

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Call to Order	4
2.	Approval of Minutes - August 27, 2001	4
3.	Approval of the Order of Business and Approval of Additions and Deletions	4
4.	Business Arising Out of the Minutes	4
5.	Motions of Reconsideration - None	4
6.	Motions of Rescission - None	4
7.	Consideration of Deferred Business - None	4
8.	Public Hearings	
8.1	Case 00329 - Request to amend the Glen Arbour Development Agreement to allow a restricted access design	5
8.2	Case 00375 - Application by Annapolis Group Inc. to amend the existing Development Agreement (DA-FEN-04-96-18) to remove Parkland Parcel "A" and replace it with Parcel "J"	13
8.3	Case 00391 - Development Agreement at 3178 St. Margarets Bay Road, Timberlea	13
9.	Correspondence, Petitions and Delegations - None	17
10.	Reports	
10.1	Case 00395 - Application by Telus Mobility to locate a cellular tower on lands owned by HRM (the Western Common) located on the south side of Highway 103 in the vicinity of the Exit 3 Interchange	17
11.	Motions - None	18
12.	Added Items	
12.1	ATV's on Roads	19

12.2	Resolution re Ketch Harbour Residents Association - Designation of Backlands	19
12.3	1880 Old Sambro Road, Williamswood	19
12.4	City of Hamilton - Tax Structure Rural Areas	19
12.5	1746 St. Margarets Bay Road	19
12.6	Request for Crosswalk - Timberlea Village entrance and Clearwater Drive	20
12.7	School Crosswalk Supervision Request - James and Charles Street, Glengarry Subdivision	20
13.	Notices of Motion - None	20
14.	Public Participation	20
15.	Next Meeting Date	20
16.	Adjournment	21

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 2750 Dutch Village Road, Halifax.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - AUGUST 31, 2001**

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams that the Minutes of meeting held on August 31, 2001 be adopted as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Added Items:

Councillor Adams: 1. ATV's on Roads
2. Resolution re Ketch Harbour Residents Association - Designation of Backlands
3. 1880 Old Sambro Road, Williamswood

Councillor Meade: City of Hamilton, Tax Structure Rural Areas

Councillor Rankin: 1. 1746 St. Margarets Bay Road
2. Request for Crosswalk - Timberlea Village Entrance and Clearwater Drive
3. School Crosswalk Supervision Request - James and Charles Street, Glengarry Subdivision

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Meade to approve the Order of Business as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. **BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES** - None

5. **MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION** - None

6. **MOTIONS OF RESCISSION** - None

7. **CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS** - None

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8.1 **Case 00329 - Request to Amend the Glen Arbour Development Agreement to Allow a Restricted Access Design**

A Staff Report dated September 24, 2001 was before Community Council. Andrew Whittemore, Planner provided an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. During the course of his presentation, he provided information on three specific categories identified supporting the secondary access: secure public safety, reduce nuisance level and facilitate efficient traffic circulation. The restricted access design would only permit emergency vehicles. He listed pros and cons of two full accesses versus one full access. The recommendation from staff was that two full accesses stay in place and that Community Council not go forward with the restricted access design. Staff having included a draft Development Agreement for consideration, he outlined the relevant points of same.

Listed below are the names of those who sent in written submissions in opposition to this application. These names were read out by the Clerk. As well, the Clerk acknowledged receipt of a Petition containing 43 names in opposition.

Lenora Bell, 21 Mohawk Street
Collette and Rob Miller, 490 Norman Boulevard
Cathy Wood, 71 Halfway Lake Drive
Kelly and Louis Blandin
Pam and Graham Streeter
Sherri Morrison, 68 Halfway Lake Drive
Nevin Coulstring, 31 Norman Boulevard
Alastair and Ann Ingram, 8 Longburn Drive
Patrick and Jennifer Bohan, 17 Carley Crescent
Kathryn Blennerhassett, 38 Carley Crescent
Pat Curran, 53 Halfway Lake Drive
Tim and Cindee Leopold, 34 Carley Crescent
Jocelyne Carreau, 232 Thompson Run
Tom MacPherson
Jim Clancey
Tracey Little, 10 Carley Crescent
Elaine Lockhart, 450 Glen Eagles Drive
Paul Doiron, 35 Carley Crescent

The Chair then called for speakers for or against the application.

