

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

CHEBUCTO COMMUNITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

November 1, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Russell Walker, Chair
Councillor Debbie Hum, Vice Chair
Councillor Mary Wile
Councillor Linda Mosher
Councillor Steve Adams

STAFF: Ms. Shawnee Gregory, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 4, 2010.....	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.....	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES	3
4.1	Status Sheet Items.....	3
4.1.1	J.L Ilsley High School – Campus Opportunity.....	3
4.1.2	Keefe Drive – Emergency Concerns Due to Road Construction and Lack of Seawall	3
4.1.3	Plow Damage.....	3
4.1.4	Resident Traffic and Safety Concerns – Fairmount Subdivision	4
4.1.5	Tall Trees Lane	4
4.1.6	Sign By-law Electronic Signs – Spryfield Area	4
4.1.7	Water Quality Testing – Dingle Beach	4
4.1.8	Solid Waste Removal Changes.....	4
5.	MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE	4
6.	MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE	4
7.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE.....	4
8.	HEARINGS.....	4
8.1	Public Hearings - None	4
8.2	Variance Appeal Hearings - None	4
9.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS	5
9.1	Correspondence - None.....	5
9.2	Petitions - None	5
9.3	Presentations - None	5
10.	REPORTS	5
10.1	Staff	5
10.1.1	Lacewood Terminal Site Selection	5
11.	MOTIONS – NONE	8
12.	ADDED ITEMS	8
12.1	Appointments and Nominations of Councillors to HRM Standing Committees.....	8
12.2	Request for Report – By-law A-300 – Councillor Wile	8
13.	NOTICES OF MOTION - NONE.....	9
14.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	9
15.	NEXT MEETING DATE – December 6, 2010.....	12
16.	ADJOURNMENT	12

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Keshen Goodman Library.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 4, 2010

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Mosher that the minutes of October 4, 2010 be approved as presented. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Additions:

- 4.1.6 Community Sign – Herring Cove Road (Case 01236) – Information Report
- 4.1.7 Water Quality Monitoring at Harbour Beaches – Information Report
- 12.1 Appointments and Nominations of Councillors to HRM Standing Committees
- 12.2 Request for Report – By-law A-300 – Councillor Wile

Deferral:

- 4.1.5 Tall Trees Lane – Presentation (December 6, 2010)

MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Hum that the agenda be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

4.1 Status Sheet Items

4.1.1 J.L Ilsley High School – Campus Opportunity

Councillor Mosher stated that she had been speaking with Real Estate staff; noting that they had identified two potential parcels of land and were currently speaking with the owners.

This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

4.1.2 Keefe Drive – Emergency Concerns Due to Road Construction and Lack of Seawall

There was no update. This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

4.1.3 Plow Damage

Councillor Adams stated that there was no update on this issue which he wished to have resolved prior to the winter season. He requested that the Legislative Assistant follow up with Transportation and Public Works staff.

This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

4.1.4 Resident Traffic and Safety Concerns – Fairmount Subdivision

Councillor Mosher provided an update and advised that a report was forthcoming.

This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

4.1.5 Tall Trees Lane

This item was deferred to the December 6, 2010 meeting.

4.1.6 Sign By-law Electronic Signs – Spryfield Area

An information report dated October 22, 2010 was submitted.

Councillor Adams thanked staff for submitting the report in such a timely manner.

This item is to be removed from the Status Sheet.

4.1.7 Water Quality Testing – Dingle Beach

An information report dated October 6, 2010 was submitted.

Councillor Mosher requested that the submitted information report be deferred to the December 6, 2010 meeting and that staff follow up with Halifax Water regarding the potential for testing at their facilities.

This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

4.1.8 Solid Waste Removal Changes

There was no update. This item is to remain on the Status Sheet.

5. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE

6. MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE

7. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

8. HEARINGS

8.1 Public Hearings - None

8.2 Variance Appeal Hearings - None

9. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

9.1 Correspondence - None

9.2 Petitions - None

9.3 Presentations - None

10. REPORTS

10.1 Staff

10.1.1 Lacewood Terminal Site Selection

A revised report dated October 13, 2010 was before Community Council.

Correspondence was submitted from the following residents: Leigh Hawkes, Jean White, Robert MacDonald, Wendy MacDonald, Patti Vaison, Sandra MacLennan, James MacLennan, Erin Flannery, A.H. Blair, Linda McInnis, Pat Kidd, Margaret Swift, Joan MacIntyre, Anastasia Daniels, Jen Powley, Robert Candy, Lauren Devine, Rose Preston, Bill Campbell, Geoff Milton, Gail Matthews, Monica Neaves, Ray Smith and Lisa MacIntyre-Smith, Peggy Carmichael, Janice Frost, Elaine Black, Larry and Caroline Ranger, Ed Handler, Huntley Blair, Judith Newman, Tony Christopher, Real O'Neil, Shelley Aker, Christina Hindle and Swapan Dasgupta.

Mr. David Reage, Coordinator of Project Planning, Metro Transit, provided the presentation on the Lacewood Terminal Site Selection. Highlights were as follows:

- The current Lacewood Terminal was meant to be a temporary facility and has now been in use for more than 20 years
- There are capacity issues at the current terminal, it is deficient in customer amenities and not up to the standard that Metro Transit has been providing in other areas
- The current terminal makes use of private property and having buses drive through a parking lot is not efficient
- Four potential terminal site options were brought forward: Lacewood Drive, Willet Street, Dunbrack Street (Northcliffe), and Thomas Raddall Drive
- The Thomas Raddall Drive site was immediately omitted as it was too far away from the existing service
- The new terminal site will be a catalyst for the future Clayton Park Metro Link
- Staff are recommending the Willet Street site
- It is located in a high density housing area which is beneficial
- The site also provides for active transportation opportunities
- The initial cost of the site will be higher than the other two options, however, it is the best investment

- For example, if the Dunbrack Street site had been chosen, HRM would have had to incur the demolition costs of the Northcliffe Centre
- The key element for a transit provider is customer convenience
- There is higher ridership on the Willet Street corridor than on Dunbrack Street
- The Metro Transit fleet is becoming greener and quieter which may help to allay noise and pollution concerns
- If the site is approved, Metro Transit staff will conduct further public consultation
- Regarding the preliminary site concept plan, Real Property Planning staff decided to angle the site so that adjacent building residents would not directly face the terminal
- The closest building is 20 metres from the proposed site
- There will be a grade in the slope of the site for accessibility and to create a vertical buffer between the site and adjacent homes

A discussion ensued with Mr. Reage responding to questions.

Councillor Hum asked, for the record, why the current facility was not capable of being expanded and why staff had not discussed with the property owners of the Clayton Park Shopping Centre, Sobeys or Canadian Tire regarding the possibility of expanding the terminal on the current site.

Mr. Reage advised that staff did not speak with the property owners as the site was not an option; it was not large enough and an expansion would take up significant parking space. He stated that a split terminal between the Clayton Park Shopping Centre and Sobeys/Canadian Tire parking lot would not work operationally nor would it be cost efficient.

Mr. Reage indicated that staff were working on the cost of the actual terminal site, after site preparation, and would bring that number forward as part of the 2011/12 Capital Budget.

Mr. Peter Bigelow, Manager of Real Property Planning, provided clarification on the passive recreation site located in the area where the proposed Willett Street Transit Terminal would be built. He stated that the lot, named Lot N8, had been given to Halifax in 1977 and had no purpose other than being a buffer. He advised that the Lot is used as a pathway to access back lands which have become the Mainland Common; noting that the Lot was appended to the Mainland Common under the Mainland Common Master Plan. Mr. Bigelow stated that staff had been looking for a site within the Mainland Common for a new terminal and this was the place.

MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Adams that Chebucto Community Council:

1. **Approve in principle that PID#40090169 (referred to as the “Willet Site”) be designated as the future location for the new Lacewood Transit Terminal as per the recommendation in the report dated October 13, 2010;**
2. **Forward a recommendation to Regional Council endorsing this approval in principle.**
3. **That this endorsement be subject to receiving appropriate environmental approvals on the site; and**
4. **That this endorsement be subject to the future approval of Land-Use-By-Law amendments as required to construct a transit terminal on the Willet site.**

A discussion on the motion ensued.

The Chair clarified that the final part of the Land Use By-law for the site would be coming forward to Chebucto Community Council in January or February of 2011 and would require a Public Hearing.

Councillor Mosher stated that there were environmental benefits to transit; however, she knew there would have been opposition no matter what site had been chosen. Councillor Mosher indicated that it was up to Community Council to make an informed decision; noting that benefits of this site included the walk up population, that it would be located in a high density area and that there would be minimal impact on traffic and current routes. She stated that the consultants report made the site sound great; however, she requested additional information regarding blasting and environmental and vegetation management.

Mr. Reage advised that details regarding vegetation management would come out during the detailed design phase. He stated that staff recognized that there were many existing trees on the site and their goal was to remove as few trees as possible.

Councillor Mosher requested a friendly amendment that the HRM Arborist create a Vegetation Management Plan for the site. Community Council agreed.

The motion now reads:

MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Adams that Chebucto Community Council:

1. **Approve in principle that PID#40090169 (referred to as the “Willet Site”) be designated as the future location for the new Lacewood Transit Terminal as per the recommendation in the report dated October 13, 2010;**

2. **Forward a recommendation to Regional Council endorsing this approval in principle.**
3. **That this endorsement be subject to receiving appropriate environmental approvals on the site; and**
4. **That this endorsement be subject to the future approval of Land-Use-By-Law amendments as required to construct a transit terminal on the Willet site.**
5. **Request that the HRM Arborist create a Vegetation Management Plan for the site.**

Discussion on the motion continued.

Regarding blasting, Mr. Bigelow stated that there was a blasting By-law meant to protect surrounding properties. He advised that staff were attempting to maintain a good amount of the tree area and that while sinking the transit site down does require a buffer, it also allows the existing level and water table to remain unaffected. Mr. Bigelow indicated that heavy blasting does cause damage to tree root hairs, therefore, more frequent yet lighter blasting would occur in order to be less intrusive.

Mr. Reage indicated that staff would be conducting a noise and vibration study as part of the process.

Councillor Hum requested that all correspondence regarding this matter be forwarded to the Municipal Clerk's Office for the record and pending report to Regional Council.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

11. MOTIONS – NONE

12. ADDED ITEMS

12.1 Appointments and Nominations of Councillors to HRM Standing Committees

This item was deferred.

12.2 Request for Report – By-law A-300 – Councillor Wile

Councillor Wile requested a staff report regarding By-law A-300 as it pertains to barking dogs. She advised that she had already been speaking to Animal Control staff regarding this issue.

MOVED BY Councillor Wile, seconded by Councillor Adams that Chebucto Community Council request a report regarding the potential of amending By-law A-300 to allow By-law Officers more discretion with regards to continuous dog barking. By-law A-300 currently states that 20 minutes of continuous dog barking must occur in order for animal control to intervene. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13. NOTICES OF MOTION - NONE

14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Richard McFarlane, Halifax, stated that he was in favour of the old Halifax West site for the new transit terminal as it was close to other sites and no rezoning would be required.

The Chair advised that the old Halifax West land had been rezoned and was now a park.

Mr. McFarlane stated that the Halifax West site was a transit oriented destination; noting that some routes could remain at the Lacewood Terminal with a shuttle running to the new terminal or the Canada Games Centre. He stated that HRM already owned the site which should be used in lieu of destroying a park. Mr. MacFarlane advised that the whole terminal, including the proposed Park and Ride and Metro Link, could fit on the Halifax West site and that it would provide reasonable access to other areas of Halifax. In closing, he noted that this seemed to be a lot of money to pay for a bathroom.

