

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

**MARINE DRIVE, VALLEY AND CANAL
COMMUNITY COUNCIL
March 10, 2010**

PRESENT: Councillor David Hendsbee, Chair
 Councillor Steve Streach
 Councillor Barry Dalrymple

STAFF: Mr. Randy Kinghorne, Municipal Solicitor
 Ms. Barbara Coleman, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.	04
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES -	04
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.	04
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES	
4.1	Status Sheet Review.	04
5.	MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION.	04
6.	MOTIONS OF RESCISSION.	04
7.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS.	04
8.	HEARINGS	
8.1	PUBLIC HEARINGS	
8.1.1	Case 01276 - Pet Care Facilities and Kennels, Lawrencetown. .	04
9.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS	
9.1	Correspondence - None.	07
9.2	Petitions	07
9.3	Presentations	
9.3.1	District Boundary Review.	03
10.	REPORTS	
10.1	Case 01337: Rezoning 2875, Highway #7, Lake Echo.	07
11.	MOTIONS.	07
12.	ADDED ITEMS.	08
13.	NOTICES OF MOTION	08
14.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.	08
15.	NEXT MEETING.	08
16.	ADJOURNMENT.	09

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. at Lawrencetown Community Centre, 3657 Hwy 207, Lawrencetown, NS.

9.3 District Boundary Review

Councillor Hendsbee welcomed the members of the public to the Marine Valley Community Council explaining that the first part of the agenda would be the District Boundary Review. He introduced the members of the Committee.

After introductions of the District Boundary Committee, Mayor Kelly assumed the Chair.

- A handout entitled *HRM's Governance and District Boundary Review Process* was circulated to the residents.

Mayor Peter Kelly, Chair, Governance and Boundary Review Committee, welcomed those in attendance and provided a brief background in regard to the Governance and Boundary Review initiative.

The following members of the Governance and Boundary Review Committee were also in attendance: Councillors Linda Mosher, Jerry Blumenthal, Gloria McCluskey, Reg Rankin and Barry Dalrymple (MDVCCC). Regrets had been received from Councillors Tim Outhit, Mr. Wayne Anstey, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Operations and Ms. Linda Grant, Administrative Clerk Assistant. Members of staff supporting the Committee and also in attendance were: Ms. Cathy Mellett, Acting Municipal Clerk, Mr. Paul Morgan, Planner and Ms. Sara Knight, Solicitor, Legal Services.

Ms. Cathy Mellett, Acting Municipal Clerk, commenced the PowerPoint presentation outlining the following questions for consideration by residents of HRM as part of Phase 1 of the review process:

- the size of electoral districts
- the role of Councillor
- the powers and size of Community Council and Regional Council
- how Council can best work to serve the citizens of HRM

Phase 2 of the review, to commence in the Fall of 2010, will consist of the boundary review and adjustments with additional public input sought in the Fall of 2010. HRM will submit its decision on the boundaries to the Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board by December 2010.

Mayor Kelly then called for members of the public to come forward with comments / questions.

Mr. Alan Robertson, Tower Road, stated that he does not live in this district, but he had just found out about the exercise a few days ago. This would be the last occasion that he would have in Phase 1 to advise the Committee. He indicated that he hoped that he would be received in that light. He is a retired management consultant. He stated that he usually approached a problem analytically. He would look at the numbers and he try to figure out what makes sense and what doesn't. He looked at the numbers with respect to HRM . He prepared a three-page analysis which he would submit for the Committee. Essentially, nobody can determine the ideal number of districts for any municipality because they are all different. They all have special needs and one could make an argument one way or another to the size of the districts. He advised that he looked at the rest of Canada. He reviewed 32 cities across the country, ranging in size from basically two and a half million, which is Toronto, down to about 68,000, which is Saint John, NB. He stated that he counted the number of Councillors in each district, excluded the mayors. Most cities elect their mayors at large as is done here. He noted that the numbers he is using are 2006 figures since that is the last time the census with respect to population was carried out. Calgary has almost a million people, they have fourteen districts, whereas, HRM has less than 400,000 and maybe about 400,000 now with 23 districts. Probably the most under represented municipality would be Mississauga, they only have nine districts but they have a population of 700,000, not quite double ours but they are certainly much more under representative than HRM is. On the other hand, there are a number of smaller municipalities where the number of residents per district is quite a bit lower. For instance, Saint John has a population of 68,000 and they have 10 districts. He stated that using a graph, HRM is severely over represented in terms of the districts if one compares it to the rest of the country. There are situations where a large city may only have nine or ten representatives but they are more heavily supported by executive assistants and staff. This may be a model that the Committee might want to look at rather than having a greater number of districts and expect each Councillor to field every phone call, every meeting, every day before they go to bed. He indicated that he knows it is a hard job. He knows that they have some really good Councillors that work hard to do it but there are other models. Maybe, one should take Toronto or Montreal, because they are the largest, out of the scenario. Then where would Halifax fit? How many electoral districts should Halifax have if it were fitted for the average for Canada. He indicated that the number he came up with was 14, not 23, but 14. Maybe one should take all the cities that are greater than half a million because HRM is getting close to half a million so let us forget the big cities and see how the smaller cities look after themselves. There the analysis suggests 12 to 13 districts instead of the 23 HRM has. He requested that the Committee seriously consider why HRM is so different to the rest of Canada and in the example that was the given the low number of districts was 15. He suggested seriously that the Committee look at maybe 12 to 14 and see if that would work.

