HALIFAX REGIONAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

August 2, 2005

PRESENT:	Mayor Peter Kelly		
	Deputy Mayo	r Len Goucher	
	Councillors:	Steve Streatch	
		Krista Snow	
		David Hendsbee	
		Gloria McCluskey	
		Andrew Younger	
		Bill Karsten	
		Becky Kent	
		Jim Smith (1:50 pm)	
		Mary Wile	
		Patrick Murphy (1:55 pm)	
		Sue Uteck	
		Sheila Fougere	
		Russell Walker	
		Debbie Hum	
		Brad Johns	
		Robert P. Harvey	
		Reg Rankin	
		Gary G. Meade	
REGRETS:	Councillors	Linda Mosher	
		Stephen Adams	
		Harry McInroy	
		Dawn Sloane	
STAFF:	Mr. George McLellan, Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Wayne Anstey, Municipal Solicitor		
	Ms. Jan Gibson, Municipal Clerk		
	Ms. Chris Ne	ewson, Legislative Assistant	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER	3
2.	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS	3
4.	PROJECT 00808 - CAPITAL COST CONTRIBUTION - RUSSELL LAKE WEST	3
5.	SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDING COMMITTEE	6
6.	ADJOURNMENT	6

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Mayor called the meeting to order at 1:45 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - June 28 and July 5, 2005.

MOVED BY Councillor Snow, seconded by Councillor Hum that the minutes of June 28, 2005 and July 5, 2005 be approved as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Addition: 5. Supplementary Funding Committee - Update - Councillor Fougere

MOVED BY Councillor Uteck, seconded by Councillor Snow that the agenda be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Council agreed to deal with the Added Item at this time.

5. SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDING COMMITTEE UPDATE

Councillor Fougere provided a brief verbal update of the Supplementary Funding Committee advising that organizational meetings have been held and the group is striving to reach consensus on issues. She added that considerable time has been spent defining the problems associated with Supplementary Funding from the perspectives of both the School Board and Council as well as identifying information requirements. Councillor Fougere commented that the group dynamics are very positive and four more meetings have been scheduled. She encouraged members of Council to forward to her any questions they wish to have addressed. Councillor Fougere confirmed for Councillor Uteck that the Committee did receive a copy of the HOGG report and are aware of Council's motion.

4. PROJECT 00808 - CAPITAL COST CONTRIBUTION - RUSSELL LAKE WEST

• A staff report dated July 28, 2005 was before Council.

Ms. Denise Schofield, Acting Manager, Planning & Development Services, presented the report assisted by a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Schofield clarified for the Mayor and Council that expansion upgrades to the Eastern Passage Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) would not be covered by the Capital Cost Contributions (CCC) for this development as expansions are not covered under the current Capital Cost policy. Further, this development area will drain toward Dartmouth not Eastern Passage. She indicated the pumping station can be applied and the trunk sewers have been factored in. Ms. Schofield added staff are researching Municipalities across the country regarding incorporating sewage treatment plant expansion costs. She confirmed that although the MGA does give HRM the ability to include those costs HRM's current Capital Cost policy has not been written in that manor.

Mr. Paul Dunphy, Director, Planning and Development Services, added that staff is reviewing expansion of the Eastern Passage STP and will return to Council with further information prior to any water flowing into that plant.

Ms. Schofield further clarified for Councillor McCluskey that Clayton Developments will be paying a significant portion of the \$2m sewer upgrade costs. Abreak down of those costs will be provided to Councillor McCluskey.

Councillor McCluskey expressed concern with development not being able to proceed in Eastern Passage due to the capacity of the existing sewage pumping station.

Ms. Schofield clarified for Mayor and Council that the Metro Link (transit service) costs have not been factored in as the Capital Cost policy is very clear regarding oversized roads.

Councillor Murphy arrived at the meeting at 2:04 pm.

Numerous Councillors expressed concern with another development coming forward without the change in the Capital Cost policy considering the issue has been discussed for manymonths. Concern was also expressed that this development will have an impact on the capacity of the Dartmouth STP. Comments were made that HRM should be charging for capacity expansion.

