

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD

MAY 17, 2000

MINUTES

PRESENT: Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair
Mr. David Dwyer
Mr. Chris Booth
Mr. Walter Regan
Mr. Peter Shacklock
Mr. Ross Evans
Mr. Glen Williams
Mr. Frank Hope
Mr. Mack McMenemy
Mr. Shalom Mandaville
Mr. Lawrence White
Mr. Kyle McKenzie

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Roger Wells, Planner
Ms. Shelley Dickey, Planner
Mr. Paul Morgan, Planner
Ms. Sandra Shute, Assistant Municipal Clerk

REGRETS: Mr. Keith Manchester, Ms. Colleen McNeil and Mr. Jim Holmes

GUESTS: Mr. Bob Kerr and Mr. Doug Murray, BWAC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Approval of Agenda 3

2.0 Approval of Minutes 3

3.0 Business Arising from Minutes

 3.1 Case 00222 - Development Agreement to Permit a Commercial Garage
 Cow Bay 9

 3.2 Western Common Recommendations 11 - 15

 3.8 Tree Cutting 17

 3.10 Alum in Treatment Plants 17

 3.11 Princes Lodge Master Plan Area Presentation 6 - 9

 3.12 Substantial Amendment to Development Agreement Fall River Plaza,
 Highway 2 9 & 10

 3.14 McIntosh Water Quality 18

 3.15 Case 00209 Shad Bay Development Agreement to Permit Tourist Cottages
 Shad Bay 10 & 11

4.0 New Business

 4.1 Musquodoboit Harbour Sobeys 3 - 6

 4.6 Meeting Procedures 15 - 17

5.0 Concept Plans 18

6.0 Subcommittee

 6.1 Subcommittee on Parameters for Water Quality Testing - Awaiting
 Response to Correspondence 18

7.0 BWAC Approved Minutes 18

8.0 Status Sheet 18

9.0 Meeting Schedule
 Hearings & Planning Advisory Committee 18

10.0 Date of Next Meeting 18

11.0 Adjournment 18

Meeting convened at 6:35 p.m., Board Room 1, 2750 Dutch Village Road.

1.0 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Item 4.2 - Monarch Estates Application taken off agenda.

Item 4.1 - Musquodoboit Sobeys and Item 3.11 - Princes Lodge Master Plan were moved up on the agenda.

Added:

- Items 4.5 - East Pepeswick Golf Course
- 4.6 - Meeting Procedures
- 4.7 - Information Item - BWAC
- 4.8 - Report on DFO Meeting - David Dwyer

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

2.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The following changes were made to the minutes:

Page 4 - 7th and 8th line - Change 'remove' to 'reduce' and insert 'removing' between 'as' and 'bacteria'.

Pages 5 & 9 - Reference to 'The Soil and Water Conservation Society' should be changed to 'The Soil & Water Conservation Society of Metro Halifax'.

Page 10, 4th paragraph - Change 'allotrophic' to 'oligotrophic'.

Page 11, 3rd paragraph, last sentence to be relocated to the second paragraph, last sentence.

The minutes of the April 19, 2000 meeting were adopted, as amended, on motion of Mr. Mandaville and Mr. Dwyer.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

4.1 **MUSQUODOBOIT HARBOUR SOBEYS**

Shelley Dickey, HRM Planner, Pat Martin, Sobeys, Rick Giffin and Willard D'Eon, CBCL were in attendance for this item.

Circulated with the agenda package was a memorandum from Ms. Dickey regarding the a Development Agreement to permit a 35,000 sq. ft. Sobeys store and 15,000 sq. ft. plaza.

A conceptual Grading & Services Plan and Erosion & Sediment Control Plan were also included, together with CBCL's March 2000 report entitled "Outline Specification - Site Grading, Services and Environmental Protection". Staff was seeking the Board's input with respect to the potential impact of the development on the fresh and marine water systems of Musquodoboit Harbour.

Ms. Dickey reviewed with the members the memorandum she had sent the Board. Ms. Dickey noted that a Public Information Meeting has been already held in the community. Reference was made to a policy contained in the Eastern Shore (West) Planning Area, ie. any commercial use in this zone is permitted as-of-right up to 5,000 sq. ft. Since this development is 50,000 sq. ft., it can proceed only via the development agreement process. Ms. Dickey quoted the general policy criteria.