A submission entitled *Too Many Districts* by Mr. Robertson was entered into the record.

Mr. Gary, Colby Village Estates, Cole Harbour stated that the question of boundaries is not really related to numbers of districts and population because that is an exercise in mathematics, average of numbers and that sort of thing but more of regional representation. In the briefing, it was mentioned the diversity of all HRM, all the way from Hubbards out to Ecum Secum and as far as Enfield and with two cities in between, Halifax and Dartmouth. When he first moved here, he indicated that he was in the County . He felt well represented by the people that understood rural politics and issues. Since amalgamation, more than half of the representation of the 23 districts are in Halifax and Dartmouth. Halifax and Dartmouth is what one would call the city folk out here in the country. He questioned how well the county is represented when decisions are made by city folk. He stated that he is not being facetious, there are differences between city and country and probably indeed between Eastern Shore and Southern Shore issues. He inquired when something goes to Council how informed are Council members when they make a decision regarding any district particularly when most of the representation is from the city. The other aspect is governance, the presentation gave the numbers ranging 15 to 26 districts with 15,000 to 18,000 people in each district. What would happen in a district if one had a Councillor did not represent one's feelings or issues, how, from a governance point of view, how does one get represented if the Councillor of the district refuses to listen to you. With 18,000 people it is not likely that one person can adequately or equally represent all 18,000 people so what do you if you do not have a representation. At least in provincial or Federal politics if one doesn't like what his MP or MLA is doing, one can go across to the opposition and say can you help me out here. HRM or any other municipal politics do not have that capability.

Mr. David Barrett, Beaverbank, NS indicated that he was there because of scheduling conflicts, one just can not be everywhere. He stated that there is about 3000 people in Beaver Bank. It was not even mentioned on the Committee's presentation. Beaver Bank has new houses going up every day. He noted that he has been involved with community groups and planning all his life. He is 71 years old. What happens here does not really have much effect on his life. He stated that he always had tremendous respect for people that would serve but he is losing that respect. When one talks about the rural areas, there is a different people, different views, different everything and there is conflict. He indicated that he has lost a lot of respect with Council and it was just happen the other day over the RCMP decision. In 1997, Beaver Bank had a meeting on retaining the RCMP with over 200 people attending the meeting. Everyone stood up including Mayor Fitzgerald, who was the mayor at the time, and supported the Mounties for Beaver Bank. If Council is going to do things in secret and not have people involved then HRM might has well have a Councillor of one and consultants. There is a saying that Lies, Liars and Statistics because you can make statistics say anything. Well if HRM hire consultants, HRM can get anything. He suggested that the report that was

brought forth was slanted. He stated that Council has to get their act together. He stated that he has seen Councillor Streach raked over the coals by the newspaper because he could not get to all the city meetings. Has the Committee ever thought of the hundreds and maybe the thousands of miles Councillor Streach has to put on every week just to go around to community meetings in that area. He has seen the map, one can not expect Councillor Streach to make every meeting. Something needs to be done that the Councillors that HRM has in the rural areas have the time and the effort to do their job. Personally, he stated that the Councillors do not have time to answer all their phone calls. He stated that a Councillor is responsible to the people. They are basically on call 24 hours a day. Yet it seems that the trend is hire civil servants that only work eight hours a day. During the summer months, decisions can not be made because the civil servants are all away on five weeks vacation. Nothing is done. Councillors should have the power to carry out their duties not the civil servants making the decisions. He noted that he would submit the minutes of the RCMP meeting in Beaver Bank meeting and the Beaver Bank Community Council. He advised that one does not hear much about Beaver Bank in the news because basically Beaver Bank just gets things done. But he noted that if Council does not listen to us, you will hear from us.