The Chair stated that the Halifax West property had been sold and a Development Agreement for the property was forthcoming, therefore, this was not a possible option.

Mr. Bob MacDonald, Warwick Lane, thanked the Councillors who had voted against the relocation of the Lacewood Terminal. He stated that the Willett Street site was currently parkland and would have to be rezoned. He wondered if HRM parkland staff had been consulted.

The Chair advised that, yes, Mr. Bigelow has been involved in the process.

Mr. MacDonald indicated that he had made an online submission regarding this issue on February 27, 2010 as everyone who had participated in the January public meeting had been encouraged to do; noting that the submission was acknowledged, however, had not been incorporated into the report. He stated that he had heard the submission was forwarded to staff on October 3, 2010 and wondered why there had been a delay and why he had not heard back from Metro Transit staff. Mr. MacDonald advised that the site should cost zero dollars; noting that the Northcliffe site must be demolished whether or not a terminal was built there. Regarding higher levels of service on Willett as opposed to Dunbrack Street, Mr. MacDonald stated that Willett Street was where the current routes went so of course there was more ridership and wondered if a proper ridership survey had been conducted. In closing, he indicated that people get on at a bus stop and not necessarily at a terminal.

Ms. Kelly Greenwood, Berkshire Close, requested an update on the Berkshire Close Walkway as no action had been taken since it had been closed five years ago. She stated that she was the Chair of the Active and Safe Routes to School Committee and would like to create safe winter routes to school via the walkway to Park West School. She indicated that this pathway, which provides access to 25% of the school population, required improvement. Ms. Greenwood expressed concern that the rose bushes in the median on Dunbrack Street required improvement as well. Regarding the proposed transit terminal, she stated that she was shocked that the Thomas Raddall site had been overlooked and not presented to the consultants. She advised that she had attended both public meetings regarding the terminal and was disappointed that the feedback from those meetings had not been given greater weight. In closing, Ms. Greenwood requested that District 10 have regular and ongoing public meetings at least twice per year.

The Chair advised Ms. Greenwood that staff would follow up on her requests.

Ms. Anastasia Daniels, Sheridan Place, indicated that her large back window was 200 feet from the blasting site. She stated that she would have safety concerns if blasting were to occur in the area since pets and children use the parkland; noting that she also used it as a route to work. Ms. Daniels expressed concern that crime rates would rise if the terminal was placed behind a residential zone; noting that she thought most people would rather walk an extra block than to have all the negative things associated with this site such as noise pollution, loss of parkland and crime. She asked what residents could do to further oppose this process.

Councillor Mosher advised residents that they could forward their opposition via correspondence to the Municipal Clerk's Office to be included in the official record and Regional Council package.

Mr. Huntley Blair, Hanover Court, stated that a bus stop was all that was required in the high density area of Willett Street. He indicated that he did not see what was preventing the new terminal from being built in a commercial area with modifications to routes, if necessary.

Mr. Jim MacLennan, Westridge Drive, stated that he had previously worked in the construction industry and that, upon studying the survey and report, he was convinced that the Lacewood site was the best location for the new terminal. He advised that the location had been dismissed as a result of a sewage pipe and noted that HRM was trading a park for a pipe.

Mr. Hiram Tiller, Regency Park Drive, stated that he had also attended the transit terminal meeting in January 2010 and that he thought the best site was on Lacewood Drive as well. He indicated that a signal could be placed on Radcliffe Drive and that the Lacewood site would be cheaper. He advised that Thomas Raddall Drive connects Lacewood Drive with Regency Park Drive and expressed concern that there was only

half a sidewalk there going towards Regency Park Drive; noting that residents could often not walk on the side of the road due to traffic in the active area. He indicated that a continuous sidewalk from Lacewood Drive should be installed. Mr. Tiller also stated that the single lane bridge in that area was causing accidents. In closing, he stated that the roses on Dunbrack Street had been replaced with trees which were supposed to be easier to look after; however, the trees had been on a 45 degree angle since the recent storm.

