

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**

---

**HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD**

**JULY 19, 2000**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair  
Mr. David Dwyer  
Ms. Colleen McNeil  
Mr. Walter Regan  
Mr. Mack McMenemy  
Mr. Peter Shacklock  
Mr. Frank Hope  
Mr. Shalom Mandaville  
Mr. Jim Holmes  
Mr. Ross Evans  
Mr. David Haley  
Mr. Kyle McKenzie

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Gary Porter, Planner  
Mr. Andrew Whittemore, Planner  
Ms. Lynne Le Boutillier, Assistant Municipal Clerk

**REGRETS:** Keith Manchester, Chris Booth, Glen Williams

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0 Approval of Agenda, Additions and Deletions ..... 3

2.0 Approval of Minutes ..... 3

3.0 Business Arising from Minutes

    3.1 Golf Course - East Petpeswick ..... 4

    3.2 Western Common ..... 14 & 15

    3.3 Performance Bond Requirement Development Agreement ..... 15

    3.4 Pollution Prevention Program ..... 15

    3.5 Princes Lodge Master Plan Area Presentation ..... 15

    3.6 Substantial Amendment to Development Agreement Fall River Plaza - Update  
    Mr. Williams on Hydro Seeding ..... 16

    3.7 Glen Arbour- Data and Tabulations ..... 16

    3.8 McIntosh Run Water Quality ..... 16

    3.9 Sandy Lake, Hammonds Plains ..... 16

    3.10 Musquodoboit Harbour Sobeys ..... 17

    3.11 Meeting Procedures ..... 17

    3.12 Clarification of Dr. Strain's Paper ..... 17

    3.13 Tree Cutting ..... 3 & 4

4.0 New Business

    4.1 Case #00208: Request for an amendment to the MPS and Land Use By-law  
    for Planning District 4 - Terence Bay (Fish Plant) ..... 4 - 9

    4.2 Professional Credibility ..... 17

    4.3 Application - Stradbrook Properties Ltd. .... 17

    4.4 Case #00071 - Request by Annapolis Basin Limited to Amend the MPS for  
    Beaver Bank, Hammonds Plains and Upper Sackville to permit Townhouse and  
    Multiple Dwelling Uses on an Onsite Contour Sewage System within the Glen  
    Arbour Golf Course and Residential Community ..... 10 - 14

    4.5 Lockview Road ..... 17

    4.6 Format of Reports ..... 18

5.0 Concept Plans ..... 18

6.0 Subcommittee

    6.1 Parameters of Water Quality Testing ..... 18

7.0 BWAC Approved Minutes ..... 18

8.0 Status Sheet ..... 18 & 19

9.0 Meeting Schedule ..... 19

10.0 Information Items

    10.1 Treatment Levels in Sewage Treatment Plants ..... 19

    10.2 The Proper Scientific Way an STP has to be Assessed Prior to (Not After) an  
    STP is approved ..... 19

11.0 Date of Next Meeting ..... 19

12.0 Adjournment ..... 19



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

It was requested by Mr. Dwyer that item 3.13 - Tree Cutting be added to the agenda under Business Arising.

With the agreement of the Board this item and item 4.1 - Case 00208 - Terence Bay - Request for an amendment to the MPS and Land Use By-law for Planning District 4 (Prospect) and item 4.4 - Case #00071 - Request by Annapolis Basin Limited to amend the MPS for Beaver Bank, Hammonds Plains and Upper Sackville (Glen Arbour) were moved up on the agenda.

2.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of June 21, 2000 meeting were approved, as circulated, on motion of Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Mandaville.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

3.13 **TREE CUTTING**

Mr. Dwyer reviewed with the Board two policies he has drafted with regard to tree cutting in rural areas. He noted that 90% of tree cutting in rural areas is for commercial purposes.

Policy I: No cutting of immature stands of lumber, specific species to be identified. Balsam Fir and White Spruce would not fall under this list, as they could be cut at any time. Mr. Dwyer defined a mature stand or group of trees to be those over 70 years of age or 7 inches in diameter at breast height. A permit would be required to cut a stand.

Policy II: Need to promote natural regeneration. In the event of an uneven age stand, selective cutting. No more than 30% of the stand to be cut. No block or strip wider than surrounding stands. An uneven stand, by definition, would have mature trees he noted.

Mr. Dwyer reflected that today almost all trees are marketable, ie. smaller ones will be turned into wood chips, for example.

Mr. Evans wondered how these policies would affect thinning. Mr. Dwyer, clarified that immature trees should not be cut except for thinning purposes..

Mr. Dwyer sought direction from the members on whether they felt it was worthwhile for him to fine-tune the policies.

A discussion followed on whether there was a need to define urban and rural. The Chair proposed that a definition defining woodland versus municipal properties might be more in order. Mr. Regan recalled that the idea was to initially divide the practices between urban core and non urban core.

The members felt this to be a reasonable approach to take for rural areas.