Mr. Ray Rudolph, 202 Glen Arbour Way, President of the Glen Arbour Homeowners Association pointed out first that 70 letters had been submitted at the February meeting in support of restricted access. He then made the following points:

- Installation of cul de sacs with an emergency exit would be a safety measure for everyone.
- Since the extension opened up, Glen Arbour Way has become a highway, with excessive speeding and increasing traffic all the time.
- It is not safe to go in and out of your driveway, let alone walk along the side of the road.
- Maplewood Subdivision has been there for 15 years without a lower exit. There was no reason for Maplewood to have an entrance to Glen Arbour and Glen Arbour does not need an entrance to Maplewood.
- Roads in Glen Arbour cannot be salted because of wells. Last winter, three vehicles went off the road and a sand truck overturned at the corner of Glen Arbour Way and Thompson Run. School buses stopped part way in on occasion and children had to walk the rest of the way home. There are no sidewalks.
- There is going to be another entrance into the subdivision later on, much further back, and well away from Carley Crescent which will serve everyone's needs with a lot less traffic.
- HRM gave a major developer permission to build a subdivision with more than 100 lots and only one exit not far from Glen Arbour.
- The safety of children and adults is at stake and the only reason they were here tonight.

Ms. Cathy Wood, 71 Halfway Lake Drive, Maplewood on the Lakes raised the following points:

- Community spirit was very important. Putting up a restricted access would be a barrier, real or perceived.
- She used Carley Crescent to visit friends and her babysitter in Glen Arbour.
- She did not go through Glen Arbour to get to Hammonds Plains Road because that is longer and would create more traffic.
- She had safety concerns. Just because Maplewood did not have a second exit did not make it right.
- Both Hammonds Plains Road and the intersection at Hammonds Plains and Pockwock Road are very dangerous with a lot of accidents.
- It was just as important for Glen Arbour to have a second access as Maplewood in terms of safety.
- The nuisance factor and efficiency were important.

Mr. Ross Evans, Pockwock Road raised the following points:

- He asked if the Fire Department had been well informed of the possible closure, particularly with regard to winter storms.
- He asked if, pursuant to Article 315(4) of the Municipal Government Act, a notice was mailed to the Minister of Transportation and Public Works to comply with the Act. If not, the Public Hearing should not continue.

- He was concerned with the right of way next to the new park area.
- If there is a gate, traffic will increase on Hammonds Plains Road and make it harder to get out of Glen Arbour.
- When people on Pockwock Road expressed concerns with increased traffic due to White Birch Hills, they were told not to worry because the new road down the power line northeast of Sandy Lake would solve the problem.
- He asked if police and ambulance would have a key to the gate and what would happen when they do not have a key.
- When the access to the new park is made into a road, the shoulder should be widened to accommodate parking off the main road.

With regard to notification, Mr. Whittemore advised that Fire Services was consulted and Paul O'Brien of Department of Transportation was notified as well as HRM Engineering. Mr. O'Brien is a representative of the Minister.

Mr. Tim Bliss, 205 Glen Arbour Way raised the following points:

- Safety is the most important factor in support of the request for closure as a thoroughfare. Volume and speed of traffic would be reduced.
- Vehicles, in the morning and evening, use it as a short cut to other subdivisions.
- Exiting Glen Arbour in the morning is becoming an exercise in frustration. If traffic volumes continue, traffic lights will soon be required.
- Glen Arbour Way was not designed for the amount of traffic it now handles. It is narrow, winding, with no sidewalks.
- Winter in Glen Arbour is a safety concern. Glen Arbour Way, with the sharp banked corner leading to Thompson Run in snow and ice conditions, is a driver's nightmare. Because of the street extension, those who live past this corner are forced to stop on a slippery hill to allow through traffic from White Hills and Maplewood. If the street were closed off, the stop sign could be relocated thereby inconveniencing fewer drivers.

Ms. Penny Larocque, 274 Glen Arbour Way raised the following points:

- She did not want to see one community isolated from another. The Hammonds Plains community is a wonderful community to live in.
- Her house was the last one on Glen Arbour Way at the intersection and she has seen the impact of changes on the road over the last three years.
- If there is a safety problem, she wanted to see everyone have the opportunity of getting through quickly but it can be accommodated with modifications.
- The road has become a short cut for large trucks carrying supplies and equipment for building homes in other communities, service vehicles and for the neighbours.
- Because the road has become a short cut, speed and traffic have increased. Speed for people walking is a major concern. The intersection is poorly designed.

