

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
HALIFAX COUNTY/HALIFAX MAINLAND WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD**

---

6:30 p.m.  
Board Room  
2750 Dutch Village Road  
January 19, 2000

**PRESENT:** Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair  
Mr. Chris Booth  
Ms. Colleen McNeil  
Mr. Walter Regan  
Mr. Peter Shacklock  
Mr. Ross Evans  
Mr. Glen Williams  
Mr. David Haley  
Mr. Michael Guilcher  
Mt. Frank Hope  
Mr. Shalom Mandaville  
Mr. Keith Manchester  
Mr. Lawrence White

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Tom Willdey, Soil & Water Conservation Soc. of Hfx.  
Mr. Gary Porter, Planner  
Capt. John J. Owens, Jr. (guest)  
Ms. Lynne Le Boutillier, Assistant Municipal Clerk

**REGRETS:** Mr. Jim MacLean and Mr. David Dwyer

**ITEMS:**

1.0	Approval of Agenda, Additions and Deletions .....	3
2.0	Approval of Minutes .....	3
3.0	Business Arising from Minutes	
3.1	Subdivision Concept Plans .....	4
3.2	Stormwater Management Policy .....	4 & 5
3.3	Prince's Lodge Master Plan - Application to Enter into a Stage II Development Agreement for Phases 1A and 2, Royale Hemlocks Subdivision, North of Hemlock Ravine .....	5 - 12
3.4	Length of Terms and Terms of Reference Update .....	12
3.5	Run-off Coefficient .....	13
3.6	P-3 Schools .....	13
3.7	Glen Arbour Water Quality .....	13
3.8	Sobeys - Fall River .....	14
4.0	New Business	
4.1	HRM's Snow Removal and Disposal Policy .....	14
4.2	Need for Urban Stormwater Treatment, etc. ....	14 & 15
4.3	Information - Beaverbank Bypass .....	15
5.0	Concept Plans .....	15
6.0	Subcommittee on Parameters for Water Quality Testing .....	15
7.0	BWAC and Lake Major Watershed Advisory Board Approved Minutes .....	16
8.0	Status Sheet .....	16
9.0	Meeting Schedule - Hearings and Planning Advisory Committee .....	16
10.0	Date of Next Meeting .....	16
11.0	Adjournment .....	16

**1.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS**

The following items were added under New Business:

- 4.1 HRM Snow Removal and Disposal Policy (David Haley)
- 4.2 The Need for Urban Stormwater Treatment; Handbook on Stormwater Treatment; Robert Pitt's e-mail (Shalom Mandaville)
- 4.3 Information - Beaverbank Bypass

The agenda, as amended, was adopted on motion of Mr. Williams and Mr. Haley.

**2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On page 8, under item 4.2, Sandy Lake, Hammonds Plains - Sackville River Watershed, paragraph 3, second sentence the word 'destroyed' should be changed to 'degraded'.

The December 15, 1999 minutes, as amended, were adopted on motion of Mr. Mandaville and Mr. Evans.

**3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

**3.1 SUBDIVISION CONCEPT PLANS**

Copies of a letter dated January 17, 2000 sent to Ms. Sharon Bond, Regional Coordinator, Subdivision/Development re the draft Subdivision By-law and Concept Approval process, as a result of her attendance, at the December 1999 Board meeting, were circulated. Ms. McNeil reviewed the letters contents with the members.

Mr. Porter reported on his discussions with Peter Bigelow. Mr. Bigelow had no recollection of previous discussions regarding the provision of concept plans. Mr. Porter advised the Board that Sharon Bond and Paul Morgan have not yet met. Kelly Denty, Development Officer gave him a copy of the Concept Plan review procedure. It contains a list of referral agencies. Richard van Ingen is the contact person listed for the Board. It was noted that sometime ago Mr. van Ingen had been the Vice-Chair, but due to a relocation resigned from the Board. This may explain why the Board has not been receiving concept plans. Mr. Porter was asked to ensure that Richard van Ingen's name is removed from the referral agency list and the Chair, Halifax County/Halifax Mainland Watershed Advisory Board, care of the Municipal Clerk's office be substituted. Ms. Denty assured Mr. Porter that she will discuss with the two other Subdivision Development Officers this matter.