There being no questions following Ms. Dickey's presentation, the representatives of the proponent were invited to address the Board. The Chair asked them to restrict their comments to watershed issues.

Pat Martin introduced Rick Giffin, CBCL, who discussed with the Board stormwater management. In his presentation, he noted the following:

- All the stormwater is to be collected in a series of catch basins and brought to two stormceptors.
- Roof water will be directed to an infiltration trench for groundwater recharge.
- A hydrological analysis is being done of the watersheds, before and after the development. The brook below the site will be used for testing purposes. Both flows into the wetland and out will be assessed. A theoretical model will be used.

Mr. Regan referred to reference to 'existing ditches' identified on the maps provided. It was confirmed by Mr. Giffin that one of these was in fact a watercourse. Questions were also posed regarding why the stormwater is not being directed into the engineered wetland. It was explained that this engineered wetland was not designed for stormwater purposes, as they did not feel the project would have a large impact on the quality of stormwater runoff.

Mr. Dwyer felt that confusion is caused by a misunderstanding of the topography of the area. He referred to the lack of contour lines on the maps. He explained the topography of the area, using the map Ms. Dickey had displayed. He confirmed that all the drainage from the site goes through the natural wetland before it enters the Pepeswick Inlet.

Mr. Regan questioned what the classification of the natural wetland was that the project will be discharging into. Mr. Giffin noted this is being looked into. Mr. Regan noted that any wetland classified above 60 must be protected at all cost. He would like to see a study of

the effect of dumping stormwater and added nutrients into it. He outlined the rules associated with registering for an undertaking under the Environmental Act.

Glen Williams posed a question regarding soils in the area. He was advised that a geotechnical report has yet to be acquired. The Board would like to see this information when available.

Mr. Dwyer noted that there are rumors that there may be some potential pollution problems associated with a former Esso station. The Board was assured that Esso has committed to cleaning up the site. Clean-up will be commenced shortly.

Referring to snow and ice control, the Board was advised that Sobeys uses a predominantly sand mixture.

Mr. Regan indicated that he was pleased to see the infiltration trenches and stormceptors proposed which will likely set a standard.

The Chair referred to the swales. He noted they are referred to as 'undisturbed' in the documentation. It is anticipated that a ditch will be used in conjunction with them. A landscaped or grassed ditch is planned. Whether it will be kept natural is not yet known. If it goes wild, it would slow up water flow, the Chair noted. This was not necessary good or bad. A rock filled ditch would not slow down water flow and it does not have a cleansing role.

A question was posed re snow removal. Mr. Regan was afraid it might be trucked off site and dumped illegally into a water course. He was assured that typically snow is stored on site, due to the costs associated with trucking it away. If stored within the paved area, as it melts, the runoff would be directed through the stormceptors. It was requested that this be confirmed to the Board.

Mr. Willard D'Eon addressed the subject of sewage treatment. He noted that it is being proposed that waste water will be treated. Of the three systems available, the recirculating sand filter is presently favoured. He explained how the system works, which also utilizes a single pass filter bed. A higher quality of effluent is expected from a recirculating sand filter. He explained that the bigger the body of water the effluent is discharged into, the better. Environmental standards are much stricter for discharge into a brook versus the ocean, for example. He referred to the system used by the hospital versus what is being proposed in this instance. In this instance they can't discharge into the Inlet, as it is too far away. Rather than discharging to the natural wetland, they are proposing discharging to an artificial wetland. He noted that the discharge would be spread-out over 300 feet, go through the wetland and enter the brook. It was noted that the small brook has a fairly good flow. Prior to discharge into the artificial wetland, there will

be chlorination to meet Department of Environment requirements. They will also de-chlorinate. The system is separate from the stormwater system. While the stormwater would be helpful in diluting the sewage, there can be a negative impact to increasing flow into the wetland. As planned, the artificial wetland would not be impacted by major rain events.