- There was no traffic count before or after the road being opened so no opportunity for comparison.
- She could not believe that Planning Department would plan an exit to a community that would disturb the peace and harmony of a residential community and put residents at risk.

Ms. Donna Clark, 402 Glen Eagles Drive, White Birch Hills raised the following points:

- On one hand it was a safety issue for traffic increasing on Glen Arbour Way with the access to Carley Crescent. On the other hand, Annapolis Group has argued an amendment to their development for higher density housing, advising the road can carry the increase of traffic in the future.
- There could be high profile golf tournaments at Glen Arbour, which could become a public nuisance, and anyone who purchased property with access to the golf course knew that was a risk. She found it hard to understand that the few extra cars that travel through Carley Crescent are a public nuisance yet thousands would come to an event which would not be a public nuisance or a danger to children.
- She preferred to turn out through the traffic lights than go through Glen Arbour.
- As much emergency access into the bowels of the subdivision as possible is required. She looked forward to new access from Lakeridge Hills. She would be concerned if traffic flow were reduced in any way. More connections are required. We do not need the rich and poor, the have and have nots.

Mr. Grant Mosher, 56 Club House Lane raised the following points:

- He had concern with the ability of Glen Arbour Way to handle traffic both in the summer and winter. In summer, it was not only local traffic but what you would expect from a golf course. On a typical day, there could be 3-400 golfers.
- There is a bad curve at Thompson Run and Glen Arbour Way. It is a poorly designed, dangerous intersection, further confused with a stop sign on a hill. The stop sign allows traffic to come through from Carley Crescent.
- It is hard to get out of Glen Arbour. You can hardly see traffic coming from Bedford. The fire station on one side of Hammonds Plains Road and the community centre on the other, so close to the intersection, have events taking place.
- He did not want to see Glen Arbour Way become another Bayview.
- There has to be a long range plan for traffic; you cannot open up other entrances here and there.
- He was not asking for a gate but to stop through traffic. If a stop sign, except for emergency vehicles, could be put every 50' along the section in question, it might be a solution.
- There are no sidewalks. The pavement is not that wide. The road is windy.

Ms. Linda O'Brien, 226 Glen Arbour Way raised the following points:

- She was not concerned about blocking people out of the subdivision but the sheer enjoyment of being able to walk along a country road in the evening and not be forced to jump into the gutter because cars speed by on a narrow winding road.
- The strongest goal a community can have is respect its members.

Ms. Joyce Evans, 11 Pockwock Road raised the following points:

- She has been watching development in her area for many years from her home on Pockwock Road. She wanted to see everyone get along.
- Taxes go up every time there is new development to pay for infrastructure. It is unfair, therefore, for segments of the community to want to put up gates and not share.
- She did not realize there was as much traffic in the area in question as discussed; she walked back there but it could have been at quiet times.
- Putting up a gate is a little selfish and not looking out for the overall picture of the community. Should a bad accident happen at Pockwock intersection and the road is closed, the residents from Pockwock Road could be blocked off for a time. An alternative route would be to go way in back of all the subdivisions to bypass the closure. Gates would hamper that plan.

Ms. Melba Holm, 239 Thompson Run raised the following points:

- Rather than the barrier being some kind of locked gate, there should be other options that would permit regular on-going traffic to the area and still provide the emergency access for both communities.
- She appreciated how the people of White Hills would feel if the only way out was through Maplewood but a locked barrier was not necessarily the only option. There should be something that would be attractive but unobtrusive, still serve to keep regular traffic from going back and forth but allow people to walk through and still allow barricaded access to emergency vehicles.

Ms. Karen Fraser, Evans Drive, Maplewood raised the following points:

- Planners recommend not closing off the road.
- Safety of the community as a whole should come first.
- The best thing is to go back to the Planners and ask what can be done as a community to solve the issues, for all areas in terms of traffic.
- Unless there is other information provided for blockage, it should be left the way it is. If there is another access being developed, then it could be left until that time for consideration.

Mr. Bruce Snow, 2 Thompson Run raised the following points:

- He has a good view of traffic flows from his home.
- He questioned the basis that staff has been using for its recommendation of keeping the road open to ease traffic flow.