### **3.2 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT POLICY**

A letter dated December 28, 1999 to the Board, attention Mr. Williams, regarding the Stormwater Management Policy from Kulvinder Dhillon, Director, Public Works and Transportation Services was circulated with the agenda. This letter was in response to the Board's letter of December 2, 1999 to the Mayor. The correspondence confirmed funding had been approved in the Capital Budget for the fiscal year 1999/2000 for the development of stormwater and wastewater policies for HRM. Staff is currently drafting Terms of Reference for the retention of a consultant to develop the policies.

From discussions with Dr. Blouin, Mr. Porter has determined that the final terms of reference are intended to be on Regional Council's January 25, 2000 agenda. It is anticipated that Council will refer the report to the Waters Advisory Boards. It was noted that a more general water resources policy is being proposed versus a stormwater policy.

It is anticipated that the terms of reference should be available for distribution with the February agenda package. In the event the document is very large, it was suggested it might be reviewed by a couple of volunteers prior to the meeting, so they might lead discussions.

### **3.3 PRINCE'S LODGE MASTER PLAN - APPLICATION TO ENTER INTO A STAGE II DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR PHASES 1A and 2, ROYALE HEMLOCKS SUBDIVISION, NORTH OF HEMLOCK RAVINE**

It had been suggested that the Master Plan for Prince's Lodge might be available in January, but it was not received for today's meeting.

Mr. Glen Woodford, Wallace Macdonald & Lively and Mr. Scott Yetman, concerned citizen, were in attendance for this item. The Chair noted that Mr. Yetman had asked to give a presentation this evening.

In his presentation, Mr. Yetman gave the Board some history regarding the application. Specific reference was made to a March 1998 Public Meeting and a Public Hearing at the June 1, 1998 Chebucto Community Council. Mr. Yetman circulated an extract of the minutes of the June 1, 1998 Chebucto Community Council and clauses contained in a draft development agreement. He highlighted that in the minutes reference is made to Mr. Zwicker outlining some changes in the proposal, as a result of comments from the public meeting in March. These changes included parkland around the lake and a trail along the lake. Mr. Yetman noted that there was no mention of such a trail in the proposal presented last month.

Referring to item 6.3 of the draft Development Agreement presented June 1, 1998, he quoted "No stormwater drainage from road runoff shall be discharged to the pond known as Cabin Lake". A subsequent revision, presented July 6, 1998, states simply "the stormwater management plan shall be designed to maintain the current water level of the pond known as Cabin Lake..". He felt that in the intervening four week period a lot of beneficial items were removed. No reference was made to these revisions in Mr. Zwicker's presentation last month, i.e. the proposed development does not include parkland all around the lake or a trail along the lake. It is also being proposed that Cabin Lake be used as a retention pond. Later in the meeting, Mr. Woodford explained to the Board that the pond would be used for detention not retention and what the difference was.

Mr. Yetman referred to the area between the Highway 102 and Cabin Lake being proposed for dense development. He felt Cabin Lake needed substantial buffering. He did not feel the proposal lived up to the Parkland Planning Strategy and does not address the Parks Department's concerns.

The Chair reflected that Mr. Yetman's comments imply a lack of good faith. This being the case, they fall outside the jurisdiction of the Board. The Board can only comment on the plans presented when drafting their recommendations.