Two documents were submitted by Mr. David Barrett, Beaverbank, NS for the record:

- a Beaver Bank Community Awareness Association Minutes Summary dated February 12, 1997, and
- a letter from Mr. David Barrett, Beaver Bank Community Awareness Association regarding a motion passed by the Association on February 12, 1997 supporting the retention of the RCMP in Beaver Bank.

Councillor McCluskey, as a member of the Police Commission, advised that a motion was passed in Council to look at the policing matter and its financial implications. It was held in camera because it dealt with contracts and safety issues. No negative comments regarding the RCMP came out of that exercise. She advised that HRM is fortunate to have two very good police forces, the HRP and the RCMP. The motion came forward simply because of financial implications. The current formula for 70/30, meaning the Federal government pays 30% with HRM paying the rest. In 2012 there is some danger that it could go 90/10 which would cost tax payers another \$23,000,000.

Mayor Kelly advised that the decision of Council has been made and both forces will be retained.

Ms. Lynn McLellan, 19 Keltic Drive, Upper Lawrencetown, requested that she be able to ask two Councillors one question each.

Mayor Kelly advised that it would be allowed , if it was pertaining to this issue.

Ms. McLellan asked Councillor Hendsbee the area mass in miles or kilometres that he covered.

Councillor Hendsbee responded that the District 3 area starts at the base of Cole Harbour Hill.

Ms. McLellan indicated that she understand where it is, but she didn't understand the area. How much is the mileage? Or do you know?

Councillor Hendsbee responded that he did not know but agreed with Ms. McLellan that it is large.

Councillor McCluskey responded that she did not know her square mileage, she travels it all the time, but acknowledged that she would not want to campaign in a rural area.

Ms. McLellan indicated that she understood. She noted that the point that she is trying to make is, what Councillor Hendsbee probably does in one day would be about the equivalent to what Councillor McCluskey could accomplish with the amount of people that she would see in an hour. She asked if that would be correct?

Councillor McCluskey advised that it might not be that great but it certainly take Councillor Hendsbee longer to see a number of people than it would take her.

Ms. McLellan noted that this was all she needed to know for her benefit.

Councillor Hendsbee clarified that District 3 has 19,000 residents or voters on the list, the largest of all the districts. It takes 45 minutes to drive from Lower East Chezzetcook to the tip of North Preston.

Ms. Linda Barker, 45 Cole Ridge Court advised that she is part of District 3 but as soon as their children reach the age of 5, they attend District 4 so our community is really District 4. The children start at the Colonel John Stewart's Elementary School, they go to Sir Robert Borden, and then go on to Cole Harbour High. Our essence, our community involvement is all in District 4 so she questioned why is it District 3, why is the boundary like it is?

Mayor Kelly called for speakers twice.

Mr. Ivor Axeford, Brookside Av, Ross Road advised that his area has been part of Dartmouth, Rural Route #1, Westphal, Lawrencetown and even Cole Harbour so the division of the districts make no difference to him anymore. The only question that Mr. Axeford had was the budget arrangement, be it fourteen Councillors or be it 23

Councillors, whatever HRM has, is the budget split equally between each one or is it prorated for the density areas and the rural areas.

Mayor Kelly advised that it is done in an *as need basis*. Staff come to Council with what they believe are the most important issues before Council, unless Council gave them further instructions to bring back other priorities. There is no prorated or no division of the capital assets according to districts.

Mr. Axeford continued that it is inevitable that the high density areas, Halifax central, Dartmouth central, East Dartmouth will receive more than the rural areas as far as expansion, sports, support and other things.

Mayor Kelly noted that in theory, that may be the case but when it comes to practical application, that is not necessarily the case. It depends upon the year and/or the situation. The budget moves where it needs to move to.

