

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 16, 2002

MINUTES

PRESENT: Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair
Mr. Jim Holmes
Mr. Lawrence White
Mr. Walter Regan
Mr. Keith Manchester
Ms. Elinor Williams
Mr. Frank Hope
Mr. Shalom Mandaville
Mr. Bill Ernst
Mr. Ross Evans
Mr. Peter Murray
Mr. Glen Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Susan Corser, Planner
Ms. Lynne Le Boutillier, Assistant Municipal Clerk

REGRETS: Mr. Dwyer, Ms. McNeil, Dr. Ray and Dr. Thomas

ABSENT WITHOUT REGRETS: Mr. Mark Leaman

TABLE OF CONTENT

1.01 Approval of Agenda 3

2.0 Approval of Minutes 3

3.0 Business Arising from the Minutes

 3.1 Ashburn Golf Course Expansion - Baseline Water Quality Testing .. 12 & 13

 3.2 Seaforth Infilling 13 & 14

 3.3 Case 00317 - Stoneridge on the Park (Formerly Stanley Park) 4 - 7

 3.4 Bedford/Wentworth Estates Master Plan 8

 3.5 Case 00265 - Request to Amend the MPS for Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville - Westgate Community Development Agreement 8 - 10

 3.6 Meeting Location Options 7

4.0 New Business

 4.1 Resignation 14

 4.2 Joint Meeting of WABS - C & D Waste Handling and Disposal 14

 4.3 Case 00403: Application by Noel Fredericks to Amend the Existing Development Agreement for 1250 Sackville Drive to Permit Expansion of the Used Car Display Court 11 -12

 4.4 Motion Western Community Council re Jurisdiction 15

 4.5 Update Jurisdictions of Boards 15

 4.6 Stormceptors 15 & 16

 4.7 Public Meeting re Construction Lake Fletcher 16

5.0 Concept Plans

 5.1 Schmidt Lake Subdivision 16

 5.2 Beach Breeze Subdivision - Lawrencetown 16

Information Items 16 & 17

6.0 Date of Next Meeting 17

7.0 Adjournment 17

Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. by the Chair in Board Room 1, 2750 Dutch Village Road.

The Chair noted that he will not likely be attending the February meeting and since Ms. McNeil is considering stepping down as Vice-Chair, someone will be needed to Chair the February meeting as interim Vice-Chair. Mr. Williams volunteered to act in this capacity for the February meeting.

1.0 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Two items were added to the agenda under New Business by Mr. Williams:

Item 4.6 - Stormceptors

Item 4.7 - Public Hearing re construction - Lake Fletcher

With the approval of the members, items 3.3 and 4.3 were moved up on the agenda.

The agenda, as amended, was approved on motion of Mr. Regan and Mr. Williams.

2.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Revised December 19, 2001 minutes were circulated at the meeting.

A couple of typographical errors were identified on page 7.

Clarification was sought re paragraph two, page 9, last two sentences. As a result, the wording was changed to read "Effluent from the sewage treatment plant will be used for irrigation in the dry season if possible".

The minutes, as amended, were adopted on motion of Mr. Williams and Mr. Manchester.

A discussion followed on information item 10, page 17 related to a newspaper article regarding a proposed **N.B. policy to protect wetlands**. No decision had been made on follow up. It was recalled that the Board had already written a letter to the Mayor regarding its concerns pertaining to the Provincial Department of Environment's regulations on the development or infilling of wetlands under two hectares in size without an environmental assessment. A response by the Mayor was circulated with the agenda package for information. This matter was discussed further and it was decided that a copy of the proposed N.B. policy should be obtained before proceeding further, i.e. corresponding with NSDOE& L, for example. Mr. Holmes volunteered to obtain a copy for the Board. In the interim, the item will be placed on the status sheet.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

3.3 **CASE 00317 - STONERIDGE ON THE PARK (FORMERLY STANLEY PARK)**

In addition to the report dated December 11, 2001 from Gary Porter on this case and the December handout by United Gulf Developments Limited on proposed amendments, provided to the members for tonight's meeting were the following:

- C Walter Regan's comments on the proposal as contained in an e-mail dated December 21, 2001.
- C A site plan of Stoneridge on the Park.
- C Correspondence from AMEC to Mr. Riles dated January 8, 2002 addressing questions posed at the December meeting, plus additional information.