Mr. Yetman concluded that he felt quite a few changes will be required to the proposal. During a discussion of the process, it was noted that there is no further allowance for public input. The Board will be the only body afforded an opportunity to comment. It was noted that staff has only to determine whether the refinements contained in the Stage II submission conform with Stage I, for approval to be recommended. The Stage I document is very general. Details are provided at Stage II. If Stage II conforms with Stage I, no Public Hearings will be held. If the plan is not in conformance, staff would endeavour to convince the applicant to make the necessary changes. If they don't, Mr. Porter was not sure what process takes place. He felt the developer must have felt the plan conformed to have brought it forward. The Chair noted that their Stormwater Management Plan has yet to be approved, so this plan can be debated.

While the Board had not commented on Stage I, in anticipation of obtaining more details at Stage II, Ms. McNeil noted that a letter had been written indicating the Board's desire to see a Master Plan for the area and advising that comments would be reserved for Stage II.

Reflecting on Mr. Yetman's presentation, the Chair sought direction from the members on whether they felt reference should be made in the preamble to the information presented at the Public Meeting and Public Hearing or simply address the plan accompanying Wallace Macdonald & Lively's correspondence of December 8, 1999. Similarly, while outside the

Board's mandate, comments could be included on good stewardship.

Mr. Woodford reflected that any changes made to the plans were not done based on profitability motives, but a number of concerns have to be addressed when planning such a development and thus plans are always changing. He referred to a report by Mr. Gagne emphasizing the need not to direct all stormwater flow to the Bedford Basin but to Hemlock Ravine, where possible. Measures were taken to address this concern. The definition of buffer was raised, i.e. would someone's backyard be included in calculations for a buffer.

The Board focused its discussions on the drafting of recommendations related to the proposal, particularly, during the construction and post construction phases. These recommendations will be forwarding to Planning and accompany their report to Council. Whether these recommendations could be specific or general in nature was debated. It is recognized that the area in question is only a small portion of a much larger area to be developed over the course of the next decade or two. It was concluded that the Board's primary concern related to Hemlock Ravine Park not being starved for water. Mr. Woodford noted this is essentially a concern during dry weather during the summer months. He described further measures being considered by the developers to retain water on site, so it will eventually make its way to the groundwater and thus Hemlock Ravine. One proposal involved the use of perforated pipes for the collection of storm water. He explained that during light rainfalls, most of water directed into such a pipe would have an opportunity to seep out before it even reached the outlet.

Reference was made by the Board to stormwater retention galleries proposed by Richard Gagne at the December meeting. Reservations were expressed by the developer's representatives that such a design would potentially pose problems with basement flooding. It was suggested if flooding is the only counter indication for the use of such galleries, that residences in the development be designed without basements. It was recalled that engineering standards might not permit retention galleries being included in subdivisions and the subject of liability had been raised.

Discussions centered on Cabin Lake and a buffer along the boundary of Hemlock Ravine Park. The members debated whether quantity or quality of stormwater or both were of concern. Quality would be affected by road salt, pesticides and fertilizers that won't be significantly reduced by stormceptors.

Comments were solicited from the members.

Mr. Regan was pleased that stormceptors are to be used. He proposed HRM be asked to study their effectiveness. There is currently no good Nova Scotia model. The Chair

questioned who would bear the cost. Mr. Regan felt HRM might be able to convince the developer to pay for such a monitoring study. It was suggested by Mr. Evans that the Board should write HRM, noting the use of stormceptors to prevent pollution, but cautioning that if HRM is making stormceptors a requirement, a study should be conducted to determine their effectiveness. If included in the recommendations for the proposal, this suggestion might be lost.

Mr. Manchester and Mr. Mandaville noted that stormceptors are not unique or new technology. Mr. Mandaville advised that he will address their effectiveness under item 4.2, through various handouts. He noted that while they are very effective for parking lots, their effectiveness in subdivision drainage is questionable.

