

## **HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**

---

**NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC MEETING  
MINUTES  
January 28, 2004**

Upper Sackville Community Centre  
2476 Sackville Drive

**PRESENT:** Ms. Ann Merritt, Chair  
Ms. Jan Gerrow  
Ms. Gloria C. Lowther  
Mr. George Murphy  
Mr. Delphis Roy  
Ms. Karen Stadnyk  
Councillor Brad Johns  
Councilor Len Goucher

**REGRETS:** Mr. Tony Edwards

**STAFF:** Mr. Andrew Bone, Planner  
Mr. Jamie Hannam, Chief Engineer, Halifax Regional Water  
Commission  
Mr. Tom Gorman, Planning Engineer, Halifax Regional  
Water Commission  
Mr. Charles Lloyd, Environmental Engineer, Environmental  
Management Services  
Ms. Sheilagh Edmonds, Legislative Assistant

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Call to Order/Opening Comments .....	3
2.	Public Participation - Case 00625 - Service Boundary Amendments for Sackville .....	3
3.	Closing Comments .....	9
4.	Adjournment .....	9

**1. Call to Order/Opening Comments**

Ms. Ann Merritt, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Chair asked the members of the North West Planning Advisory Committee to introduce themselves, after which, she introduced Mr. Andrew Bone, Planner, advising that he would be giving a presentation. Also in attendance were Jamie Hannam and Tom Gorman, Halifax Regional Water Commission, and Charles Lloyd, HRM Environmental Management Services.

**2. Public Participation: Case 00625 - Service Boundary Amendments for Sackville**

**Staff Presentation:**

Mr. Andrew Bone, Planner advised that the Water Commission and Environmental Management Services have made an application to HRM to consider changing the Municipal Plan, i.e. change the service boundaries of the Sackville area. He explained that at present HRM operates a stand-alone water treatment plant in the Lively Subdivision, and a sewage treatment plant. When the Water Commission initially proposed putting in a better water quality system, it involved a rate increase, however the Public Utilities and Review Board denied this rate increase and recommended that the Commission look at options of improving the water quality without an increase. Mr. Bone indicated that, as a result, staff have come up with a option which involves extending water services into the subdivision, and as well, Environmental Management Services would run sewer services into the subdivision and it would be connected into the Mill Cove Treatment Plant. Mr. Bone pointed out that this evening's meeting is to explain the proposal and to get public feedback.

Mr. Bone elaborated on the proposal, advising that they are proposing a land swap i.e. taking a parcel of land out of the serviced boundary, thus reducing the service boundary, and replacing it with a parcel closer to Lower Sackville. He added that the implication of this land swap is that the replaced parcel will be developed as urban style lots which are small, serviced lots. This proposal will facilitate the owner of the two 'swapped' lots paying a portion of the cost of the extension of services, thus reducing the cost to HRM and anyone affected.

In concluding his presentation, Mr. Bone advised that this meeting was very preliminary noting that a lot of the details have yet to be worked out and that staff will be coming back to the public with a second meeting when they have gathered more information. He added that they will respond to questions as best they can this evening, and any questions they can't answer tonight, will be provided either at the next meeting, or directly to the individual.

**Questions/Comments - Public:**

Mr. Bill MacDonald questioned if services will be extended to Wilson Lake.

Mr. Bone advised that it is not being considered at this time, however, staff is aware there are

people in adjacent areas who are requesting the services, and he will get back to the people with regard to the implications of price, noting the cost would be dealt with primarily by the residents.

In response to a further question from Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Bone advised that one implication of the proposal, if approved, is the potential for lot subdivision.

Mr. David Borden questioned if services may be run elsewhere than Sackville Drive.

Mr. Bone outlined the area intended for servicing. He added that, for the section of Sackville Drive that they are not intending to service, if the residents are interested and a certain portion of the residents are in agreement for servicing, then staff can determine the costs.

Mr. Sheldon Roach addressed the meeting and advised he was a resident of Lively Road. He noted that there are some homes on Lively Road that are serviced for water but not sewer and questioned if they intend to include the older homes for sewer services.

Mr. Charles Lloyd, HRM Environment Management Services, advised that at this time, there is no plan to service those lots. He added that it could be considered but it would be subject to cost and would require the approval by Council.

Mr. Matthew Boates asked if the proposed routing of the water line was based on topographical considerations or on property aesthetics.

Mr. Bone pointed out that the main purpose of this proposal was to save cost and that, should the developer agree to the swap, then he would be paying a portion to have the line go into his property.