Mr. Porter briefly outlined to the members elements associated with the proposed amendments to an existing development agreement related to the construction of five single family residential dwellings and an increase in height of a proposed apartment building from 12 to 16 storeys, with corresponding reduction in the building's footprint. Mr. Porter explained that this is an opportunity for HRM to tighten up the existing development agreement, assuming the proposed amendments are approved by Regional Council. A lot of opposition was expressed regarding the proposal at two public meetings, it was noted. Suggestions were being sought from the Board on how water related aspects of the development agreement could be improved.

The members were encouraged to pose any questions to Mr. Porter prior to his departure. Drafting of the recommendations to follow later in the meeting.

The Board commenced its discussions with a review of the items contained in AMEC's correspondence to Mr. Riles.

During the discussions which followed, it was noted that the original development agreement called for sampling of Withrod Lake, in addition to Hail Pond. It was felt this requirement was not necessary, given Hail Pond's discharge does not enter Withrod Lake. It was felt that the development would thus not affect Withrod Lake.

It was noted that the proponents were not sure if it is a Federal or Provincial body which determines the requirements of the proposed fish survey.

Mr. Regan questioned whether the island in Hail Pond, if it was not simply a contour line, would be part of the parkland. Mr. Porter felt that since the area around the lake was to be deeded to HRM, if such an island existed, it would be included.

When the Board returned to this item, Ms. Williams volunteered to draft the Board's recommendations for review at the February meeting.

The Board used comments provided by Mr. Regan as the outline for discussion in forming its eventual recommendations.

A discussion ensued on whether a RCap analysis would be satisfactory. Reference was made to the list of thirty-seven (37) water quality parameters listed in the January 8, 2002 correspondence from AMEC to Mr. Riles. Mr. Ernst felt some parameters are missing related to organic contributions and oil and grease. He felt TPH should be included.

The Board discussed where the water samples should be taken. It was noted that there are two inlets to Hail Pond and one outlet. Mr. Mandaville felt that due to the small size of the development, it would not be necessary to ask for several sites to be tested.

In addition to TPH testing being added to their list, it was felt that total suspended solids should be measured.

Given earlier discussions of the previously approved development agreement and the requirement to test Withrod Lake, since the proposed development will only impact Hail Pond not Withrod Lake, it was felt only sampling of Hail Pond should be required. Staff should be alerted that this correction should be made to the Development Agreement.

It was decided that sampling should be done at the deepest point (centre of the pond) in Hail Pond. Due to the small size of the pond, it was not felt necessary to test at the inlets. As the pond is so shallow, it was decided to request that the samples be taken mid column.

In addition to the parameters listed, it was noted that amounts have not been specified. Water analysis is being conducted by PSC Analytical Services. Mr. Mandaville advised that he spoke with their chemist regarding whether they can do Total Phosphorous tests. He was advised they don't do TP. They send these samples to their London office. Mr. Mandaville again reiterated that only the VG (QEII) does these. He cautioned that a sample splitting analysis will not be done unless they are directed to do so. The Board's recommendations will require a Total Phosphorous analysis to the micrograms per litre level. It was noted that Total Phosphorous is not part of the RCap parameters.

A discussion followed on whether RCap (Rapid Chemical Analysis package) was adequate. Both Mr. Mandaville and Mr. Ernst did not feel it was. It was recalled that Mr. Riles indicated they would do Total Phosphorous and Chlorophyll, but Total Phosphorous is not included in the list provided.

It was also decided TPH (Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons) should be tested for. Mr. Manchester questioned taking water samples mid column if one desires to test for petroleum products, which tend to collect on the surface. Mr. Ernst noted that light will dissolve them.

It was also felt that testing for aluminum should be included. Mr. Ernst noted it is one of the leachable elements and can be toxic.

Mr. Regan questioned the difference between the RCap list and the sub-committee's recommendations for testing for new developments. The Chair indicated that they did not use the RCap list, but a smaller list of parameters.

