### NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 6, 2006

PRESENT: Ms. Barb Grant

Ms. Ann Merritt Ms. Gloria Lowther Mr. Walter Regan

Councillor Robert Harvey
Councillor Gary Martin

**REGRETS:** Mr. Warren Hutt

Mr. David Grace

STAFF: Ms. Thea Langille-Hanna, Planner II, Planning and

**Development Services** 

Gail Harnish, Admin/PAC Coordinator Susan Corser, Planner, Regional Planning

**Andrew Whittemore, Acting Manager, Community** 

Development

Julia Horncastle, Legislative Assistant Chrissy White, Legislative Assistant

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER03		
2.	ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR03		
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS03		
4.	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES04		
5.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES04		
6.	REPO	REPORTS	
	6.1	Case 00835: Amendments to two Development Agreements on Shaffelburg Run- Bedford08	
	6.2	Case 00690- Amendment to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for phase II of Crestview CCDD10	
7.	PRESENTATION-Community Visioning Pilot Project04		
8.	STAT	STATUS UPDATES	
	8.1 8.2	Monthly Status Sheet	
9.	ADDED ITEMS12		
10.	NEXT MEETING DATE12		
11.	ADJOURNMENT12		

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm in the Fenerty Room, Sackville Library.

#### 2. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

The nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair were deferred until the next meeting which will be held on January 3, 2007.

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

At the request of Mr. Walter Regan, the Committee agreed to move item 7 up on the agenda.

# 4. <u>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</u>- <u>September 6, October 18, November 1, and November 6, 2006.</u>

Ms. Gloria Lowther commented that the minutes of September 6, 2006 under section 4. Business Arising out of the minutes should read; Ms. Gloria Lowther, not Ms. Barb Grant, requested that the statistics regarding the number of units built/remaining to be built in the Bedford South/Royale Hemlock development area.

Ms. Grant noted that the minutes for September 6, 2006 under section 4. Business arising out of the minutes should read "in regard to the (North West Community Council, and the Western Region Community Council)." Exclude the Marine Drive Valley and Canal Community Council from that sentence.

Ms. Thea Langille-Hanna answered Ms. Lowthers question concerning the number of units built or remaining to be built in the Bedford South/Royale Hemlock development areaa. Ms. Langill-Hanna informed Ms. Lowther that occupancy permits have been issued, and there are approximately 140 units left to be built in the Bedford South and Royal Hemlock development area, with the majority of those units being single dweelings.

In response to Ms. Lowther as to whether the units included individual condo units, Ms. Langille-Hanna confirmed that they do.

MOVED by Mr. Walter Regan, seconded by Councillor Harvey that the minutes of September 6, October 18, November 1, and November 6, 2006 be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### 5. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES- NONE

### 7. PRESENTATION- Community Visioning Pilot Project

- A staff report dated August 30, 2006 was circulated.
- PowerPoint Slides were distributed for reference.
- A brochure was available for the committee to view.

Ms. Susan Corser, Planner, Regional Planning presented the report.

Some points from the presentation were as follows:

- The Community Visioning Project is the first stage in implementing the Regional Plan.
- On September 19, 2006 Regional Council approved the community visioning project and the three pilot communities. The three pilot communities are Musquodoboit Harbour, Fall River, and the Bedford Waterfront.
- The community visioning pilot project will be used as a research tool to test certain solutions and techniques that will strive to enhance community relations and engagement. Throughout this process partnerships, consultation tools, and community based solutions will be the focus.
- Specific criteria were established to enable a community to qualify as a pilot community for the visioning project, these criteria were as follows:
  - Level of community interest.
  - The three chosen communities must distinctly represent one urban, one Suburban and one rural.
  - Communities with a diverse range of planning issues were examined.
  - Communities with a diverse range of community development issues were examined.
- Community vision should represent a process of developing consensus among residents and other stakeholders on what their community should look like, feel like and be like 5, 10, even 20 years into the future.
- The community visioning project will strive to ensure consistency with the Regional Plan, collaborate on problem solving and testing solutions, assess regulatory tools, achieve greater efficiency in operations, and improve customer service and public perception of HRM.