Mr. Guilcher agreed that stormceptors would not be as effective post development, as more dissolved nutrients would be contained in stormwater as contaminants. He proposed that the development be fertilizer and pesticide free. Mr. Guilcher noted that the use of pesticides in HRM is a continuing topic. How HRM would enforce was questioned. Perhaps control could be achieved through covenants. Considering that any top soil will have to be trucked in, Mr. Willdey suggested that without regularly feeding with fertilizer, lawns would not survive with only one and a half inches of topsoil. The Chair noted that there is no evidence that Hemlock Ravine would be adversely affected by additional nutrients being contained in the groundwater.

Mr. Haley reflected that while members agree that Hemlock Ravine is a sensitive area, no studies to confirm this are available. Mr. Yetman did not agree and made reference to a Hemlock Ravine Study. He had in his possession a study that Mr. King had used as the basis of a report. The Chair noted that the rarity of trees in Hemlock Ravine is not in question.

Mr. Regan felt there should be a predevelopment flow study and it be compared to flows after development. He also felt the study should include quality. HRM could then instruct the developer not to exceed the Guidelines. Mr. Haley reflected it might be very difficult to monitor, as so much of the water in question is sub-terrain. Mr. Manchester noted that a judgement can't be made over the course of one year. While agreeing with the philosophy, the Chair felt a five year window would be required. While asking for a study would provide information, how would you interpret? It was also noted that there are only two locations where samples could be taken.

Mr. Regan proposed recommending that this site should not be developed. It was felt that such a statement would have to come out of a Regional Development Plan, which HRM has yet to commence. There was no support for this recommendation. Mr. Willdey felt that

this could be cited as an example of why a Master Plan is needed.

It was acknowledged that Cabin Lake will experience a water quality change if it is accepting more water. Mr. Manchester was of the opinion the majority of the changes would be the result of the construction period. This is the time siltation can be expected. The importance of enforcing standards at that time was emphasized.

Mr. Manchester felt timing of development will have tremendous impact as to environmental effects. Mr. Woodford noted that the plan in color identifies which areas will have to be developed in one shot. The rest will be developed as required.

Since the prime concern was the effect on the Hemlock Ravine's ground water, Mr. Evans proposed that it be recommended that multiple discharge points be used for the release of water along the length of Hemlock Ravine. Referring to last month's presentation, it was noted these were contained in the proposal. Mr. Evans contended the more the better, i.e. maximize the number of outfall points into Hemlock Ravine. He also reflected on how fragile the area is, with very little water retention potential in the soil. As a result, there will be little sedimentation or erosion to be concerned about.

In summary, it will be stated that the Board recognizes Hemlock Ravine as a sensitive ecological system and thus development at the boundaries of the park should be planned so there is little or no change in the adjacent park. Reference will be made to groundcover being minimal, water retention limited, thus caution must be observed in terms of the water situation. Measures must be taken to control nutrients during the post construction phase, for example by reducing the amount of pesticides applied.

Mr. Hope felt the Board should state its concerns and recommend mitigating measures to be taken into consideration depending on circumstances. It is hoped the developer and HRM can work something out to retain Hemlock Ravine.

In order to maintain the water flow into Hemlock Ravine, it was recommended that galleries be created and if this poses a problem, remedial measures be considered such as the homes not having basements.

Perforated pipe be used where practical.

Clay dams be installed in the gravel bed for the large pipeline from Highway 102 to help retain groundwater.

Referring to blasting, no net change in the groundwater hydrology should result.



It was noted that measures can be taken to minimize blasting, ie. depth of foundations reduced, for example. A pre-blasting survey be required. It was questioned whether the root system of trees would be affected any differently than wells.

Measures be considered to reduce runoff through manmade channels. Glen Woodford noted that the depth that the various pipes are laid would be taken into consideration to ensure the retention of the maximum amount of groundwater to be directed toward Hemlock Ravine.