The Board discussed how frequently the testing should be done and the duration. It was noted that Section 13 (b) of the Development Agreement specifies April, June and August. It was agreed that it should be recommended that the testing be done quarterly. Sampling to be conducted for one year post construction of the units associated with this amendment. Results of analysis to be provided to HRM, with a copy to the Board.

It was noted that Chlorophyll A is not part of RCap. This test to be added to the list. Also Dissolved Oxygen to be added.

The Board debated the merits of just indicating RCap, plus the extras identified above versus composing a list to be appended to the recommendations. Mr. Ernst noted there appears to be some uncertainty whether the list of parameters provided by AMEC represents RCap.

It was requested that a fish sampling survey be done of Hail Pond. A discussion followed on whether this would be necessary if the proponent could obtain this information from another source. The Chair reflected that if you can't get a quantifiable estimate, the survey results are meaningless. You need comparative measures, unless you find zero fish present. Mr. Regan indicated he just wanted a fish survey. The Board will indicate they want a document on the fish fauna of the lake.

The Board reviewed the present stormceptor installation at the Northwest Inlet and the proposed installation at the Northeast Inlet. It was recommended that the proposed stormceptor, adjacent to the roadway at the northeast corner of pond, be installed and maintained as per manufacturer's instructions. In addition, it was felt that something must be done between the stormceptor discharge and the pond to reduce water flow rates. Perhaps something which could be incorporated into the proposed path.

Referring to the pathway around the Pond, the Board supported the proponent's intention to leave the vegetation around Hail Pond undisturbed.

The Board recommends an Erosion and Sedimentation Plan needs to be prepared and approved by the HRM Engineering Department.

Reference was made to the effectiveness the new trail will have in buffering Hail Pond. A discussion ensued on the effect of imposing a buffer. The Board's Guidelines call for a 15 meter buffer associated with watercourses. It was noted that the brook, associated with the Northwest Inlet, is really an intermittent brook and thus would not be effected in any event.

It was recommended by the Board that the pathways be created in such a manner that they will act as an infiltration and filter system for run off going into Hail Pond. It had been noted that the portion of the path system already constructed was a raised path, with coarse rock on the bottom and fine crusher dust on top. The construction would appear to allow the filtering of runoff from existing backyards into the Pond.

For outlet points, the Board recommends a bridge or three sided culvert associated with the pathway to allow for fish passage.

The balance of the compilation of the recommendations related to a review of the December minutes. Reference was made to covenants associated with the development referred to on page 6 of the December minutes, second paragraph. A copy of the protective covenants had not been provided. It was recommended that they utilize enduring covenants.

The Board recommended that the proponent ensure a minimum of a 15 meter buffer of undisturbed vegetation is maintained around Hail Pond, with the exception of the pathway.

3.6 **MEETING LOCATION OPTIONS**

The Clerk suggested several possible meeting locations and their pros and cons. She conveyed the preferences of those who could not attend tonight's meeting and the desire expressed that the location be handy for those using Metro Transit.

Of the locations identified, only three seemed to worthy of further consideration, i.e. Training Room, City Hall; Keshen Goodman Library and the Spicer Building (former Dartmouth Police Station). The Spicer Building conference rooms might not be available for the February meeting it was noted. It was decided to try the Training Room, City Hall for the February meeting.

3.4 **BEDFORD/WENTWORTH ESTATES MASTER PLAN**

It was recalled that at the December meeting, Ms. Corser who was not in attendance, was to be asked to follow-up to ensure that the Master Plan, associated with Clayton Developments, will come to the Board. In her update, Ms. Corser assured the Board that everything the Board had recommended for the previous Master Plan had been incorporated in the draft. The Board at their December meeting indicated that they wanted Clayton Developments provided with the recommendations so they are taken into consideration in the development of their proposal. She noted that the both the Master Plan and Land Use By-law are being revamped. The Planner, associated with the case, is Paul Morgan. She will contact him.

**3.5 CASE 00265 - REQUEST TO AMEND THE MPS FOR
TIMBERLEA/LAKESIDE/BEECHVILLE - WESTGATE COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

Bill Ernst volunteered to draft the Board's report containing recommendations associated with the above noted Development Agreement. Unfortunately, a list of comments provided on the development by Mr. Regan was not available due to an oversight by the Clerk. It was decided that the comments would be circulated in the next agenda package and when the draft report is reviewed, they could be taken into account. Mr. Williams, who will be chairing the February meeting, indicated he would ensure this happens. In the interim, a copy will be e-mailed to Mr. Ernst.