Ms. Kathryn Blennerhassett, 38 Carley Crescent raised the following points:

- Her property was beside where the proposed barrier would be located.
- Fire and emergency crews would be severely inhibited from reaching houses on either side of the barrier. The time it would take to open the gate could mean a life and death situation.
- What would happen if a remote device did not work or the snow was not removed.
- They used the road at peak hours and never had occasion to have more than three cars pass either way on the road.
- Regarding congestion, while on vacation for two weeks she kept track of the cars going by her house and the daily total never exceeded ten.
- Some cars cannot find the golf course and turn around in the area where she lives.

Mr. Stephen Taylor, Lower Sackville raised the following points:

- Volunteer Fire Departments from Lucasville or Pockwock would not be able to get through the gate. Police and Ambulance would need bolt cutters, not keys.
- He cited two instances in the community of Sackville where there was a move to close a road. He felt it was a policing issue.
- Staff is recommending that the road not be closed. Staff should be asked to come up with traffic calming ideas.
- He noted that Alan Taylor of Transportation Services, HRM was not in attendance. Community Council would be starting a precedent on road closures in HRM.
- Stop signs work.
- The gate will bring nothing but an opportunity to drop garbage/junk off.
- There would be problems with policing.

Mr. Jerry McIsaac, 214 Glen Arbour Way raised the following points:

- Traffic has increased incredibly.
- They cannot sit on their front step anymore because it is one car after another all year round.
- The gate could be put up for a trial period to see how it works.

There was agreement at this time that there would be no further speakers.

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams to close the Public Hearing. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Rankin said that an important consideration was the origin of the policy requiring two exits for subdivisions. This was done five years ago in terms of approval and he understood it was prompted wholly by certain subdivisions having severe problems getting out of their subdivisions. A primary example was Glengarry/Greenwood Heights where the Municipality had to deal with an application for an exit after the land had been developed and the Municipality and province had to fund it. What the Municipality learned from that was to require two exits for over 100 homes. In that context, it was primarily to serve the subdivision and not the outside community. The application before Community Council at this time was on behalf of the Glen Arbour subdivision.

Councillor Rankin continued that when Council moved to have two exits for 100 units, it was primarily based on safety; other considerations came after that and it was not the drivers. With regard to safety considerations, if there was emergency access, there would have to be insignificant impediment to emergency vehicle access and if that meant an unlocked gate, then so be it. With regard to traffic calming, there was no evidence one way or the other regarding this issue. With regard to travel back and forth, he was convinced over time that it would be used as a short cut and could be divisive. Traffic calming was not a good exercise because you cannot make everyone happy. You only shift traffic around.

Regarding maintenance of the emergency access, Councillor Rankin said the subdivision should be asked, commensurate with their application, to pay for maintenance and it might mean an area rate. He did not want to invite a situation where two or three years down the road there would be incremental traffic, a short cut, down Glen Arbour. Since there is controlled signalized access at Pockwock/Hammonds Plains Road, it would be some time before there would be signalization so close by at Glen Arbour and Hammonds Plains Road.

Councillor Rankin stated he has weighed the balance of interest. If the gate were locked, it would not offer good unimpeded access for emergencies. The applicants themselves are most affected and, therefore, the best interests of the subdivision. There are arguments but they are minor arguments - linkages with other communities. He was, therefore, in favour of the request but wanted to defer a motion for staff to come back with measures to respond to unimpeded access for emergency vehicles for the next meeting. He explained that he was indicating a positive disposition to the alternative to go with emergency access subject to emergency access being something less than locked, noting the five year clause in the agreement. He also wanted to see an indication from the Ratepayers Association that they were prepared to consider an area rate for maintenance.

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Adams to defer a favourable decision subject to safety concerns re emergency vehicles raised being met and not

requiring a locked gate. Staff also to consider concerns raised re truck traffic and high speed of cars. Also, assurance to be obtained from the Glen Arbour Ratepayers Association that they are prepared to consider an area rate for maintenance.

Councillor Meade asked for clarification that the intent was to be open for emergency vehicles and not for the residents to go from one area to another.

Councillor Rankin confirmed it would be for emergency vehicles only being able to pass back and forth. There would be provision for pedestrians as well.

Councillor Meade stated there should be two exits for subdivisions and he would not be supporting the motion. He cited subdivisions in his District with two exits.

Councillor Rankin pointed out that the subdivision would have two exits and nowhere did he find specifications of an insistence on open thoroughfares. If it was an existing subdivision, it goes beyond the requirements. It was only through the Development Agreement, that two exits were agreed upon.

Ms. Rosemary MacNeil, Development Officer pointed out that the Concept Plan and the Development Agreement show full connection.