Mr. Herman Pye, Upper Lawrencetown, questioned if they changed the Council, could they make it so that there is a Councillor responsible inside and outside the core for each district. He noted that when votes come up in Council, it would make it fairer. The Councillors will be more knowledgeable as to what is going on inside and outside the Council. When HRM has four Councillors outside and nineteen of them sitting inside, it is very hard to go the way of the rural areas because the Councillors already made up that they want to spend their money inside the core. He thinks that the rural area is losing out because of it. It would be a good idea if there were a way to have a buddy system so that a Councillor outside the core and a Councillor inside the core are responsible for the districts. Both Councillors would be responsible for the districts they represent and when election time rolls around one would vote for both Councillors. It would make it fairer in the municipality because it is so big. It seems the Councillors inside the core want to keep everything on the peninsula including our money. He stated that he has lived in Lawrencetown every since amalgamation and he can not see one thing that Lawrencetown has ever received since then except for higher taxes. Outside the core needs to be looked at and given a break because right now, Mr. Pye noted that they are not getting it. Regarding Community Councils, he would like to see it mandatory that Community Councils have to be held in each district every 30 days whether the Councillor wants to hold them or not. He noted that the Councillors would be more accountable to the people in those districts. Right now if they do not want to hold a Community Council for a year and a half, residents can not express their concerns. They do not know that maybe their neighbour is concerned about the same issue. He indicated that if there is a meeting called and no one shows up in 15 minutes, they can go home. Right now, some Councillors show up at a meeting and some don't.

Mayor Kelly clarified that Community Councils generally meet every month but because these three districts share a Community Council, they have the largest geographical area to cover. Even though they meet every month, it may be in any one of the Districts.

Ms. Cindy Murtha questioned when a proposal is presented to Council by a specific Councillor for his area, what is the decision criteria that the other Councillors use in making a decision?

Mayor Kelly advised that depending what the proposal is, it may be a public hearing or a budgetary discussion. Mayor Kelly requested that Ms. Murtha be a bit more specific.

Ms. Murtha indicated that one of the items on the agenda currently is Case 01290 which is a proposal for a new subdivision within the Cole Harbour area. This proposal requires a redesignation in the zoning. When that proposal comes forward for discussion at a Council meeting, what were/are some of the considerations of the other Councillor members think about, when they were/are casting the vote for or against.

Mayor Kelly advised that the main Council would only be involved if it were a Municipal Planning Strategy amendment, if not, it would go back to Community Council. Council can not indicate favour one way or another until it goes through public process which includes a public hearing. He further noted that there has been some public discussion that more power should be given to Community Councils; to have more of those local issues dealt by Community Council rather than the whole of Council. There is a feeling that, it is a good approach to take. He indicated that Council still not indicate pro or con until they hear all points of views from the public. They can not pre-empt or predispose their outcome or their decision until Council holds its public consultation.

Mr. Jim Willis, 186 Dorothea Drive, indicated that there was an article in the paper about Councillor's salary, discretionary funds, capital funds, and district funds. It totals up to \$69,000 per Councillor. At the end of the year, if the Councillor has not spent all his discretionary funds, does the funds go back into the main pot.

Mayor Kelly advised that each Councillor has capital funds to aid his district. He explained that If the school in a particular district wanted to fix up the basket ball courts, the Councillor of that district could allocate funds from their discretionary funds to complete those smaller projects. The larger projects usually come before Council. If at the end of the year, the funds are not spent, they would carry over to the following year. Councillors can hold funds from one year to the next to do larger projects. There funds are always used for the boundaries of that district. However it can happen that two or three Community Councils can cost share to complete projects within their districts.

Mr. Donald Crowe indicated that he has been a resident in the Maritimes for nine years. He is originally from Vancouver. He was born and raised in Vancouver but came to Nova Scotia on a visit and thought wow, what a great place to kick back. They call him the reverse migrator. He noted that he had a couple of concerns. As he stated, he is from Vancouver which is a state of the art city. He questioned whether there were any plans to upgrade the Metro Transit system in the Eastern Shore because there is one bus - he noted that he did not take the bus. He stated that he is thinking about all the kids and the youth and the social development that could be planned for kids plus all the parents that drive their children. He noted he grew up in a wonderful city and had such wonderful experiences that could be applied to this city to make it that much better. Again he noted, there is one community bus that does the area. Mr. Crowe expressed that he feels that it is imperative that the transit system be upgraded in this area.