For purposes of drafting the recommendations, minutes of the December 19, 2001 meeting were used. It was recalled that the members, following the presentation at the last meeting, indicated it appeared the proponent was trying to be environmentally sensitive in the approach taken. The Board was impressed with the proposal.

During the subsequent review, the following items were addressed and recommendations made:

- C Reduce pavement width, thus reducing the amount of impervious surface. The Board endorses reducing the width of road beds.
- C Open ditches are proposed rather than piping stormwater. The Board supported this concept as it would increase infiltration rates.
- C Retention (detention) ponds proposed to capture stormwater. The Board supported this approach to managing stormwater.
- C Culverts: It was recalled that Ms. Cantwell had pointed out a number of pre-existing culverts. No provision had been made for fish passage at the time the culverts were

installed. It is being proposed by EDM that at one site, associated with the Timberlea Village Parkway, a stream tunnel be constructed. The design would allow for a fishway, as described in 5.4 Stream Restoration, page 18 of EDM's presentation. The Board supports this component of the proponent's proposal.

Mr. Regan proposed that a letter be written to DOT (Department of Transportation) and DFO (Department Fisheries and Oceans), Habitat Management section, alerting them of the shortcomings of the culverts previously installed. Mr. Regan offered to draft the correspondence for review at the February meeting. Copies of the photographs provided in the December handout could be used to illustrate the problems.

- C** Green area bordering Nine Mile River from the Community Waterfront Park to the Highway. It was felt that HRM should purchase the land along Nine Mile River from the park to the highway. The Board recommended that HRM acquire a buffer zone of a minimum of 30 meters along the boundary of the development. Walkway and trails associated with passive recreation would be permissible in the buffer zone. The Board encourages development of a canoe launch area to allow public access to Nine Mile River.
- C** The Board endorses the proposal to hire an aquatic scientist to advise on environmental issues associated with the project.
- C** Water testing locations - The Board recommends that testing be conducted at all stream exit sites (where streams cross the boundary of the property). Reference was made to 5.5 - Permitting and Monitoring, page 18 of the report - "All sample points will be at site exit points".

The water testing should consist of those elements covered by RCAP, plus TPH and Oxygen.

The Board recommends water testing be done quarterly during construction and for a year post construction. It is recognized that this development may take 20 years to complete. The Board recommends that attempts be made to do the testing during high flow events.

In the recommendation, reference will be made to the HRM's commitment that the Western Commons remain as pristine as possible, thus the need to test water flowing from the development in that direction. Mr. Mandaville offered to provide Mr. Ernst with the Board's recommendations pertaining to the Western Common.

- C Pesticides - The Board recommends that a Pesticide and Turf Management Plan be developed and submitted to the Board for review. When the Management Plan is provided, the Board will deal with monitoring aspects. The Board anticipates there will be a monitoring component associated with the plans.
- C Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plans - These plans be developed for each phase of development and be brought to the Board for review. Part of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan to deal with dirt leaving the site on vehicles.
- C The Board recommends the amount of grubbing be minimized, thus reducing the amount of burning required.
- C The Board recommends that the amount of exposed area, at any point in time, be minimized.
- C The Board recommends that the developer try to meet the standards of such groups as the Evergreen and/or Audubon Society.
- C The Board recommends that wetland areas should be retained. Wording could be quoted from the Board's Guidelines, i.e. "Natural wetlands and salt marshes should not be infilled, altered or destroyed".
- C The Board strongly endorses the proponent's proposal to use effluent from the sewage treatment plant as a source of irrigation water for the water course, however careful consideration should be given to any chemicals being added to the effluent.

There was considerable discussion of the use of alum in sewage treatment plants. It was noted that the issue of the use of alum is really a HRM matter, as they run the plants. The Board considered whether a letter should be written to HRM on the issue of the use of alum. It was decided not to deal with the matter at this time. Mr. Regan felt a letter should be written to HRM that any new plant should be at least tertiary.