- The community visioning pilot project will consider:
  - community composition;
  - sense of community and civic pride;
  - health and quality of life;
  - safety;
  - parks and environment;
  - the places where we meet and gather;
  - local culture and heritage;
  - economic development;
  - children, youth, and families;
  - housing and life stages;
  - transit and roads
- Three Community Liaison Groups (CLG), one for each pilot community will be chosen to guide the community visioning process at the local level. The CLG's will consist of 7-9 members and will be responsible for creating the community vision and action plan. CLG recruitment and prep work is already underway and will conclude in January 2007.
- Community Consultation is scheduled to begin in February 2007 and will conclude in May 2007.
- At the end of each process, each community will present their vision as well as an action plan to Regional Council and Community Council for approval. This will begin in June 2007 and will conclude in July 2007.
- At the end of the project, staff will evaluate the three processes and make recommendations to Regional Council beginning in August 2007 and will conclude in September 2007.
- This plan will be implemented through the Business Planning and Budgeting process.
- Community outreach programs are in the process of being designed to assist communities that are interested in taking part in the community visioning exercise, but have not been chosen for the pilot program. More details will come in the new year.
- Orientation training for the CLG's will begin in January.

Ms. Corser and Mr. Andrew Whittemore answered questions following the presentation. Some questions were as follows:

In response to Ms. Grant as to why Musquodoboit Harbour, Fall River and the Bedford Waterfront were chosen as the pilot communities, Ms. Corser explained that 50 communities were examined, and the three chosen communities best fit the criteria (outlined in the staff report dated August 30, 2006) for the pilot program. Ms. Grant continued by asking Ms. Corser why Bedford was chosen as a pilot community and not Sackville. Ms. Corser explained that the Fast Ferry played a role in the decision making

process; but overall, Bedford better suited the criteria.

In response to Ms. Grants concern about few people making the decisions for many surrounding the pilot project, Mr. Whittemore reassured her that the CLG is a Steering Committee, and their main focus will be to encourage public input and communication of the masses.

Ms. Corser informed the Committee that staff is working hard to make the committee meetings attractive to the public by including a "fun" element.

Ms. Lowther expressed concern that the Bedford pilot community was named the "Bedford Waterfront." Ms. Lowther noted that this may cause some confusion among residents that were under the impression that this pilot project was intended to serve the entire community of Bedford; not just the Waterfront. In response to Ms. Lowther's concerns, Ms. Corser verified that the vision of the Bedford pilot will be focussing on the Bedford Waterfront, but assured the Committee that this is a work in progress and that each of the three communities present unique challenges.

In response to Mr. Regan's concerns about not having a "Committee of Members at Large" from outside the community, Mr. Whittemore explained that Ms. Corser is working on developing a Regional Planning Advisory Committee composed of members from the community at large to ensure the general context of the Regional Plan is serviced.

Mr. Regan reminded staff of the Vision 20/20 strategic initiative and asked if this initiative was taken into consideration when planning for community visioning. In response to Mr. Regan's question, Ms. Corser explained that the community visioning pilot program is more of a local process, where Vision 20/20 was a broad initiative. The focus of community visioning is to develop a synopsis of all corporate strategic initiatives, including Vision 20/20, and capture the important aspects of each at a local level. Mr. Whittemore assured the committee that the community will be given the opportunity to provide input into this process.

In response to Mr. Regan's request for a list of the 50 communities considered for the community visioning pilot program, Ms. Corser informed him that he could obtain that list from the Regional Plan.

Mr. Regan questioned whether Sackville was one of the 50 communities considered for the pilot project, and requested information as to what number Sackville was on the list. In response to Mr. Regan's questions, staff informed him that Sackville was one of the 50 communities considered, and assured Mr. Regan that they would research Sackville's numerical listing and get back to him.

Mr. Regan expressed concern about the pilot projects focus on the Bedford Waterfront. He noted that he would prefer to see Bedford as a whole community piloted. In response to Mr. Regan's concerns, Mr. Whittemore assured him that although the Bedford Waterfront is the central focus of the pilot, Bedford as a whole community will be considered for some aspects of the plan.

Mr. Regan questioned if there is a movement to plan by water shed. Mr. Whittemore explained that this is not a planning exercise, but if the community identifies planning by water shed as a priority, then the community will outline that priority as a next step in the Action Plan.

Mr. Regan expressed concern about the possibility of the community response being ignored if it does not jive with Council priorities. Mr. Whittemore assured Mr. Regan that there is a process in place to ensure that public opinion is considered surrounding this issue. Ultimately, how the priorities are actioned depends on the Budget and Business Planning process.

Mr. Regan questioned whether there was going to be a three year evaluation plan included in the community visioning process. Mr. Whittemore responded by assuring Mr. Regan it would be ideal to have a monitoring tool; possibly a staff person to focus on implementation and evaluation of priorities. At the three year point, if the CLG decides to remain a committee, they may take on this responsibility on as well.