Mr. Mandaville posed a question regarding what type of phosphorus they anticipated before the effluent enters the constructed wetland. Mr. D'Eon did not have the information with him to answer this question, but the filters will remove phosphorus. Mr. Mandaville indicated that he liked the contour trench design.

Mr. D'Eon noted that it is the intent to use local vegetation in association with the constructed wetland. Reference was made to the fact that there are two different types of engineered wetlands, the other being an open surface wetland. A subsurface wetland is being proposed on this site. In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. D'Eon listed some of the substances the filters will remove.

Questions were posed by Mr. Regan regarding grease pits. He was assured that the grease would be physically removed from the food preparation areas or treated on site.

Mr. Regan questioned whether the three existing buildings, including a church, on the plan would be hooked up to the sewage system. The Board was advised that the owner of two of the buildings, who is encountering problems, has requested that they be hooked into the system. Sobeys has asked the consultant to look into this. Negotiations would be required between the owner and Sobeys, once it is determined whether the system would have to be up-sized to accommodate them. Mr. D'Eon did not know what facilities were associated with the church, which is infrequently used.

In response to a query from Mr. Regan, he was advised that a tertiary level of treatment is proposed for the plant.

Mr. Regan asked that information be provided on the recirculating type of filter identified for this project and de-chlorinator via the Clerk's Office, through the Assistant Municipal Clerk.

Referring to the reference of using vegetation from the natural wetland in conjunction with the artificial wetland, Mr. Regan questioned if any permits are required. Mr. D'Eon was not aware of such a requirement, but when the classification of the wetland is looked into, this can be addressed.

In closing, the Chair noted that the Board will formulate its recommendations in due course. The draft will be reviewed at the June meeting.

Mr. Dwyer volunteered to draft the recommendations pertaining to Sobeys. The Chair will help him. The Clerk will provide Mr. Dwyer with an extract from the draft minutes.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

3.11 **PRINCES LODGE MASTER PLAN AREA PRESENTATION**

Circulated at the meeting by the Chair were the draft recommendations pertaining to the Princes Lodge Master Plan Area. Members of BWAC were in attendance, as the area also falls within their area of jurisdiction. The Chairman reviewed his recommendations, noting that the preamble contains statements from earlier recommendations pertaining to Royale Hemlock Estates. He felt concerns associated with Hemlock Ravine Park still apply since the master concept plan includes the Kimberley Lloyd development.

The only change to the preamble related to a typographical error in the last paragraph, fourth to last line. Remove the first 'towards the'.

Referring to item 9, Mr. Regan felt that wording was not strong enough and HRM should not allow the development to proceed until the sewage treatment plants are in place. This item was subsequently changed to this effect. Reference will be included that the sewage does not go directly into Bedford Basin, but via the Duffus Street pumping station at the Narrows.

It was proposed by Mr. Murray of BWAC that it be recommended that the developer(s) be required to provide sewage treatment facilities. The Chair explained how it is done is beyond the Board's mandate but what should be done is within the Board's prerogative to recommend.

A question was posed to Mr. Roger Wells regarding whether priorities have been established for construction of the sewage treatment plants. He did not know if these priorities have yet been determined, but referred to the Herring Cove site being high on the list. Another site is located next to Maritime Command, which will likely process effluent from this development and all of Mainland North. Problems are being encountered locating a site near the Halterm Terminal. Sandy Cove, adjacent the Coast Guard lands, will be location of the sewage treatment plant for the Dartmouth side.

Roger Wells was asked to update the Board on the Royale Hemlocks process. He

referred the question to Mr. Morgan. Mr. Morgan reviewed with the Board what has transpired since the Public Hearing, specifically noting that a hydrologist has been engaged. His update also made reference to cost sharing agreements and an appeal of the decision by the Friends of Hemlock Ravine, which was eventually withdrawn after negotiations with Kimberley Lloyd. Part of the agreement was that the developer would follow the recommendation of the Board in its entirety, including engaging a hydro geologist to do an assessment. At a meeting with the Department of Environment, it was noted that Jacques Whitford has been retained for this purpose. They are preparing the proposed assessment plan. A draft has already been prepared for the Department of Environment for review. He understood the Department of Environment were not satisfied with this plan.