The Board discussed the need for a buffer zone around Cabin Lake. Reference was made to the minimum 15 meter wide buffer zone requirements around watercourses contained in the Guidelines. It was noted that the plan before the Board does not achieve this. Given the amount of soil, it was questioned whether the buffer zone should be increased. It could be argued that due to the fragility of the soil, it should be increased. For most of the area there is a buffer larger than 15 meters, except in the vicinity of Cabin Lake. As an alternative, it was suggested that restrictions be placed on what people can do with their land in the vicinity of the lake. Mr. Manchester felt it would be preferable if the lots were not sold. Mr. Woodford noted that HRM's treatment of such lands has not always been exemplary.

Mr. Regan proposed the buffer zone be increased to 30 meters and the area be zoned Conservation area or greenbelt and conveyed to HRM. It was felt water retention could be improved through a larger buffer zone. Mr. Porter noted that since this area falls under Schedule K, which governs development by Development Agreement, zoning isn't an option, but such areas could be designated in the Development Agreement as open space.

Such buffering in the vicinity of the school was not felt necessary, but from Cabin Lake to Highway 102. Right now the distance from the property lines to Hemlock Ravine Park average between 8 and 15 meters. While a 15 meter minimum would not be a major change to the proposed buffer to the Park, it would constitute a major change in the vicinity of Cabin Lake. A total of 11 to 12 lots might be lost. The argument to justify an increased width in the buffer zone would be the limited soil. As an alternative, Mr. Manchester suggested it be recommended these lots not be developed until later so the overall impact of the development can be gauged.

The Chair questioned the need for a larger buffer along the north side of Cabin Lake if it is to be used as a catchment area. Last month the Board supported Cabin Lake's use as a detention area. While a 15 ft. buffer would allow for development, a 30 ft. one would not. Walter Regan and Shalom Mandaville were in favour of the larger buffer. It was noted that

a good reason would be required to deviate from the Board's Guidelines. If the Board's concern was Hemlock Ravine, the Chair felt a larger buffer on the north side of Cabin Lake was unnecessary.

It was concluded that it be recommended that a 15 meter buffer zone around lakes and the boundary with Hemlock Ravine Park be conveyed to HRM as a green belt.

The Chair sought input regarding the use of Cabin Lake. Whether stormwater should be discharged directly into the lake or further back over the buffer area was discussed. It was felt since the buffer was rocky, there would not be much difference.

During discussion of the use of Cabin Lake for detention, Glen Woodford noted that there will be changes to the lake level on a temporary basis. It will retain water until it evaporates or enters the ground. This measure is being utilized to control the rate of runoff. He felt this measure will make a big difference to Hemlock Ravine during the dry summer months.

Mr. Willdey questioned why the Board is discussing the lake in relation to environmental concerns, when supporting stormwater being directed to it. Mr. Haley noted that there are two issues quantity and quality. At present the Board was focusing on quantity. Mr. Guilcher agreed that the ecology of the lake will be fundamentally changed if this practice is followed. Mr. Yetman noted that he and those he represents want water, but they also want quality water. The Chair noted that some storm water has to go in to maintain Cabin Lake.

Mr. Evans reiterated that the greatest risk is starving Hemlock Ravine of water in summer time. It was concluded by Mr. Haley that the recommendation then has to be based on quantity.

Support was given to the use of the pond for water retention.

It was also noted that there needs to be multiple points for stormwater to discharge into Hemlock Ravine. The focus should not only be on Cabin Lake.

Referring to water quality, it was noted that there are two issues, i.e. short term during construction and on a long term basis. Water quality in the short term can be maintained through the Erosion Control Plans and use of stormceptors. The Board was confident that these Erosion Control plans would be approved not only by HRM but other authorities, ie. NSDOE and/or Oceans and Fisheries. An approved Erosion Control Plan infers water quality.

The Board has been advised that fish habitat may be affected. If this is the case, Mr. Regan wanted the control structures designed to accommodate the movement of fish. Mr. Regan indicated his preference for three sided culverts, versus circular ones.