Mr. Regan suggested that a binder should be developed with all the Board's recommendations in it. Mr. Ernst felt it would be only fair to developers if the Board comments were consistent.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

4.3 **CASE 00403: APPLICATION BY NOEL FREDERICKS TO AMEND THE**

**EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR 1250 SACKVILLE DRIVE TO
PERMIT EXPANSION OF THE USED CAR DISPLAY COURT**

The members were in receipt of a memorandum dated December 12, 2001 from Andrew Bone regarding the above case. The Planner was in attendance. Comment was being sought from the Board on the potential impact to the areas' watercourses, particularly the brook which transverses the property.

Mr. Bone reviewed aspects of the report with the members. It was noted that the expansion being requested would allow the applicant to accommodate forty (40) vehicles versus the sixteen (16) vehicles permitted under the development agreement signed in 1991. This expansion was possible, as the proponent had acquired an adjacent property of approximately 20,000 sq. ft. At present he displays one vehicle at the front of the property facing Sackville Drive. He would like to display four vehicles. It was noted that the remainder of the vehicles are currently displayed on essentially a grass surface.

The proponent is not intending any excavations. Reference was made to the property being generally flat and sloping toward Sackville Drive. The property is crossed by an intermittent brook. It is piped halfway across the property. It is not the owner's intention to disturb the brook or change the grade of the site. He intends to do as little work as possible on the site. The water flow eventually enters Little Sackville River. Mr. Bone noted that under the provisions of the current development agreement, if there are any grade alterations, the owner has to follow the Erosion and Sediment Control measures set up by the Province.

The members reviewed the photographs provided of the site. One photo identified a raised area along the property line, associated with a soccer field. Mr. Bone noted that this grade change was artificial. A grass swale runs along the back of Mr. Fredericks' property line and eventually water in the swale enters the brook. Mr. Bone was not aware of any environmental issues associated with the property. He had done a site visit in the late spring of 2001.

A question was posed regarding where the vehicles are washed, i.e. in the open or in a garage. While there are two garages on the property, Mr. Bone noted Mr. Fredericks has no authority to use the detached garage. HRM is questioning the legality of this structure.

A member noted that if oil changes and power washing of engines occurs on the site, if the run off is not collected and dealt with, it will end up in the brook. Petroleum and washing products were a concern.

It was suggested that activities associated with the back of the lot could potentially result in substances feeding into the brook before water enters the pipe. Mr. Bone felt that some

runoff could flow forward on the site, enter the ground and/or the swale from the back portion of the site.

A discussion followed on whether the site was serviced or not. It was felt that this area is serviced with water and sewer.

Recommendations were drafted during the course of this review. It was decided that rather than prepare a separate set of recommendations, draft minutes would be provided to Mr. Bone to accompany his report. The Chair noted that the Board can't comment on the piped portion of the brook. Comments would have to be contained to the exposed portion of the brook as it currently exists. It was observed from the photos provided that the brook flows between a corridor of trees to Sackville Drive. The Planner understood the proponent wishes to keep them undisturbed.

A discussion followed on whether a grit and oil separator installation was required given there is a substantial increase in the number of vehicles to be displayed. A member felt there should be paving of the display area and associated curbing, plus a catch basin(s) and a stormceptor type unit installed.

The following recommendations were made by the Board.

- C Existing brook area and surrounding buffer zone be left undisturbed.
- C Paving should be provided for the car display area and curbed, so runoff water can be collected and directed into an oil and grit separator.
- C If car washing in garage is conducted, discharge water is to be directed to an oil and grit separator as well.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES (cont'd)**

3.1 **ASHBURN GOLF COURSE EXPANSION - BASELINE WATER QUALITY TESTING**

Ms. Corser, in her update, noted that she feels the confusion related to this item was associated with the wording of the Development Agreement. As a result, the Development Officer was not aware that baseline testing was done prior to the signing and approval of the development agreement.

Ms. Corser advised that she discussed the item with Paul Dunphy, Director, Planning and Development Services this week. She noted that the Board had not received a response to their correspondence of May 21, 2001. She provided him another copy. He indicated to Ms. Corser that it would not be unreasonable for HRM to do sampling. Firstly, HRM will go back to the consultant, Jacques Whitford, in the hope they will do the additional

baseline testing, however.