Given the Royale Hemlocks development has been approved, the Chair noted that a recommendation against allowing the project to proceed, will not affect the Royale Hemlocks development portion.

Referring to point 2, Mr. Regan wanted reference to fish surveys included after the reference to an Environmental Assessment. The Board agreed.

Mr. Regan also thought a water quality survey should be included in the recommendation. There are some houses in the Fernleigh Subdivision which take water directly from a pond. It was subsequently agreed that a new recommendation would be included, ie. water quality testing, pre and post construction, for suspended solids and total phosphorous (to be measured to the minimum accuracy to at least one microgram per liter). Frequency of testing to be specified, i.e. monthly starting a year pre-construction to a year post construction. Samplings to be taken where streams exit the site. It was recognized this would not take into account the pond which is a source of drinking water. Reference to be made to the NSDOE definitions to determine which water bodies and courses should be sampled. The recommendation would be second to last.

The Chair will prepare the redraft of the recommendations.

Mr. Kerr briefed the Board on what had happened at the last BWAC meeting when Jenifer Tsang made a presentation. As there was not enough time to devote to this item on the regular agenda, it is proposed that a special meeting be held devoted to this one item. He noted that it appears the plan is to have an MPS which covers both areas under the jurisdiction of BWAC and the Board. No plans for future impervious areas were displayed at this meeting. Mr. Kerr felt they needed more details on the actual developments proposed. He noted that concerns pertaining to sewage treatment were also raised. He referred to the limited capacity at Mill Cove. Referring to a situation at Paper Mill Lake, which has elevated coliform counts, he cautioned that clauses pertaining to testing, have to be worded very carefully regarding frequency of testing. He noted that NWCC, at its last

meeting, passed a motion that the portion of the Master Plan falling within the former Town of Bedford must conform with the Bedford MPS.

The Chair stressed that this is only a concept plan and details are to come back to the Board for review.

Mr. Kerr indicated BWAC's desire to work closely with the Halifax/Halifax County Watershed Advisory Board on this concept. The Chair indicated that a copy of the recommendations will be forwarded to BWAC.

The Chair was questioned whether it has been stated somewhere in the recommendations that the Board would like to see the tightest rules associated with the two MPSs applied. The Chair noted that no reference is made to the MPSs. He noted that the Board has not addressed the overall Planning Strategy, but limited comment to watershed issues. He referred to BWAC's terms of reference being broader than the Boards.

Mr. Mandaville suggested that fecal coliforms be added to the variables. He noted that a quarter of the watershed drains into Kearney Lake, which has heavy recreational use.

Before departing, Mr. Kerr provided copies of BWAC's environmental statement and solicited any comments the Board might have.

3.1 **CASE 00222 - DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO PERMIT A COMMERCIAL GARAGE COW BAY**

A draft recommendation prepared by Mr. Haley was circulated in the agenda package. Comments and concerns on the draft were solicited by the Chair.

The following changes were identified:

- 4th paragraph, 1st sentence - replace 'without the opportunity for review and that staff may' with 'prior to any review and the Board recommends that HRM staff should....'.
- 2nd paragraph - Replace HM/HC with 'Halifax/Halifax County'

A sixth recommendation was added. 'The proposed extension respect the 15 meter undisturbed buffer zone adjacent to all watercourses, as recommended in the Halifax/Halifax County Watershed Advisory Board's Guidelines.'

There was consensus that the Chair make the changes and the recommendations be forwarded on.

3.12 SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FALL RIVER PLAZA, HIGHWAY 2

Circulated at the meeting were recommendations drafted by Glen Williams.

Before commencing the review, the Chair noted that Mr. Manchester had observed cleaning out of the catch basins in May. The stormceptors did not appear clogged, with relatively low sediment.

In giving background to his recommendations, Mr. Williams indicated that he had used portions of the letter from Angus Schaffenburg, the Planner associated with this case. He felt the letter from MEC Engineering on stormceptors, previously circulated, had really covered this aspect, so a lot of detail was not required. Referring to the rest of the site, he felt that Kirby Thompson of MEC Engineering covered the problems associated with the expansion.