Councillor Wile stated that Thomas Raddall Drive was a park road and it would be the responsibility of Halifax West High School to have it turned into a street. She advised that a double bridge was to be installed and the area filled in underneath; noting that stakeholders and staff had been working on this matter for some time.

Ms. Anna MacLennan, Westridge Drive, expressed concern that this was the third meeting regarding the new terminal and residents were never presented with options. She stated that it was incredible that a transit terminal would be put in a residential area and wondered what the noise level would be like for those living close by as the terminal would only be 60 feet from some homes. In closing, Ms. MacLennan indicated that she hoped Community Council would take this into consideration.

Mr. Bruce Smith, Forsyth Crescent, stated that he had attended the October 7, 2010 meeting regarding the proposed transit terminal and it was his impression that Metro Transit staff had come to that meeting with their minds made up regarding the new terminal location. He stated that staff had spent a lot of money putting a plan together before giving residents a chance to consider other sites. Mr. Smith expressed concern that it would cost \$3,000,000 to dig out the park, build a fence, install lights and run the buses; noting that while he did not live near the site, he could only imagine the amount of noise and dangerous situations the pit would cause. He advised that the parkland was a nice break between communities and that greenspace was valuable; noting that it was not right to take it away as it was given to residents by developers. He stated that there was plenty of greenspace west of the proposed site which could be used and that he was morally opposed to trading public space for other uses. Mr. Smith expressed concern that the property values of the homes around the site would be affected if the terminal was put in as nobody wants to live beside a transit terminal. He advised that it was short sighted to build a terminal and then a Park and Ride lot half a kilometre down the road; noting that they should be amalgamated into one. In closing, Mr. Smith stated that he preferred the Thomas Raddall site as both the terminal and Park and Ride lot could be contained there, it was near the Canada Games centre and it would be a good long term investment.

Mr. Brad Davies, Lancaster Drive, advised that he owned two buildings adjacent to the terminal site. He stated that there are drainage issues in the area and that he had water issues on his land as well. He wondered who would deal with the water issue once the trees were gone; noting that HRM had advised him that the water comes from the Mainland Common and he stated that it should not be his problem. Mr. Davies

expressed concern that there would be noise and light pollution from the terminal and wondered what the affect would be on his tenants on a warm summer night.

Councillor Wile advised that the Department of Environment was already aware of the drainage issues in this area.

Ms. Lauren Devine, Sheridan Place, agreed that there were water issues in the area of the proposed terminal; noting that she had the same concerns as everyone else. She stated that the Willett site would cost \$180,000 to run per year and noted that surely a cheaper location over the life of the terminal would be better even if it was more expensive initially. She wondered if it was worth it from a financial perspective to pay more up front and save over the years. In closing, Ms. Devine stated that she will move if the terminal is built in her backyard.

Mr. Leigh Hawkes, Westridge Drive, stated that he had lived on Westridge Drive for 25 years and his parkland view would now be of a transit terminal. He indicated that putting the terminal on the Willett Street location would have the most negative effect on the largest number of people. He advised that he did not believe that proposed expansion opportunities existed for the site as bus routes change constantly with new development. Mr. Hawkes expressed concern that the January 2010 public meeting on this matter was not well advertised; however, in October the meeting was advertised well via door to door pamphlets. He stated that he had an issue with the timing of meeting notices. He expressed concern that property values in the area would be affected and that the best tenants would be lost in the adjacent apartments. In closing, Mr. Hawkes stated that he would also move if that transit terminal was put on the Willett Street site as the area would be destroyed.

15. NEXT MEETING DATE – December 6, 2010

16. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Shawnee Gregory
Legislative Assistant