It was stressed to Ms. Corser that it is important that should Jacques Whitford agree to conduct the tests, they be made aware of the fact that only the QEII labs can do the proper analysis.

Ms. Corser also reported that Maureen Ryan, the Planner originally involved in the case, wants to become included in setting it right. She and Ms. Corser plan to meet with the consultant, Tom Swanson. Copies of Mr. Mandaville's e-mails, plus the Board's letter to Mr. Dunphy will be provided to Mr. Swanson. It was noted that while the Board's letter reiterated the need for monthly sampling, it will likely be only possible to have quarterly sampling. Ms. Corser will provide a further update on how the developer and consultant respond.

The Board would like a copy of the results.

3.2 **SEAFORTH INFILLING**

Ms. Corser provided, for the files, a copy of a letter dated August 22, 2001 to Mr. Rutter from the District Manager, NS Dept. of Environment & Labour. Attached to the correspondence were Terms and Conditions of Approval under the N.S. Environment Act for the watercourse alteration associated with causeway/culvert constructions. Also provided was the original letter from the Habitat Assessor, Fisheries and Oceans Canada to Glen Warner, NSDOE&L, regarding the construction of the causeway.

Ms. Corser reported that the causeway was constructed in August. Road construction commenced in October. She displayed a plan of the thirteen (13) lots being proposed. She noted that comments from the Department of Health have yet to be received. She referred to the how the creation of these thirteen (13) lots came about as a result of an exemption under the Subdivision Bylaw, associated with the existence of four lots prior to a certain date. No development agreement is required in this instance. It is an as-of-right development.

In his review of the correspondence and attachments, the Chair noted that the Fisheries and Oceans Canada concluded "the proposed work is not expected to result in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat provided the additional mitigation measures are implemented". He concluded that there is nothing the Board can comment on related to this development.

Reference was made to the Board's Guidelines. The Secretary was instructed to send them to Mr. Rutter.

It was noted that the Board does not approve of the practice of infilling wetlands and although the Board can't do anything in this instance, some members felt it would be remiss not to write letters conveying its concern and displeasure with the decision to NSDOE, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Mayor.

During discussion of this suggestion, it was noted that a letter has already been written to the Mayor regarding concerns the Board has with the Provincial Department of Environment's regulations on the development or infilling of wetlands. Doing anything further was postponed until Jim Holmes had obtained a copy of the proposed New Brunswick regulations. It was felt that any additional letter writing should be postponed until the New Brunswick regulations are in hand. It was proposed that in subsequent correspondence the Seaforth Infilling could be used as an example of what happens when a small area is taken out of context, causing incremental reductions of a wetland, i.e. how piecemeal development can destroy a wetland.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS (cont'd)**

4.1 **RESIGNATION**

The Chair informed the Board that Mr. Donald Mason has resigned.

4.2 **JOINT MEETING OF WABS - C & D WASTE HANDLING AND DISPOSAL**

The Board was advised that a joint meeting of BWAC, DLAB and the Board has been arranged for Tuesday, January 22, 2002, the Helen Creighton Room, Alderney Gate Library. Ms. Corser provided copies of the report dated January 15, 2002 from Kurt Pyle, HRM Planner. It was noted that a similar package had also been mailed out today. The purpose of the meeting is to obtain the input of the three Boards. Regional Council is desirous of a recommendation(s). It was recalled that Mr. Pyle had attended a Board meeting early in 2001 and indicated at that time he would be getting back to the Board for its input. It was noted that it is important that each Board which attends has a quorum present, as the process requires a meeting be convened of each of the three boards.

4.4 **MOTION WESTERN COMMUNITY COUNCIL RE JURISDICTION**

4.5 **UPDATE JURISDICTIONS OF BOARDS**

Circulated in the agenda package was a motion that a report be requested on the feasibility of splitting the H/HCWAB into two committees, the jurisdiction for one to be the

area for the former City of Halifax and the other, to be the area of the former Halifax County Municipality, as there are too many waterways for the present Committee to adequately deal with and the Committee appears to be too large.