Councillor Martin assured staff that he will support this project; however, he expressed concern about the small size of the Bedford Waterfront and the recruitment of committee members and public opinion on such a focussed area. He is concerned that residents will want to work for Bedford as a whole community, not just the Waterfront as a centralized area.

Ms. Lowther expressed concern that the Bedford Waterfront is too narrow to declare it as an entire community. She referenced a staff report that she felt supported this comment, and questioned the validity of the report.

Ms. Grant expressed concern surrounding the credibility of the staff report that Ms. Lowther referenced, and is concerned the Community Visioning strategy disagrees with the information initially presented in the report. Ms. Corser reassured Ms. Grant that the referenced section of the staff report was quite broad and did not reflect the entire evolution of the process. Ms. Langille-Hanna informed the committee that the report was written by her and was intended to touch on some broad aspects of the plan and edits have been made to the process since that staff report was circulated.

Mr. Whittemore encouraged input from the committee and assured the members that this project is a work in progress. Ms. Langille-Hanna noted that some issues in staff reports may be outdated and they will look into correcting those errors.

Mr. Whittemore informed the committee that residents are confused about the boundaries of the Bedford Waterfront and what area is actually considered to be the Bedford Waterfront. He assured the committee that issue will be discussed.

Ms. Corser informed the group that in the past citizens felt they were not given a forum to discuss broad issues because most of the Regional Plan consultation was very focussed. The community visioning project will give residents the opportunity to express those issues.

In response to Ms. Corsers statement, Mr. Regan requested a list of concerns that were not addressed by staff. Ms. Corser assured Mr. Regan that planning staff have conducted a scan of local issues and plan to review the findings with the committee.

The questions ended at this time and Ms. Corser and Mr. Whittemore left the meeting.

#### 6. REPORTS

## 6.1 <u>Case 00835: Amendments to two Development Agreements on Shaffelburg</u> Run-Bedford

- A staff report dated November 20, 2006 was before the Committee.
- A PowerPoint presentation was also presented.

Ms. Thea Langille- Hanna, Planner II, presented the report.

Ms. Langille-Hanna addressed questions arising out of the presentation:

In response to Mr. Regan's question as to why the properties that are owned by Mr. Redden need to be put into the Union Street Development Agreement, Ms. Langille-Hanna informed Mr. Regan that what Mr. Redden wants to do on his parcels of land is not necessarily permitted in the Bryson Development Agreement. The plan is to realign the boundaries to reflect the proper ownership of lot #37.

In response to Mr. Regan's question as to if this was going to be the only change, Ms. Langille-Hanna informed Mr. Regan that the developers would rather take the plans for an 8 unit apartment building and develop 6 townhouses instead which is permitted in the Development Agreement as amended.

In response to Mr. Regan's question as to whether there would be an increase in units, Ms.

Langille-Hanna informed him that there would be less units.

In response to Mr. Regans question as to there being any change in storm water management, any more green space, or any benefits to HRM from this proposal, Ms. Langille-Hanna informed him at this point she does not foresee any major benefits to HRM as a whole coming from this proposal as it only focuses on a very minimal amount of land; however, the owners will be required to meet all the land development requirements set forth by the municipality.

Ms. Lowther asked for clarification about an area on Shaffelburg Run that has an area that developers will not be permitted to connect. Ms. Langill-Hanna assured her that there would be no changes made to that specific area as outlined in the Brison Development Agreement.

After the committee discussed certain issues with the placement of lot #37, Ms. Langille-Hanna assured the committee that they are only following the application submitted by Mr. Redden. The owner of lot #37 has not contacted staff or expressed an interest concerning this issue. Ms. Langille-Hanna suggested that the Committee could make a motion on adjusting the top line of lot #37 if they feel it is necessary.

Ms. Ann Merritt questioned whether this proposal will have an effect on legal survey registry regulations. In response to Ms. Merritt's concern, Ms. Langille-Hanna assured her that survey registry would be a legal issue, but that Mr. Redden has been made aware of these regulations and has resolved this issue through the application process.

Councillor Harvey expressed concern that the owner of lot #37 may not be aware of the plan. In response to Councillor Harvey's concern, Mr. Redden assured him that the property owner of lot #37 has been informed of the plan.