Mr. Whittemore added that there was a requirement of subdivision at the time requiring two accesses. Following that, municipal specifications were adopted.

Councillor Rankin stated he was trying to make a distinction regarding by right and this would constitute two exits.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

8.2 Case 00375 - Application by Annapolis Group Inc. to Amend the Existing Development Agreement (DA-FEN-04-96-18) to Remove Parkland Parcel "A" and Replace it with Parcel "J"

A Staff Report dated September 10, 2001 was before Community Council. Andrew Bone, Planner provided an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. He advised that staff was recommending approval of the application.

The Chair called three times for speakers for or against the application. There were none.

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Meade to close the Public Hearing. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams to:

- 1. Approve the amending agreement (Attachment 3 of the Staff Report dated September 10, 2001) to permit the relocation of parkland from Parcel "A" to Parcel "J"; and**
- 2. Require the amending agreement be signed within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Community Council on request of the applicant, from the date of final approval of said agreement by Community Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever approval is later, including applicable appeal periods. Otherwise, this approval shall be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

8.3 Case 00391 - Development Agreement at 3178 St. Margarets Bay Road, Timberlea

A Staff Report dated September 25, 2001 was before Community Council. Paul Morgan, Planner provided an overview of the application and advised that staff was recommending approval of the application.

Councillor Rankin asked for confirmation that there was no intent to include detox programs, for instance. He referred to Section 2.1 of the Development Agreement and, in order to add more clarity, he asked the applicant if they would be in agreement to say at the outset that there was agreement to add to Section 2.1 the intent that there would be no other type of residential facility.

Mr. Morgan advised that this clarification could be added to the agreement, the applicant is sensitive to community concerns and would be willing to consider the amendment.

Councillor Rankin asked for input from the Municipal Solicitor in this case. In response, Ms. Mary Ellen Donovan, Municipal Solicitor advised it would be in order to add the clarification but, for consistency, you would have to delete Section 3.1(b).

With regard to Section 3.1(b), Councillor Rankin stated that he did not want to create an opportunity, for a future Council or for people representing the applicant at a future time, to come forward and ask for a change without a public process.

He then asked, should the application be approved tonight, would the applicant have any problem amending the Development Agreement to reflect those two amendments.

Ms. Evelyn Williams, Chair of the Board of the Marguerite Centre advised that she was in full agreement with the amendments.

Councillor Rankin then requested that these amendments be reflected during discussions on the application.

Written submissions were received from the following:

- David Lynds, 3325 St. Margarets Bay Road
- B. Lynds, 3325 St. Margarets Bay Road
- Claire and Wilson Reinhardt, 10 Merganser Avenue

The Chair then called for speakers for or against the application.

Ms. Joanne Bernard, Project Director, The Marguerite Centre raised the following points:

- C The Marguerite Centre is not an emergency drop of for people under the influence of drugs or alcohol, nor a halfway house, nor a house for abused women.
- C Women will be required to go through a strenuous intake application process to determine eligibility for the program.
- C In terms of traffic, the women will be coming with a suitcase and very little else. There will be eight staff and no time when they all will be working. Parking will be no more of a problem than already there now.
- C There might be one or two extra cars on any given day when there are workshops.
- C Research on property values finds no evidence that this type of facility in any residential community does anything to property values.
- C A holistic program for women will be offered for women suffering from addiction.
- C There is no other facility available in Nova Scotia like this.

Ms. Evelyn Williams, 1830 Lower Prospect Road, Chair, Board of Directors, The Marguerite Centre, raised the following points:

- C Information on the background of the development of The Marguerite Centre.
- C Information on how the Board has collaborated with other agencies to obtain support and funding for the proposal.

Sister Connie Maclsaac, 22A Wedgewood Avenue provided information on the Exodus House program in Halifax which was opened in 1989. The Marguerite Centre will offer a similar program.

Sister Mary Morris, 22A Wedgewood Avenue raised the following points:

- C Additional information on programs at the Exodus House and a history of a woman who had been a resident there.
- C The space around the property is very important. Women need to be able to go out and get fresh air without having the sense that someone is watching them. There should be no fear of the outdoors.

Ms. Gail McDowell, 72 Sparr Crescent raised the following points:

- C She advised that in 1993 she entered the residential program at Exodus House. She provided information on her recovery.
- C She read letters from her son and daughter in support of the application.