It was noted that although the Board has a potential for being very large, as representatives come from a number of districts and there is no limit to the number of groups which can be represented on the Board, it has never presented a problem. It was also noted that since Community Councils have to approve appointments to the Board of District representatives or groups to join, they have the discretion to turn down applications. Secondly, there has been an initiative to try to move away from using political boundaries, past and present, to determine jurisdictions of the boards. Watersheds are more appropriate in determining jurisdictions.

Ms. Corser referred to the draft proposal, prepared by the consultants, associated with the new Comprehensive Water Management Policy preparation. The proposal addresses the division of responsibilities for the WABs based on watersheds. The document will be coming to the three Boards for their comment. It was also recalled that NWCC had passed a motion late last year regarding boundaries, which Dr. Blouin is endeavouring to respond to. She will provide copies of Dr. Blouin's report to the Community Council, once it is tabled.

One of the big issues associated with this matter relates to the Bedford/Wentworth Estates Master Plan. At present the area is split between the jurisdiction of BWAC and the H/HCWAB.

4.6 **STORMCEPTORS**

Mr. Williams relayed to the Board observations that an engineer passed on to him regarding the operation and effectiveness of stormceptors. When tested some of them had nothing collected. It appeared the materials had become resuspended during heavy rain events.

Mr. White noted that Strescom, who markets Stormceptors, is proposing a testing program in the metro area on their effectiveness. They are prepared to put in \$50,000 towards a test program, but need this amount matched by the Municipality and the Province to proceed. While they have statistics on the effectiveness of the units in other locales, it would be beneficial to have information related to the metro area.

It was reflected that the problems witnessed may have been associated with techniques used in installing the units or maintenance. Reference was made to a stormceptor, in the vicinity of the Sackville River, working very effectively.

4.7 **PUBLIC MEETING RE CONSTRUCTION LAKE FLETCHER**

Mr. Williams referred to the outcome of a Public Meeting he had attended Monday night regarding a Development Agreement associated with a development on Lake Fletcher. It had been identified that three of the five septic systems on the site are not functioning. The proponents decided, when this came to light, not to pursue obtaining a development agreement to expand the facilities on the site, thus opening up the property to inspection. Mr. Williams expressed concern that even through the problems with the septic system are apparent, the HRM can't or won't step in, once the development agreement process stops. Someone would have to bring the situation to the attention of the Department of Health. There was a brief discussion of whether there is a process when HRM knows of such infractions.

5.0 **CONCEPT PLANS**

5.1 **SCHMIDT LAKE SUBDIVISION - HAMMOND PLAINS**

A map was provided under separate cover of this development proposal, which Ms. Corser understood was an as of right development. Mr. Evans recalled, although the lots can be developed as-of-right, there is a limit to how many can be developed in any given year. Ms. Corser will check into.

5.2 **BEACH BREEZE SUBDIVISION - LAWRENCE TOWN**

A concept plan for this subdivision was provided for the members' information.

INFORMATION ITEMS

One item associated with the Status Sheet was dealt with. Ms. Corser provided graphs associated with the **Sandy Lake, Glen Arbour** water testing.

It was recalled that Jacques Whitford had been hired to do additional sampling of Sandy Lake, however due to no fault of theirs, the sampling could not be conducted at the opportune time. Dr. Blouin has reviewed the sample results. The condition of the Lake appears stable. Nevertheless, Dr. Blouin feels additional samples need to be taken this year to confirm. He desires samples to be taken at least in the spring and summer of 2002. Arrangements will be made with Jacques Whitford. The Chair felt three samples are required, i.e. February/March; May/June and October/November. Susan Corser will pass this recommendation along.

Mr. Evans related to the Board that he observed at the site that fertilizer bags are still not

being stored indoors.

The graph provided information on TP, Cha and SD. Mr. Mandaville indicated that he did feel Cha was most important.

Once the raw data is available from Jacques Whitford through Dr. Blouin, Mr. Mandaville will put it on the Website.

6.0 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, February 20, 2002, Training Room, City Hall.

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned on motion of Glen Williams, at 11:20 p.m.

Lynne Le Boutillier
Assistant Municipal Clerk