Referring to a previous letter pertaining to the effect of water consumption on Lake Thomas, it had been indicated that over a 6 month period it had dropped 2 cm. He was not sure which six month period they had tested over. If it was for fall, winter, spring, the natural flow from Lake William to Lake Thomas is quite high compared to June to October, when the water level drops substantially.

During the review of the draft, the following changes to the recommendations were suggested:

Heading should be changed to Halifax/Halifax County Watershed Advisory Board.

Recommendation 3:

- End of first sentence - replace "the water system" with "Lake Thomas".
- Add clause to end of last sentence "and disposal of removed sediment should occur in accordance with the regulations of the authorities having jurisdiction.

A discussion followed on the wording of Recommendation 2. It evolved into a discussion of not only monitoring waterflow off the site but conducting a study to see how well stormceptors work. Mr. Mandaville reflected that it is quite possible that an arrangement can be made between the manufacturers of Stormceptor systems, Sobeys and MEC Engineering Limited to conduct such a study. While it is not really a HRM issue, the Chair felt a letter could be written to Sobeys encouraging them to conduct such a study.

Recommendation 2 to be modified to make reference to:

- a suggestion that a manhole be installed in the infiltration trench.
- water samples be tested for the various elements from the infiltration trench.

Glen Williams will redraft and send to the Chair.

Roger Wells referred to a presentation by the manufacturer of the Stormceptor Systems to HRM. Gary Porter has advised that this individual is willing to give a presentation to the Board. The Chair felt this would be a good idea, time permitting.

3.15 **CASE 00209 SHAD BAY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO PERMIT TOURIST COTTAGES, SHAD BAY**

A second draft of the Shad Bay recommendations was circulated.

Recommendation 1 was changed to “within” 30 metres of the shoreline.

Recommendation 2 was changed to refer to a tertiary rated sand filter system be installed and the addition of the clause “certified wastewater treatment operator”.

A third (3rd) recommendation was added that the site be left as natural as possible.

The Chair will redraft.

3.2 **WESTERN COMMON**

Circulated at the meeting were recommendations from the Soil & Water Conservation Society of Metro Halifax regarding the Western Common. The disk was provided to Mr. Shacklock, who had volunteered to draft recommendations on behalf of the Board. Mr. Mandaville noted that contrary to his earlier statement, the group is no longer opposed to development. He referred to the Society’s terms of reference indicating that they should not oppose development outright. He reviewed the two parts of the recommendations.

Reflecting on Society’s first recommendation referring to four lakes, the Chair questioned which ones would be in the future Wilderness area. Big Indian was identified by Mr. Mandaville.

The Chair questioned Mr. Mandaville on what would be done if the value in Big Indian Lake goes above 30% Carrying Capacity. It was suggested by Mr. Hope that development should only be approved provided that it can be demonstrated that the impact of development would not exceed these guidelines.

A discussion followed on setting a mean allowable Chlorophyll-a level in terms of the

carrying capacity of the lake and not allowing development unless it can be proven that it will not be affected negatively. The possibility of something offsite draining into the upstream lakes, Otter, Blueberry and Ragged and causing a problem was raised. The Chair noted that this has been a wilderness area and it will be a new step for HRM if Recommendation 1 is adopted. It was suggested by Mr. McMenemy that if there is no objection to the recommendations, it be included in Mr. Shacklock's recommendation, which will come before the Board again at the next meeting. There was consensus that the recommendation be included in the draft. Since there was a procedure/methodology to be followed with respect to this recommendation, an appendix will be added.

Referring to Recommendation 2.1, there was consensus to include it, but add suggestions on how they might accomplish, i.e. engineered wetlands, some kind of precipitation method/procedure.

Referring to the 100-150 metre setback, it was emphasized that the setback is only for lakes not streams.

Mr. Morgan reflected that while these recommendations might not fit into the MPS policies, they would fit more into the community plan which emanates from these policies. He noted that since these are public lands, asking for a set back of 100-150 metres would be more feasible than if they were privately owned. It has to be recognized that if the HRM decides to sell these lands, they would have to sell them for less with this requirement.