Mr. Jamie Hannam, Halifax Regional Water Commission suggested that perhaps staff could look in detail at what the future phases might be like as they look at infill servicing down the road.

Mr. Kevin Spears, Lively Road made reference to the planning phases and questioned if any consideration was being given to limiting property owners from subdividing their lots.

Mr. Bone responded that at the present time there are no plans to limit subdivision of lots. Ms. Patricia Sheppard, Parklane Drive, asked if the public will be kept informed of the developers plans for development of the subdivision.

Mr. Bone pointed out that negotiations with the developer are at a very early stage and that depending on what arrangement is worked out, certain things may be facilitated as-of-right while other things may be facilitated by other processes where the municipality has more control, e.g. development agreement. Reiterating the fact that staff and the developer are at very preliminary stage, Mr. Bone indicated that staff will look at whatever is most appropriate to get what the Municipality and community want.

The Chair noted that this particular question will come back to the Planning Advisory Committee.

Mr. Walter Redden, Lively Road, requested clarification on extending water and sewer lines through Lively Road, to which Mr. Bone and Mr. Lloyd responded.

Mr. Ron MacIntosh, Lively Road questioned if the water lines will be put up the centre of Lively Road or will they be connected to the existing plant and pipes.

Mr. Hannam advised that the Water Commission wants to: 1. get municipal services extended to Lively subdivision so they can decommission the well system; and, 2. to renew the existing distribution system within Lively, thus the small diameter piping that has been causing problems, will be upgraded. He added that, at this point in time, they don't know if they will go through the back yard easement or go to the street.

Mr. MacIntosh added that it would be an opportune time to install sewer lines, if the road was going to be dug up to install a water line.

Mr. Walter Regan, Sackville Rivers Association addressed the meeting and indicated that his Association was generally in support of the proposal, but had several questions and concerns as follows:

- S In the new area to be developed will they be able to put R-0 on apartment buildings?

Mr. Bone indicated he did not have an answer at this time, and he would have to get back to him.

- S With regard to the new section to be developed, Sackville Rivers Association support a development agreement over a by-right agreement
- S The Association is concerned that this proposal will open the door for other developers with similar type plans.

In response, Mr. Bone advised that it is within Council's mandate to consider any request to change plans. The intention in this case is that it is a one-opportunity scenario.

Mr. Hannam pointed out that the developer did not approach Council on this issue, adding that it has been initiated because staff want to get water service into the Lively Subdivision, and they are trying to add as many partners as they can to make it economically viable for everyone.

- S Is it possible that the whole area could be a master development agreement, i.e develop it all at once rather than in different phases?

Mr. Bone advised that the area is to be developed as of right, noting that a good portion of it is currently developed.

- S     The Sackville River Association wants staff to look at the impact of the development on the Sackville River.
- S     What side of the planned four-lane highway will the development be on? A four-lane highway is needed in this area and if staff had a master development agreement, they could make the highway part of the agreement.
- S     Concern that the new development will have driveways directly on the #1 highway.

Mr. Bone indicated that Municipality is addressing the issue of driveways in general, and it is its goal to prevent driveways from connecting onto major arterial roadways.

Ms. Theresa Scratch, Lower Sackville, referred to the zoning of the lands involved and asked if small lot development would have to go through a plan amendment or receive public input.

Mr. Bone responded that there would be further public meetings, adding that things are so sketchy at this time a lot of the details aren't known. He pointed out that if this matter should turn into a more complicated process then it may go straight to public hearings.

In concluding her remarks, Ms. Theresa Scratch expressed concern that HRM had not redrawn the boundary to date, noting that it is based on a design capacity of 1970. She added that she was concerned about the total impact on Mill Cove and questioned if it has the capacity to service all these lands.

Mr. Kevin Gough questioned if the property owners, who live opposite the parcel of land the developer owns, have been asked if they would want to accept the cost of getting services installed.

Mr. Hannam noted that staff hasn't approached that particular group, either individually or collectively, as it is early in the process but they will be considering this and see what options are available. He added that they haven't included or excluded anyone along Sackville Drive, but are treating this group as another potential partner along with the developer, HRM, and the residents of Lively.

Ms. Valerie LeBlanc of Wilson Lake Drive expressed concern that her taxes may go up as a result of this proposal, but that she wouldn't be a beneficiary of the work.

Mr. Bone indicated that couldn't answer her question at this point in time, however he would further investigate and provide communication to Council on what the implications could be

for adjacent property owners from a tax perspective.