Ms. Rose Marie Smith, 41 Edward Laurier Drive raised the following points:

- C Additional information regarding Exodus House, such as the neighbourhood being safe, no vandalism, children being safe, traffic flow not increasing.
- C Many of the women from Exodus House were working and happy to be taxpayers or pursuing careers at post secondary institutions, or entrepreneurs.
- C No family is immune from addiction.
- C HRM has an opportunity to take a leadership role in the establishment of such a facility.

Mr. Ed Brine, a member of the community raised the following points:

- C There are other abutting owners, other than the letters received, who are against the proposal. He asked if there would be another opportunity for those people to provide input or was the decision to be made tonight.
- C On being told that Community Council was the body making the decision and could do so tonight, he asked for deferral of a decision to allow others to have an opportunity to speak.
- C He attended the public meeting and was of the understanding that the people who attended would be notified by mail of the hearing. He indicated that people he spoke to were not notified. This was why he was asking for a deferral.

Pursuant to Mr. Brine's questions, Mr. Morgan provided information on the notification process that had taken place for this application.

Ms. Karen Baker, 24 Greenhead Road raised the following points:

- C Speaking in support of the application, she said that some images about the proposal can be brought about by misinformation and fear.

- C The Marguerite Centre will benefit not only the residents of the facility but their children as well.
- C The community has an obligation and opportunity to provide such a service.

The Chair then called three times for further speakers for or against the application. There were none.

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Meade to close the Public Hearing. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Rankin acknowledged there was some apprehension about this application but it was important to distinguish from other types of applications such as a halfway house. With regard to depreciation of property values, he has not seen any evidence of that. He encouraged, in the short term, creation of a liaison committee and he was available to serve on such a committee. He did not want to see conversion of the facility at some time in the future, however.

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Adams to approve the proposed Development Agreement attached to the Staff Report dated September 25, 2001 with the following amendments:

1. **Section 2.1 first paragraph - the words “and for no other residential care facility” to be inserted after the word “abuse”; and**
2. **Section 3.1(b) to be deleted.**

Further, require that the applicant be given one hundred and twenty (120) days to sign the agreement from the date of approval by Community Council, or the date of any other approvals required to sign the agreement as the case may be, unless any extension thereof is granted by Community Council at the request of the applicant. Otherwise, this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councillor Adams referred to the letter received from Claire and Wilson Reinhardt requesting that Community Council not approve the application. He referred to the Reinhardt's request to be advised of the results of the Public Hearing and their fourth reason outlined in the letter (a further increase in their vulnerability to some not so desirable traffic (visitors), at Exit 4, to a facility of that sort). He stated he was disturbed by their statement which was, in his opinion, an example of ignorance regarding the facility. He requested that the Municipal Clerk provide

written response regarding the outcome of the Public Hearing and, at the same time, ask the Reinhardts what is meant by that statement.

It was agreed to send the letter as requested.

9. **CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS** - None

10. **REPORTS**

10.1 **Case 00395 - Application by Telus Mobility to Locate a Cellular Tower on Lands Owned by HRM (the Western Common) located on the south side of Highway 103 in the vicinity of the Exit 3 Interchange**

Paul Morgan, Planner provided a verbal report on this application to date. During the course of his presentation, he advised that a Public Information Meeting had been held. Any decision regarding a lease of land has to be a decision of Regional Council; however, staff wanted to obtain feedback from Community Council regarding this issue.

Ms. Kiersten Enemark, Telus Mobility provided information on the proposal after input received from the public at the Public Information Meeting. Based on discussions with Planning and Recreation Departments, the proposed location was in the Business Campus zone and not near any residential neighbourhood. There will be a long term revenue opportunity with the lease agreement. As well, there was agreement to build a parking area to be used by the public accessing the park which will accommodate approximately 20 vehicles. There was also agreement to clear a pedestrian walking path from the parking area to the main trail about 4' wide.

Ms. Enemark submitted a Lease Proposal: Telecommunications Site the Western Common, to accompany her verbal presentation. She advised that her company was looking for approval from Community Council for the proposal tonight with the understanding that they would continue to work with Planning, Recreation and Real Estate on details so that they could be forwarded on to Regional Council for approval.

Councillor Meade stated he understood there were only three parcels of land of the Western Common being sold off and the land in question at this time would be additional.