The Chair stressed that even if the developments are fully serviced, in order to keep Chlorophyll-a levels down, you will still have to have major buffer zones around every one of these water bodies and the streams to achieve this goal. He felt an associated recommendation should be made recommending buffer zones around all water bodies and streams. During the subsequent discussions, Mr. Regan noted that the buffer zone to heritage rivers has been specified as 1000 ft. This standard is used by Environment Canada. Mr. Regan felt such a buffer in the Wilderness Park was realistic.

There was consensus that since no development is proposed but possibly walking/recreational trails in the Wilderness Park for passive recreation, there would be no need for reference to distance.

The proposed development area adjacent to Big Indian Lake is indicated to be closer than 300 metres. It was noted that a portion of the RB-1 area has already been developed as a golf course.

Mr. Morgan referred to Mr. Regan's desire to have a fish ladder installed at the end of Big Indian Lake.

Reference was made to Nichols Lake and Otter Lake parks. Whether camping is allowed in these areas was questioned. Mr. Morgan felt it is intended that they be more community parks. Soccer fields and ball fields are proposed for around Nichols Park and associated washroom facilities.

Mr. Hope felt a differentiation between wilderness and parkland was intended with respect to planning. He referred to the boat launch for non-motorized boats for Nichols Lake. He felt the setbacks should be specific to wilderness or park lands.

By consensus, the suggestion for the wilderness area was accepted as defined i.e. there be no development other than passive recreational trails or conservation related uses, which would potentially provide for fish ladders.

Mr. Dwyer referred to lengthy discussions related to the development of a National Park. He suggested what has been done before should be researched. Mr. Hope did not feel the Board had to be concerned about precise definitions.

Paul Morgan referred to a meeting where the attendees were asked if they were interesting in forming a Stewardship Committee. Twenty (20) people signed up. It is hoped that the Stewardship Committee will make recommendations, particularly in terms of the activities, i.e. all terrain vehicles, camping, etc. which will be permitted in the Wilderness Area. He hoped the Board would be able to give some guidance re good practices.

The Chair proposed drafting wording at a subsequent meeting, which essentially says minimal use or use restricted to passive paths, for example. The Stewardship Committee could refine even more. He encouraged the members to keep discussions confined to the concept at this time.

The Chair referred to an active recreational area designated between Otter and Blueberry Lake. He wondered if any one had a problem with this. He proposed that given that this development area edges close to Otter Lake, a substantial buffer should occur between these active recreational areas and the water bodies. It was suggested that a 150 metre buffer be applied. The Chair estimated that half of the active recreational area by Blueberry Lake would be lost, but he no particular problem with it. He referred to the wilderness designation around Ragged Lake, in the order of 100 to 200 metres. It was cautioned by Mr. Morgan that this is only a concept plan and the consultants were not thinking in terms of feet.

It was felt that it was simply an oversight by the consultants not to draw in a buffer around Blueberry Lake.

Mr. Hope proposed the setbacks be established according to the activity, i.e.:

- Active recreation - 50 metres
- Parkland- 150 metres
- Wilderness - 300 metres

The Chair questioned whether Otter Lake was in a subsystem separate from the other lakes. If there is less interchange with this lake and Nichols Lake, perhaps beaches and development be done on the lakes divorced from the rest, thus protecting the rest which are connected. It was noted that since Nichols Lake is at the lower end of the system, any development would have no effect on Blueberry, Ragged or Big Indian. He proposed if public access was desired for beaches, etc., Nichols Lake would be the best place. He concluded it could be recommended that public access in the Nichols Lake area would have minimum effect on most of the other lakes, therefore the Board suggests development occur there, rather than around Ragged and Blueberry Lakes as suggested in the concept plan.

Mr. Hope did not feel the Board should be determining land use, but simply looking at proposed land use and determining what protection we need to give the water bodies. In this case, the Chair felt deliberations should be confined to the size of buffer zones. Mr. Hope noted that the groups he is involved with are seeking guidance from the Board on the buffer zones to be recommended for these applications. The Chair argued that although Ragged Lake has been zoned Industrial, Mr. Morgan has noted no development has taken place, therefore there is no reason to say that in order to retain the integrity of Big Indian Lake, you are better off protecting Ragged and Blueberry Lakes. If deterioration occurs in Nichols Lake, it would have minimal effect on the others three lakes. Deterioration of Ragged or Blueberry Lakes will effect the rest.