Ms. LeBlanc also expressed concern about the environmental impact with regard to sewage and runoff on her property, and questioned what was the process with regard to new sewer installation.

In response, Mr. Charles Lloyd advised that the plan is to leave the pipes in Lively and disconnect the pumping station and treatment plant and reconnect to a new sewer. He noted the existing pumping station will be removed.

Ms. LeBlanc indicated she would like to see how staff intends to address the environmental concerns about the removal of the pumping station. She also questioned if the land use would change, to which Mr. Bone responded that the intention is not to change the land use mix in the area. In response to a further question why that parcel of land wasn't included in the boundary, Mr. Bone indicated he was currently researching this matter.

Mr. Alvin White, 1497 Sackville Drive, addressed the meeting and noted his concern with the proposal was that some residents along Sackville Drive will be excluded from the services, given the configuration of the proposed development.

Ms. Shauna VanBuskirk, Old Sackville Road requested clarification on the term of 'unserviced within the serviceable boundary', to which Mr. Bone responded.

Mr. Hal West, representing Sackville United Church located on the Old Sackville Road also expressed concern about some property owners being left out of services. He also suggested that once the land swap is approved, the developer could run a lateral up to the parcel. In response, Mr. Bone advised that once the area is removed from the servicing boundary, the developer will not be permitted to put municipal services in, however, that's not to say he wouldn't be permitted to put in unserviced lots.

Mr. Walter Regan addressed the meeting again and asked if there were any plans in this project to hook up with Springfield Lake and Springfield sewage treatment. In response, Mr. Bone pointed out that the intent of the project is have an even land swap without expanding on the number of homes, and at the present time it is not their intention to extend the boundary. He added, however, staff has heard this request before and there maybe an opportunity in the future to look at this.

Mr. Walter Regan referred to the recent moratorium on development, and asked if it will apply to these lots. Mr. Bone indicated that the moratorium applies to this area, and he noted that the moratorium is for 90 days and it is unlikely that this project would be approved in that timeline

Mr. Bill MacDonald addressed the meeting once again and pointed out the advantage of getting as many homes hooked up to a new system, advising that the more homes that can be hooked on the line will make it financially feasible for all involved.

Mr. Clare Lively, Victory Lane, questioned whether the water lines would go through, or affect Victory Lane in any way. Mr. Bone advised that at the present time, it will have no impact. Mr. Lively pointed out that if services were going in past his street he didn't want to be left out. Mr. Lively also expressed concern about the additional traffic which will be generated.

Mr. Brian Grennan, Upper Sackville questioned the number of building lots that would be permitted. Mr. Bone advised that those details haven't been worked out, but that with 54 acres he would expect that four lots per acre could be developed. On another point Mr. Grennan advised that if water lines were going to be installed through Lively Road, it would make sense to install sewer lines at that same time.

Ms. Theresa Scratch questioned if an assessment was done on the impact of providing water service to this area. Mr. Hannam indicated that it had been done in general terms of providing water and sewer in this project.

Ms. Scratch questioned if the information pertaining to the cost of extending service from the existing line to Lively will be made available to the public at some point. Mr. Bone indicated that it was too early in the process to provide accurate numbers. Ms. Scratch noted that she was disappointed that HRM can't provide water to where it is needed without going through these negotiations with a developer.

Mr. Kevin Gough had further questions with regard to the land swap, to which Andrew Bone responded.

Mr. Cecil George, Lively Road suggested that if the lines were installed in the centre of the road, then fire hydrants could be installed.

Mr. Jamie Hannam advised that when they bring the main line out Sackville Drive they have that opportunity. He added they have the volume and the source of supply to provide fire protection. He added that the question then will be, are the resident's willing to pay the extra cost of putting in the hydrants and size of the mains in the streets required to service fire hydrants.

Mr. Allan White, Sackville Drive addressed the meeting with a question relating to the installation of services along Sackville Drive, to which Mr. Bone and Mr. Hannam responded.

A resident addressed the meeting and raised a question concerning the frontage charges applicable to the developer. Mr. Hannam explained that if the land swap proposal did not proceed, and staff went back to another plan which included running a water main out and imposing frontage charges along the way, then the land owned by developer would be treated like any other property owner and the developer would have to pay accordingly.



**3. Closing Comments**

In concluding the meeting, the Chair suggested that once staff has an opportunity to gather further information and prepare a report taking into account the comments and questions raised this evening, another meeting can be held. She noted that every one that has signed the sheet will get a notice.

**4. Adjourn**

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Sheilagh Edmonds  
Legislative Assistant