MOVED by councillor Harvey, seconded by Councillor Martin, that the North West Planning Advisory Committee recommend that the North West Community Council:

- 1. Give Notice of Motion to consider the amendments to the Union Street and Brison Development Agreements as proposed in Attachment A of the staff report dated November 20, 2006 and schedule a public hearing.
- 2. Approve the amending development agreements as set out in Attachment A of staff report dated November 20, 2006.
- 3. Require that the development agreement be signed within 120 days, or any

extension thereof granted by Council on request of the applicant, from the date of final approval of said agreement by Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever is later, including applicable appeal periods; otherwise this approval shall be void and any obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end, and;

4. Adjust the plan to include all of lot #37 within the Brison Development Agreement.

#### MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

# 6.2 <u>Case 00690-Amendment to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Phase II of Crestview CCDD</u>

- A Report dated November 20, 2006 was before the Committee.
- A PowerPoint Presentation was presented.

Ms. Thea Langille- Hanna, Planner II, presented the report.

Ms. Langille-Hanna addressed questions arising out of the report. Questions were as follows:

Ms. Grant expressed concerns about the cumulative traffic problems on the Bedford highway and the effect this development will have on this issue. Ms Grant also noted that she feels the report does not accurately reflect the overall impact the development will have on traffic issues. In response to Ms. Grants concerns, Ms. Langille-Hanna informed her that capacity measurements that are supported by a formula are in place, and traffic capacity on the Bedford Highway does not exceed regulations. Ms. Langill-Hanna assured the Committee that proposals that will compromise the capacity formula have been or will be rejected until the interchange is ready.

After Committee members recieved clairification on some housekeeping items pertaining to the Development Agreement, Ms. Grant asked several questions concerning the Bedford Waters Advisory Committee and their inability to reach an agreement with staff on water related concerns with this proposal. Ms. Langille-Hanna informed her that this was a unique decision and that Regional Council would be the body to make the final ruling in this situation.

Ms. Lowther noted that she recalled reading in the minutes that this proposal has gone

before the BWAC three times, and it has been rejected three times. Ms. Langille-Hanna noted that she only recalls the proposal being rejected twice.

In response to questions asked by Mr. Regan, Ms. Langille- Hanna answered as follows:

- HRM will not be taking over the natural vegetation area of the land outlined in the proposal.
- The site does not need to have two driveways due to the fact that they are not over 100 units.
- Additional units could not be covered under this proposal.
- The crossing of the brook through the private road does not fall into this agreement.
- The \$5,000 bond awarded will be added to by an additional \$5,000 required by the By-law.
- An agreement will be needed to dump water on the property surrounding this area.
- Oil separators will be included in the development.

There were no further questions at this time.

Moved by Ms. Lowther, seconded by Councillor Harvey, that the North West Community Council:

- 1. Recommend that Regional Council give First Reading to the proposed amendments to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land-Use Bylaw as provided in Attachment A to A-3, of the staff report dated November 20, 2006 and schedule a joint public hearing with North West Community Council.
- 2. Recommend that Regional Council approve the proposed amendments to the Bedford Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-laws provided in attachment A to A-3 of the staff report dated November 20, 2006; and
- 3. Give Notice of Motion to consider the proposed development agreement and discharging the existing development agreement as provided in Attachment B and Attachment B-I of the staff report dated November 20, 2006 and schedule a joint public hearing with Regional Council.

Contingent upon the adoption by Regional Council of the above Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law amendments and those becoming effective under the *Municipal Government Act*, it is further recommended that the North West Community Council:

- 1. Approve the proposed development agreement and discharge the existing agreement as provided in Attachment B and Attachment B-1 of the staff report dated November 20, 2006; and
- Require the development agreements be signed within 120 days, or any
  extension of granted by Council on request of the applicant, from the date
  of final approval of said agreements by Council and any other bodies as
  necessary, whichever is later, including applicable appeal periods.
  Otherwise this approval shall be void and any other obligations arising
  hereunder shall be at an end.
- 3. 3.6.8. should read the multiple unit dwelling should not have access up Wyatt road.

#### MOTION PUT AND PASSED

- 8. STATUS UPDATES
- 8.1 Monthly Status Sheet

No additional applications/updates at this time.

8.2 <u>Decisions of Community Council</u>

Circulated for information.

- 9. ADDED ITEMS- NONE
- 10. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be held on January 3, 2007 in the Fenerty Room, Sackville Library.

#### 11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55pm.

# HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

13 **December 6, 2006** 

Chrissy White Legislative Assistant