Reflecting on his involvement with the subcommittee on the Parameters of Water Quality Testing, Mr. Haley felt that while the construction phase is very important, you quickly move into long-term monitoring. Road salts and pesticides were cited. The Chair felt the Board will eventually have some input into the Stormwater Management Policy, but that will be sometime down the road.

A question was raised regarding maintenance of the proposed stormceptors. Since the stormceptors will be on HRM property, something is required in the recommendations pertaining to the need for them to be maintained regularly.

Mr. White referred to BWAC discussing the subject of water conservation through the use of low flow toilets and faucets. The Chair felt this should be considered given the resultant reduction in waste water entering Halifax Harbour and ultimately the reduced amount which will require treatment.

The Board also felt comments should be included regarding it not being able to support any development which puts untreated waste water into the environment.

Reference was made to the different requirements within the former units for roof drains. It was noted that the City of Halifax requires they be piped into the storm water system. In this case, it should be recommended that they be allowed to empty and flow onto the land. Mr. Manchester cautioned that while this may help with quantity, it may reduce quality, as the water running over land will pickup pollutants.

The Chair will take the above noted comments into account when he drafts the recommendations.

A short break followed the conclusion of this item.

### **3.4 LENGTH OF TERMS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE UPDATE**

Mr. Porter advised that the terms of reference would be going to the Community Councils in February. Dr. Blouin had some questions about the staggering of terms and wondered if this had to be maintained. It was noted that this had been included to ensure continuity on the Board. Only half the Board could change at anyone time. The Chair asked Mr. Porter if Dr. Blouin commented on any issues raised by Legal Services. He had not.

Dr. Blouin proposed a name change to Halifax Watershed Advisory Board. The Chairman felt this name implied that the Board served the whole HRM, which is not the case. Mr. Porter suggested that eventually there may be only one Waters Advisory Board. The consensus was that the title Halifax/Halifax County WAB would be preferable.

### **3.5 RUN-OFF COEFFICIENT**

The Chair advised that he has not had an opportunity to discuss this subject with Dr. Burney.

### **3.6 P-3 SCHOOLS**

Circulated at the meeting was a draft letter stating the Board's concerns regarding exemptions granted from the Municipal By-law and regulations during the construction of these schools which resulted in environmental degradation.

During the review of the draft, it was suggested that paragraph 2 should be read as follows: One of our member groups, the Sackville Rivers Association has reported to *NSDOE, HRM and DFO by phone* that the construction procedures being followed at one of your P-3 school sites in the HRM (corner of #1 Highway and Lucasville Road, HRM) *have* frequently resulted in silt entering the Little Sackville River.

It was suggested that the word 'allow' be changed to 'tolerate' in the third paragraph. Fourth paragraph change 'it's' to 'its'. Fifth paragraph add 'and municipally' after 'provincially'.

Ms. McNeil felt that the whole letter should be reordered to simply state that the Board has concerns and use the two schools as examples. Who the correspondence should be addressed to was discussed at length. It was concluded it should be sent to the Mayor, Premier and Regional Director General DFO. Ms. McNeil will redraft.

### **3.7 GLEN ARBOUR WATER QUALITY**

While the Chair had nothing new to report, Mr. Porter indicated he had spoken to Dr. Blouin. Dr. Blouin indicated his willingness to look at the data if he is provided with copies. The Chair recalled that the Board was also concerned about data being missing. It would be desirable if Dr. Blouin contacted Annapolis Basin for the missing reports. It might actually be easier if Annapolis Basin resubmitted all the reports. Mr. Porter will follow-up. Both issues require pursuing with Dr. Blouin. Mr. Regan recalled that it was originally Ms. Hamilton who dealt with the data.

**3.8 SOBEYS - FALL RIVER**

Mr. Williams showed photos of the site to help illustrate problems associated with the above noted development. These photos have been provided to Mr. Warner and Mr. Sheppard. While the site has been cleaned up, they are still operating without an Occupancy Permit. He referred to another 50,000 sq. ft. development being considered. This would involve a development agreement and the Board should have an opportunity to give its input.