Mr. Wells questioned the status of the report which went to Council produced by EDM, with input from committees over a five year period. Mr. Morgan noted that Council has requested that staff come back with policies and implementation strategies. He cautioned that if the Board suggests the concept plan is all wrong, the process will be back to square one. The Chair questioned if the process is so far gone that the Board should limit its recommendations to proposals to try to mitigate degradation of the lakes or is the Board in a situation to be more radical as stated above, i.e the concept plan makes the water system much more vulnerable than another proposal would.

Mr. Morgan reflected that much of the lands will remain undeveloped. The majority of the development is proposed around Ragged and Blueberry Lakes because central sewer and water services can be extended there. It would be difficult to extend down to Nichols Lake. The residents along Prospect Road would be concerned if any additional traffic were added to the Road. Mr. Evans recalled that one of the reasons for the interchange at

the landfill site was to provide access to parks, etc.

Dr. Stobo concluded that the plan can be modified to some extent but not radically. Mr. Hope noted that Councillor Mitchell anticipates Council debating approval of the plan, July 4th.

The Board concentrated its efforts on determining how big the buffers they will recommend around the various areas. Dr. Stobo summarized the following:

- 150 metre buffer around the upper lakes
- no development in Wilderness Area
- for areas identified for active recreational - 50 metres.

Mr. Morgan pointed out the developed portion of the site essentially being a community around Ragged Lake and Blueberry Lake. He reflected on tonight's comments indicating that if this area is not handled properly, quite a negative impact on the system will result. He felt Mr. Mandaville's comments on modeling would be very relevant in the more detailed planning exercise. He noted an area designated for unserviced residential development bordering Highway 333 between Big Indian Lake and Nichols Lake.

The Chair noted that if a 100 metre buffer zone was recommended around water bodies and watercourses, the conceptual plan almost has this, even in the unserviced residential. The only area of potential impact, if it is not a drafting mistake, is a section of Blueberry Lake. The conceptual plan allows for 100 metres around most of water bodies. The two park areas would be excluded from the buffer.

The Chair summarized:

- A 100 metre minimum buffer around watercourses and water bodies (just about covered off in the proposal).
- Two areas proposed for park lands - 50 metres. Minimal development in this area adjacent the lakes in the designated park areas/no facility development.
- Areas with septic systems require a 100 to 150 metre setback.

Mr. Wells questioned whether this would mean no golf course? There is one already established, but he was thinking in the instance of an application for another, as a proposed land use. Mr. Hope indicated there is no consideration at this time of turning over any of the wilderness area for another golf course.

A discussion followed on what the various active recreational areas are slated for. Mr.

Morgan noted that the area adjacent Otter Lake, was designated as a possible golf course by the consultants, but the Steering Committee did not know if this was the best place for a golf course and decided to include a residential and business campus. Before anything is concluded, a more detailed planning study was required.

Mr. Hope sought direction on the buffer in the Wilderness areas. The Chair proposed even passive recreational paths not occur within 15 metres of the lakeshore. Rather than a distance, it was suggested that any activity around the lake should be kept to a minimum in the Wilderness area. There was consensus.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS (cont'd)**

4.6 **MEETING PROCEDURES**

As it was 10:20 p.m, the Chair proposed the rest of the agenda be deferred to June.

The Chair noted that the reason for the meetings being so long is because of the length of the agendas, partly due to the geographical area and the magnitude of advice. He felt some adjustment must be made. He proposed going back to the HRM and saying the Board took on the area of responsibility as an interim measure. At the time the Board had been assured that the ad hoc advisory committee would review and rationalize the boundaries and jurisdictions of watershed advisory boards. This has not happened and the Board can no longer provide timely advise. Either HRM accepts the delay in receiving advice or realigns responsibilities of watershed boards. He did not think it is fair to staff or the volunteers to spend 5 or 6 hours per meeting, especially with no refreshments provided.