Mr. Dunphyexplained that staff should do the proper research as to how this will be done and then ensure it is done for all developments. He indicated that staff's research is in the final phase. Mr. Dunphyfurther clarified that staff have made it clear in the report that no development could take place until the Capital Cost Contribution is applied. He added, if Council wants to revisit the issue of applying CCC charges to the Dartmouth plant, the same would have to follow for the Halifax plant and that would affect all developments.

Mayor Kelly suggested the change to the policy be held until staff have completed their

4

research.

MOVED BY Councillor Karsten, seconded by Councillor Uteck that the Committee of the Whole recommend Regional Council give First Reading to the proposed Subdivision By-Law amendments to the Subdivision By-Law, as presented in Attachment 1, and schedule a Public Hearing date to be determined by the Municipal Clerk.

Councillor Rankin commented that what Council hopes to achieve is a business arrangement with Developers and HRM to capture the costs in kind for development as the object is to have those costs identified at the outset.

Mr. Dunphy commented that great strides have been made as HRM is playing catch-up in every district due to infrastructure issues. Staff's intent is to continue working on this and provide the information to Council to make decisions.

Councillor McCluskey commented that Developers should be charged what it is costing HRM to put the services in that they need.

Mr. George McLellan, CAO, commented that the Capital Cost Contribution policy, in consultation with Developers, was determined to be a suitable approach. Now, it is clear some members of Council want to move to the next step. To do so, would require directive from Council including appropriate notice times. If Council decides to recover more money from development the cost would be passed on to the land buyer. Mayor Kelly clarified that previously a few Councillors did want to move to the next step but were prevented by the legislation at that time.

Councillor Hum inquired if staff had a revenue figure regarding the amount of revenue that would be generated from tax dollars for this residential/commercial development. Councillor Hum inquired if that revenue would be estimated to be more than what HRM is paying out in Capital Cost Contributions. Mr. Dunphy responded that no analysis has been done but staff could provide the information.

Councillor Wile commented that on page 7 of the report, under the Provincial Funding section, it indicates that HRM is to buy the land from the province to build the highway and then give it back to the province. Mr. Dunphy commented that staff are discussing this matter with the province to determine if the province will donate that land to save the tax payers money.

Councillor Uteck commented that the CCC policy was not an easy decision on part of Regional Council. She referred to page 2 and 3 of the staff report where it indicates to move development forward and allow this area to grow the Developer will do more than required by the Capital Cost Contribution policy. She added existing residents will also benefit.

Councillor Younger requested clarification on the reduction in size from a six lane to a four lane highway at the Mount Hope interchange and asked if a four lane highway would be

sufficient to support the traffic generated by the industrial park, community college and proposed commercial development. Mr. Ken Reashor, Manager, Traffic Authority, explained that staff reviewed the issue and, after discussions with the Province, determined that section would not require six lanes.

Staff responded as follows to requests for clarification from Councillor Hendsbee:

- Mr. Dunphy responded that open space allocations will be done simultaneously with the Regional Plan. He added that staff will bring forward Capital Cost Contributions for areas before they are developed.
- Ms. Schofield responded that the map (in the staff report) indicates a future roadway, not a runway extension. The actual location will depend on surplus land that comes from DND (Shearwater) as DND has to determine which of those runways will be surplus.
- Ms. Schofield clarified that the urban section of the arterial road indicated on the map would have curb and gutter; a more rural cross section would be farther down the arterial road as that area is not anticipated to have a lot of development. She added that the details will be finalized once more development plans come forward.
- Mr. Ken Reashor responded that staff did review Gaston Road access and determined that the current access will be maintained. This has increased costs as it was intended to close the road. Adding a right turn onto Gaston Road would further increase the cost and cause a problem with the interchange. He added that an alternate access could be through the Industrial Park.
- Mr. Reashor commented that in regards to the CNR Marshaling yards staff have indicated the existing roadway will have sufficient capacity to handle increased traffic as some traffic will be removed to the Eastern Passage roadway. The Industrial Park will enter through the back section. Eastern Passage/Cow Bay residents will use this interchange as well. Councillor Hendsbee requested staff keep the option open regarding the CNR Marshaling yards.
- Mr. Reashor confirmed that Mount Hope Avenue will conform to HRM's Civic Addressing policy.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5. ADDED ITEM - SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDING COMMITTEE UPDATE

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting. See page 3.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.