 2.3.1 – Potable Water Supply reflect the importance of protecting and referencing the impact on water supply at the Halifax International Airport and Aerotech Industrial Park, as well as where the water supply comes from in relation to development.

#### Chapter 4: Transportation Review

Reference was made to Councillor Mason's five objectives outlined in his email dated April 22, 2013 sourced from the San Francisco Transit First Policy:

1. The urban service boundary needs to be hard, meaningful and enforced

2. The clear announcement of what the commercial core of the city is critical
3. The industrial designation needs to be industrial only, the current proposal allows commercial
4. Let us establish a rural reserve akin to the urban reserve
5. Bring back leadership that lead to Solar City

During the review of Section 4.1 – Objectives a question was raised as to whether there was a need to further define the term *assessable*. Discussion was held on the challenges around how to make everything accessible at all times, while achieving cost-effectiveness, especially for residents in rural communities. It was noted that there is a need to define what transportation policies have an impact on the Regional Plan from an economic standpoint. Further, that the definitions need to be reduced to focus on the areas where transportation does have an impact on the Regional Plan.

Additional suggestions and points raised:

- Insert a description of the corridor locations on the Future Transit and Transportation Map (Map 7) and where the corridors end in relation to rural areas
- Provide reference/greater clarity in Table 4-1: Road Network Projects; identify by project and how they interrelate to the overall transit priority, objectives, active transportation, in regard to road widening
- In regard to the signalization piece for priority transit, there is a need for stronger wording: that there is a priority, that consideration is always being given to transit and how single vehicles will be incorporated into the network, and that inside the Urban Service Boundary, which will also be the transit boundary, that HRM will only build a transit orientated zone
- Reference was made to the ten principles from the San Francisco Transit First Policy outlined in Councillor Mason's April 22, 2013 email
- In terms of wording there is a lack of relationship between Section 4.3.1 Planned Projects and Section 4.3.2 Transportation Corridors
- Section 4.3.2, T-10: identify whether there would be a public consultation process; previous discussions held on how the land would be dealt with and what options there are for land designation
- Section 4.2.1 Active Transportation: provide more detailed reference to how targets will be set for Active Transportation in this process and acknowledgement in the Regional Plan (referenced in Councillor Watts' email dated April 9, 2013)
- Section 4.4 Street Design, T-13: replace wording "*from time to time*" with "*on an as needed basis*"
- In response to question raised under Section T-14, staff clarified that the term *Engineer* used is in reference to the Municipality's Engineer
- Section 4.2.3 Public Transit, T-5 The Metro Transit Strategic Ferry Operation Plan: provide additional wording/recognition of the ferry's role

In response to concerns raised on the public's comprehension of all the policies outlined in the draft plan, staff reiterated that each Chapter would have a glossary, as well as when the plan is uploaded to the web, hyperlinks would be provided for key words.



## Chapter 5: Economy and Finance Review

The Committee entered into discussion on Section 5.2 Business and Industrial Parks with concern being expressed on the recommendation for EC-2 as per the use of industrial parks. An example was provided in regard to HRM's Q&A for the authorization of the Burnside Industrial Park 12-4; one of the questions being: *what is HRM planning to do in the future to strengthen these controls and ensuring industrial parks are industrial.* It was suggested that a stronger statement was needed in this section which would allow for a little bit of commercial (ie. small showroom in front of warehouse) but that this was not the location for office and retail space.

Ms. Godsoe stepped down as Chair at 1:34 p.m. and exited the meeting; Mr. Morley assumed the Chair.

Councillor Mason exited the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Further discussion ensued with staff responding to questions regarding what could be permitted within areas such as Dartmouth Crossing and other HRM business parks. Staff clarified that the recommendations outlined in the draft plan would not affect retail or commercial space in current industrial and business parks, but rather what would be permitted in future parks and expansions.

Ms. Godsoe entered the meeting at 1:36 p.m. and resumed as Chair.

The Committee asked staff to review the wording around permitted residential uses in business parks, as several members felt that residential uses should not be permitted.

During the review of Section 5.2.3 Halifax International Airport and Aerotech Business Park, concern was expressed that there did not seem to be any policy measures in place in relation to the construction of the new runway and legislative changes for the creation of a noise buffer around the airport. Mr. French suggested that this could be addressed as a preamble in the Plan for noise reduction in residential; but as this was technical matter, which requires an amendment to the Charter, currently being addressed by the Province, he indicated that it would be in excess to have as a policy.

Further points and suggestions made:

- Section 5.2.5 Halifax Harbour Designation; EC-10: recommendations made for sections (b) and (c) seem to contradict one another in relation to the preservation of marine industrial uses; request staff to review
- The following was noted as being redundant under Section 5.2.6 The Rural Economy:
  - that the Halifax Regional Development Authority disbanded in 2007
  - that Port of Halifax has assumed responsibility of the Sheet Harbour Port
  - HRM does not currently own any rural industrial park; therefore, HRM would be promoting a Provincial park (ie. Sheet Harbour Industrial Park)

The Chair suggested that members and staff re-review Section 5.2.6 The Rural Economy for redundancies, and that members could provide their comments for the next meeting.

The Committee discussed Section 5.2.2 Private Business Parks, with staff responding to questions of clarification on: planning for growth centres, location of business parks and the concept of having “complete communities”.

Councillor Nicoll exited the meeting at 1:56 p.m.

Staff advised that they would take the Committee’s feedback and direction from today’s meeting and prepare revisions for review at the next meeting.

**7. ADDED ITEMS: None**

**8. NEXT MEETING DATES – May 6<sup>th</sup> (Special Meeting) and May 15, 2013**

The Chair indicated that she would not be available May 6<sup>th</sup> until 12:30 p.m., and asked the Clerk to email members the next meeting dates and whether they would be available to meet May 6<sup>th</sup> at 12:30 p.m. instead of 11:30 p.m.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

Krista Vining  
Legislative Support