Mayor Kelly advised that Council has been discussing for the last several years, \$155,000,000 transit investment fund to upgrade the overall transit. HRM has started down that road to do exactly that. Because of the cost implications of operations, for instance this year, HRM needs to come up with another \$10,000,000 to increase the operational portion of the budget. He noted that when HRM invests the capital then one must also deal with it operationally at the other end. This year HRM has a \$30,000,000 challenge in its budget. Council may need to alter their transit budget or move it up or down and that is a debate to occur. Having said that, Council fully recognizes there is a need for enhanced transit. HRM has a \$155,000,000 transit enhancement program. How it unfolds is yet to be determined. Transit will come back to Council for the Capital and Operational budget discussions.

Councillor Hendsbee advised that the municipal staff at Metro Transit do have Lawrencetown on their planning radar with regards to transportation needs assessment for the Highway 207 Corridor so that will be coming in the next little while.

Mayor Kelly called three times for speakers to speak to the issue of District Boundaries.

There were no other speakers on this matter.

Councillor Hendsbee resumed the Chair.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 24, 2010

Councillor Hendsbee advised the minutes were not available and would be circulated for approval at the next meeting.

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

MOVED by Councillor Streach, seconded by Councillor Dalrymple, that the Order of Business be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

4.1 Status Sheet Review

No items were brought forward at this time.

5. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION - NONE

6. MOTIONS OF RESCISSION - NONE

7. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS - NONE

8. HEARINGS

8.1 PUBLIC HEARINGS

8.1.1 Case 01276 - Pet Care Facilities and Kennels, Lawrencetown

- A report dated January 13, 2010, on the above noted, was before Community Council.

Mr. Kurt Pyle, Planner, presented the report to Community Council.

Councillor Hendsbee called for those wishing to speak either in favour of or opposition to the application.

Ms. Lynn McLellan, 19 Keltic Drive, noted there were two public meetings and did not feel the minutes from those meetings were complete. She stated that no one at the public meetings were opposed to the fact that she was keeping dogs. She noted it was stated that 12 dogs or more was illegal. Under these rules she is an illegal kennel if she had 15 dogs in her home with 8 of them altered. She advised that her dogs are a hobby and she does not advertise nor put her dogs out to stud.

In response to Ms. McLellan as to whether she would be considered an illegal kennel, Mr. Randy Kinghorn, Solicitor, clarified the definition of a kennel and noted that there would be a distinction between commercial boarding, breeding or showing. As long as Ms. McLellan was not commercially involved she would be outside the definition of a kennel.

Ms. Janis Kivimaki, asked what is defined as a commercial business. In response, Mr. Kinghorn, Solicitor, advised it would involve financial transactions, for business purpose as opposed to non business purpose. If breeding with the intention of selling it would be commercial. He noted if you sell one dog it is questionable whether this is a commercial operation, however, if you sell three you might be considered a commercial operation.

Mr. Pyle advised in terms of licensing, under the former County of Halifax Dog By-law residents had to meet the provisions of all other municipal by-laws. In the past there were licenses issued incorrectly with only permission under the Dog By-law and not the Land Use By-law.

Ms. Kivimaki, noted there was mention of a Committee being formed and to her knowledge no Committee has been formed. She said it was also her opinion that there were several omissions in the public meeting minutes.

Ms. Marilyn Boylan asked if you are considered a kennel if you show dogs. She indicated she was a hobbyist and show her dogs for enjoyment. She asked for clarification as to why she would be considered a kennel because she has more than one dog.

Mr. Pyle further clarified the definition of a kennel and advised it would not apply to her circumstance, noting she would have to be commercially showing for this to apply.

Ms. Patricia Andrews, noted that her female dogs are altered and stated she trials one of her females. She went on to indicate that it concerns her that 'showing of dogs' is included in the regulations and is concerned that she is being penalized because of this. She noted her neighbour could have as many dogs as he wants but because she shows her dogs, she is considered to be operating a commercial kennel.

Mr. Kinghorn advised the intent of this provision is to deal with commercial operations. The reference to purposes of commercial breeding or showing is dealing with a commercial operation, it is not trying to deal with people who have pets and takes one to a dog show. The municipality is trying to prevent people from running a business.

Ms. Andrews said that the wording needs to be better clarified.