In response, Mr. Morgan advised that when the Staff Report went forward regarding policies and regulations for the area, at that time three requests for parcels of land were identified. The lands designated as a wilderness park would be retained by the Municipality; however, this did not preclude the possibility that somebody else might want land. The idea, however, was that there would have to be more detailed planning done before contemplating any other

development. He pointed out, however, that if Telus cannot locate on the proposed site, they would still be looking for a site in Timberlea which could be a less desirable site.

Councillor Meade asked if the application under consideration would have to go to the Western Region Advisory Committee.

In response, Mr. Morgan advised that the committee in question was disbanded. There is a policy adopted by Regional Council to form a Steering Committee for the wilderness park which was to be headed up by Parks and Recreation but they have had other priorities and have not had an opportunity to form the Steering Committee as yet.

Mr. Ernie Brennan, on behalf of Parks and Recreation advised that Parks and Recreation tended to agree that there were only three sites to be dealt with and there were concerns about the piecemeal effect of development and allowing Telus to develop before there is any master planning. The report prepared by EDM clearly talks about three sites. Parks and Recreation would go forward as directed but had concerns regarding the impact on the site.

Councillor Meade indicated a need for deferral because there was a recreation committee in the area which he felt should be consulted.

Councillor Rankin stated that a Public Information Meeting was held and budget deliberations would be taking place soon. He wanted to see some action in short order on the concepts that were approved some time ago. He also wanted a report advising where the partnership is coming from and how the park will be advanced including safety considerations. He acknowledged that Telus made an application and should receive a response on a timely basis.

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams to defer this matter for a Staff Report to be provided for the next meeting, noting that a decision would ultimately be made by Regional Council. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

11. **MOTIONS** - None

12. **ADDED ITEMS**

12.1 **ATV's on Roads**

Two members of the RCMP were in attendance. Councillor Adams outlined the problems, addressed concerns re this issue to them and advised he had already raised this matter at the Police Commission meeting.

12.2 Resolution re Ketch Harbour Residents Association - Designation of Backlands

Councillor Adams asked for Community Council's support regarding the designation of the backlands related to Herring Cove/Ketch Harbour and the surrounding area as Conservation.

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Meade that Western Region Community Council endorse the request of the Ketch Harbour Area Residents Association to support the designation of the backlands related to Herring Cove/Ketch Harbour and the surrounding area as Conservation and that a letter be sent to Premier Hamm in this regard. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.3 1880 Old Sambro Road, Williamswood

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Meade that a letter be sent to Department of Transportation requesting that they carry out repairs to the ditch system at the above address. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.4 City of Hamilton - Tax Structure for Rural Areas

Councillor Meade indicated that the City of Hamilton recently amalgamated with six other municipalities resulting in a different tax structure for rural areas, with a ceiling on the rural rate. He requested that staff obtain information on how this tax structure was implemented.

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams that a request be sent to the City of Hamilton in this regard. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.5 1746 St. Margarets Bay Road

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams that appropriate staff be requested to take steps to remove obstructions of rocks and trees interfering with the line of sight at the entrance to the Senior Citizens Manor, 1746 St. Margarets Bay Road. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.6 Request for Crosswalk - Timberlea Village Entrance and Clearwater Drive

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams that appropriate staff be requested to carry out a pedestrian count and look into the feasibility of locating a crosswalk at the above location, where there are a number of super mailboxes, and provide a report in this regard. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.7 **School Crosswalk Supervision - James and Charles Street, Glengarry Subdivision**

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Adams that appropriate staff be requested to consider the feasibility in the next budget of a school crossing guard at the above location in order to allow for consideration of a crosswalk. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13. **NOTICES OF MOTION** - None

14. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Councillor Rankin thanked Cst. Bruce Brophy and Cst. Kwabby Oppong for attending the meeting. Cst. Brophy provided the following information:

- People addressed safety issues during the first Public Hearing yet there were only 15% of the homes in that area with civic numbers the RCMP can see at night.
- He understood that HRM is now considering a By-law for civic numbers.
- It is the intention of the RCMP to have a representative at Community Council meetings and the RCMP is very interested in the Minutes of Community Council to know the issues in the community.
- RCMP can only remove people if they are loitering when there is a curfew or a By-law in effect.

Other Items

Councillor Meade referred to the imminent sale of the former Halifax County Municipality building at 2750 Dutch Village Road and expressed concern that another meeting location would have to be found for Community Council. This matter will have to be pursued.

15. **NEXT MEETING DATE** - Monday, November 26, 2001.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from Councillor Adams, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Sandra M. Shute
Assistant Municipal Clerk