**4.0 NEW BUSINESS**

**4.1 HRM'S SNOW REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL POLICY**

Mr. Haley felt it would be worthwhile for the Board to look into what the HRM snow removal and disposal policy is as it relates to stormwater management. He felt it would be worthwhile knowing what HRM does with its snow. He noted that it used to be carted to the Harbour and dumped. This practice might be considered for inclusion in the new Stormwater Management Policy. The Board endorsed Mr. Haley determining what HRM is doing.

Mr. Manchester also felt their salting policy should be included in the new Stormwater Management Policy.

Mr. Porter noted that HRM may be only part of problem, as private operators are also contributing.

These points will be kept in mind when the Board reviews the terms of reference. It was suggested that John Sheppard should be invited to address this subject.

**4.2 NEED FOR URBAN STORMWATER TREATMENT, etc.**

Circulated at the meeting were copies of an e-mail from Mr. Mandaville on the above noted subject. Mr. Mandaville also provided the Chair with two documents entitled "The Use of Wetlands for the control of Stormwater Pollution". Case histories are contained in this document. He stressed that constructed wetlands are superior to natural wetlands for this function. He also noted that most of the pollutants in urban areas can't be removed by stormceptors. Detention ponds are effective in removing large particles. The second document was entitled "Environmental Geology of Urban Areas", containing actual case histories from Ontario.

An additional e-mail from Mr. Pitt on Stormceptor Systems was provided to the Chair. The effectiveness of stormceptors plus constructed wetlands are addressed. Mr. Mandaville also made reference to a chapter from a BIO publication entitled "Environmental Geology of Bedford Basin".

The Chairman felt it was interesting that there is actual literature on stormceptors and constructed wetlands. It appears they are advising against the use of natural wetlands for treatment of stormwater, but it was noted that construction of artificial wetlands is more costly for the developer. In the event there is not enough room, the use of natural wetlands would be better than nothing. The Chairman felt this material will be beneficial in providing references when the Board reviews the Stormwater Management Policy.

For his personal use, Mr. Mandaville provided the Chair with material on Lake William.

The members were polled on who would like to review the above materials. Ms. McNeil provided Walter Regan with her copies and the Chair lent his to Mr. Guilcher, who will return them to the Clerk.

#### **4.3 INFORMATION - BEAVERBANK BYPASS**

Mr. Regan advised the Board that a four lane highway is to be built from Highway 101 to the Beaverbank Road. He illustrated on a map the route.

It was requested that an item be added to the next agenda re HRM Bylaw for Tree Cutting.

#### **5.0 CONCEPT PLANS**

None.

#### **6.0 SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARAMETERS FOR WATER QUALITY TESTING**

The Chair indicated that he has not had an opportunity to draft the correspondence to BWAC and DLAB.

#### **7.0 BWAC AND LAKE MAJOR WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD APPROVED MINUTES**

In addition to the November 10, 1999 approved BWAC minutes circulated with the agenda, the Clerk distributed at the meeting their December 8, 1999 approved minutes.

The Chair noted reference in the December 8<sup>th</sup> minutes to the Bedford Basin acid slate site and concerns re Paper Mill Lake.

Copies of the Lake Major Watershed Advisory Board minutes, together with various attachments, were circulated in the agenda package.

**8.0 STATUS SHEET**

It was noted that there are a number of items on the Status Sheet requiring attention. It will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**9.0 MEETING SCHEDULE - HEARINGS & PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The Clerk provided copies of the most recent meeting schedule.

**10.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is Wednesday, February 16, 2000 at 6:30 p.m.

**11.0 ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m. on motion of Mr. Williams.

Dr. Wayne Stobo  
Chair

Lynne Le Boutillier  
Assistant Municipal Clerk

(march1/2000)

To do: Scott Yetman requested a copy of the recommendations on Hemlock Estates Proposal to 15 Park Street, 469-6380.