Discussions related to:

- A reduction in the amount of paper circulated on a monthly basis is needed.
- The Board getting bogged down with long discussions.
- Whether or not the Board should look at concept plans, such as the Western Common.
- Process - Proposals initially brought the Board by the Planner(s) associated with them. The next meeting the proponent presents. Now the Planner and developer come in to present at the same time. It had been initially a three meeting process, now compressed into two meetings. This places a larger load on the Board. It was suggested that it may be necessary to revert back to the original process.

- Things are being seen two or three times. Concern was expressed that burnout will result.
- The Terms of Reference - It was suggested that developments such as a Sobeys will not have that much impact on water bodies, but areas such as the Western Common, in the conceptual stage, have more potential to affect the water quality. The Board should deal with the big picture and become involved at the early stage.
- Should the Board be dealing with individual residences? The Chair noted the Board's mandate is to advise on watershed not water quality and the magnitude of development does not necessarily change the impact on the watershed.
- The size of the geographical area. Perhaps the Board should alert HRM that you can't expect a single group to cover that large of area.
- Setting up subcommittees - It is not within the mandate of the Board to do. Only HRM can partition portions off to other groups.

Mr. Wells referred to the value added that such boards give to the Municipality and the development community in terms of environmental protection mechanisms. He noted that only a few years ago stormceptors, infiltration trenches and engineered wetlands were unheard of and this might still be the case, if it had not been for the expertise of the volunteer boards. He speculated that in future the Board may receive less applications, as its mandate is being fulfilled in practice and instead information reports will be forwarded for the Board's attention.

Referring the size of the agendas, Mr. Wells felt this is a topic which should be addressed at the staff level to determine alternatives. A subcommittee may be struck to deal with this item.

It was suggested that the proponents be given a list of questions before their presentations, so they come prepared. The Chair suggested that this was essentially the situation before the process got shortened. Where the pressure came from to reduce the length of process was discussed in association with the flow chart. Mr. Wells concluded that for a developer to be tied up for three meetings is an incredible length of time to wait for a recommendation from an advisory committee. He proposed that if the three steps are required, perhaps the recommendations could be drafted by the second meeting with the developer, having met with the Planner at the first meeting. The Chair noted that while the recommendations are currently only approved at the second or third meeting, the Planner would have them sometime prior to the meeting at which they were adopted.

Mr. Mandaville noted the Board does have the power to set up subcommittees. He also

referred to the role of the Department of Environment with respect to small development. Since the majority of the members are associated with other environmental groups, if issues come up in their particular area, the member could take the item to a meeting of the group for a recommendation.

The Chair felt that it is essential for effectiveness that the community groups report to HRM. The difficulties of creating sub-groups to consistently deal with problems and questions was debated at length. It was felt that it would be very difficult to create such groups. Mr. Wells summarized that the whole public participation program is issue driven right now. He felt that the simplest solution to cut down on workload would be to split the area in two. Or alternatively, if the mandates of the other two groups were expanded.

This item will have to be pursued further.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING** (cont'd)

3.8 **TREE CUTTING**

Mr. Regan assured the members that the draft document has been drafted.

3.10 **ALUM IN TREATMENT PLANTS**

The Clerk circulated information from Mr. Holmes entitled "Overview of Alum in Drinking Water Treatment and Sewage Treatment".

3.14 **MCINTOSH RUN WATER QUALITY**

Peter Shacklock circulated to the members his findings entitled "Roach's Pond Sewage Pumping Station Overflow Studies - 1999".

5.0 **CONCEPT PLANS**

Nil.

6.0 **SUBCOMMITTEE**

6.1 **SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARAMETERS FOR WATER QUALITY TESTING -
AWAITING RESPONSE TO CORRESPONDENCE FROM DLAB AND BWAC**

Nil.

7.0 **BWAC APPROVED MINUTES**

April 12, 2000 approved minutes circulated at the meeting.

8.0 **STATUS SHEET**

May status sheet circulated with agenda package.

9.0 **MEETING SCHEDULE**

HEARINGS & PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Schedule dated May 4th circulated for the members information.

10.0 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting is Wednesday, June 21, 2000.

11.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Dr. Wayne Stobo
Chair

Sandra Shute
Assistant Municipal Clerk