Ms. Linda Barker, President, Dartmouth Kennel Club stated some of the terms will be important down the road. She noted she takes her dogs to shows and advised this is costly. Commercial showing would be by handlers who take dogs around the ring nothing there are very few professional handlers in this area. She noted people show dogs as a hobby but are not a commercial venture. She stated it is very important that the word commercial be clearly defined. She stated they are not puppy mills and she

said the terms should have been set up in consultation with people who do this as a living and there should have been more input from the people who are involved in the sport.

Mr. Henry Warren, stated when professional handlers are brought in people are making money but there are very few handlers in the Dartmouth area. The term professional handler should be clarified.

Mr. Dan McLean stated that if money is involved it is commercial operation. If money is being exchanged it is a business.

Ms. Adelaide Green, stated that in her opinion already existing commercial breeders should be allowed to have their practice at their house if they have been compatible and in harmony with neighbours. Some breeders have small dogs and should be allowed to exist. If someone has a couple of dogs and only breeds occasionally this should not be classified as a commercial breeder.

Ms. Diamond Muise, stated she has show dogs and occasionally she might breed a litter to offset costs but is not a commercially viable operation. She stated she would like to see the commercial aspect changed to reflect commercial viability. She also questioned what a lot would have to be shaped like to meet the criteria such as separation distance from an adjacent home.

Ms. Karen Metcalf made a written submission to the clerk regarding the public meeting minutes. She indicated she had commercial runs on her property for the safety of her dogs and the dogs are not at large and bothering neighbours. She said her dogs are her pets and she does have a litter now and again but the word commercial should refer to a viable business.

Mr. Gerald McLellan thanked Community Council for clarifying things that were in doubt but expressed disappointment that the land use was referenced and feels that many residents are not aware of this. He stated there should be an explanation on the areas affected by both the By-law and Land Use regulations.

Councillor Hendsbee called three times for any additional speakers. Hearing none, the following motion was placed.

Moved by Councillor Streach, seconded by Councillor Dalrymple that the public hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Streach, seconded by Councillor Dalrymple that this matter be referred back to staff for clarification on issues raised and that the

**decision be deferred pending a supplementary report from staff in this regard.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

9. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

9.1 Correspondence - None

9.2 Petitions - None

9.3 District Boundary Review

This item was addressed at the beginning of the meeting. (See page 3)

10. REPORTS

10.1 Case 01337: Rezoning - 2875, Highway #7, Lake Echo

- A report on the above noted was before Community Council.

Ms. Jillian McLellan, planner, provided an overview of the proposal to Community Council.

MOVED by Councillor Dalrymple, seconded by Councillor Streach, that Marine Drive, Valley and Canal Community Council give First Reading to Case 15782 rezoning 2875 Highway 7, Lake Echo from R-1 (residential single unit dwelling) Zone to C-1 (community commercial) Zone as shown in Attachment A and schedule a public hearing. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

11. MOTIONS - NONE

12. ADDED ITEMS - NONE

13. NOTICES OF MOTION - NONE

14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Mike Goudreau, Citizens for Responsible Development in lake Echo, stated he was speaking on the application of the development of a mobile home park in Lake Echo. There are over 80 concerned residents who proactively promote development in keeping with the community. Mr. Goudreau indicated the group were speaking to stop an application to amend the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law that would see the creation of high density housing in community. He stated the concerns of the citizens have not been taken into consideration. There are environmental

concerns with regard to Lake Echo and the effects development will have on it and surrounding watercourses. Attention must be paid to protecting the water quality. The application contains nothing that can be considered beneficial to either the residents or community of Lake Echo. He stated they will continue to monitor and endeavour to prevent this development from going ahead. They will present a petition to Councillor Hendsbee to be presented to Regional Council. The majority of homeowners are against this development and they will ask that this application be rejected when it comes before Regional Council. Residents of the community are saying no and will continue to say no.

Mr. Goudreau presented a copy of his presentation to the Clerk.

Councillor Hendsbee advised that Community Council could not make comment as this application had not yet come before Regional Council.

Mr. Duncan Cann, Patterson Sales, stated they are looking at 350 units and they are willing to sign an agreement to stop at this number. He stated there is a great deal of misinformation with regard to their application. He noted retired people need a place to live and they are looking to develop this project as a gated community. He stated it seems that the community does not want to bring retired people into the community. He noted there would be additional public information meetings held by the developer.

Councillor Hendsbee noted for the record that the noted public information meetings were being held by the developer and not HRM.

15. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

16. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Prepared by:
Julia Horncastle