### **3.1 GOLF COURSE - EAST PETPESWICK**

In his update, Mr. Dwyer advised that he has spoken to Mr. Baker. Apparently they are awaiting delivery of topsoil and sods. He observed the culvert to be still plugged. Mr. Baker apparently contacted DOT and was advised that they would not clear the culvert, but when Mr. Baker offered to do it, they told him not to.

Mr. Porter advised that he has discussed the project with Cathy Spencer, the Development Officer for the area, and was advised Mr. Baker still has not applied for the required permits.

### **4.0 NEW BUSINESS**

#### **4.1 CASE #00208: REQUEST FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE MPS AND LAND USE BY-LAW FOR PLANNING DISTRICT 4 - TERENCE BAY (FISH PLANT)**

In attendance for this item were Councillor Jack Mitchell, Bruce Holland, General Manager and Tina Slaunwhite, Vice-Chair, Coastal Communities Economic Development Co-operative Limited, John Lam, Senior Environmental Engineer, ABL Environmental Consultants Ltd. and architect, David Garrett.

Circulated with the agenda package was a copy of a report which went to Regional Council, March 7, 2000 regarding this item, attaching a request from the Co-op to waive the required application fee/advertising deposit. The Planner originally associated with the case Maya Ray is on extended sick leave.

During his presentation to the Board, Mr. Holland referred to Coastal Communities Economic Development Co-operative's involvement in creating long term employment opportunities in the area. This is one of the sites identified as a business project. Circulated at the meeting were conceptual drawings prepared by Fowler Bauld & Mitchell Ltd. on the Northland Fisheries Project.

It was noted that it is intended to develop the site as a tourism centre, including a restaurant, office space, retail space, etc. in the original building which contains 10,000 sq. ft. per floor. Future plans would include development of a marina and 40 room inn in two or three years.

The on site sewage septic system has been designed to accommodate the needs of the expansion. The system has been designed so as not to discharge directly into the Harbour.

Before the presentation proceeded any further, the Chair indicated to the representatives the prime areas of concern of the Board, ie.:

- waste water treatment
- runoff from the parking lot
- aspects of potential pollution from marine operation
- erosion and sediment control plans during construction

Mr. Porter, HRM Planner introduced the item. He noted that the site is currently designated Mixed Use in the MPS for this area and zoned MU-1 in the Land Use By-law, which permits a resource use, such as the former fish plant. A MPS plan amendment is required to enable a development agreement to consider some of the uses proposed for this property. He indicated that usually an MPS amendment and Land Use By-law amendment are done first and then the development agreement is dealt with separately. Mr. Holland indicated that he was of the understanding that the zoning changes required to permit the development proposed would be done all at once.

Councillor Mitchell referred to the site bordering a HRM property, which already has a boat launch. He expressed his support for the Co-operative's initiatives in finding ways to give people employment opportunities.

John Lam, the engineer who designed the sewage disposal system, circulated to the members a package of materials on the proposed Sequencing Batch Reactor, illustrating how it functions and earlier installations. He noted that the system has been in use for many years and requires minimal operator intervention. The units are totally enclosed, require a small footprint for the building and produce effluent of a high quality, suitable for reuse. The sludge is trucked away on a regular basis. He referred to the requirement of the client that there be no direct outfall into the Harbour. While the effluent produced by the plant exceeds the requirements for a salt water environment, it will nevertheless be discharged into a percolation field, as an extra precautionary step. Operator support and training is provided by ABL Environmental or they can provide an operator on a contract basis. The control system is run through their computer system.

When the floor was opened to questions, Mr. Regan indicated a conflict of interest, as he was a good friend of Bruce Holland.

Questions were posed regarding the following:

- Level of treatment? 10 ml. per litre BOD and 10 ml. per litre suspended solids.
- Location of percolation field? Areas in the vicinity of the parking lot were identified by the proponents. It was anticipated that the field will take up very little room.

The Chair noted that the effluent will still be fairly high in nutrients, therefore the more distance the field is from the shoreline the better. Alternative locations were considered, such as the front of building, but it was observed this area is really no further from the shoreline. It would also be preferred that the site of the field not be in an area of heavy traffic. A green area, with access is preferable.

The Chair reflected that it would appear that most of the site's undeveloped surface will be impervious. He stressed maximizing the distance from the water.

- Average flow - 5,000 gallons a day. In the event the Inn is constructed, a slightly higher demand will be placed on the system, but Mr. Lam was confident the facility could handle.
- Mr. Mandaville reflected that the more pervious the soil, the faster effluent will reach the water.

He questioned the amount of phosphorus and nitrogen coming from the plant. Mr. Lam noted that it may be difficult to make estimates of the effluent as it reaches the water, but he should be able to provide figures on amounts of these elements leaving the plant. He noted that in other facilities, they have an extra step to reduce nutrients but it requires a larger plant. This process releases a significant portion of nitrogen in the form of gas. He will calculate nutrient load to determine if acceptable.

- Mr. Regan questioned whether it was possible to go to a tertiary level of treatment with this system. Mr. Lam indicated that the system was rated as advanced secondary treatment. He did not see the need to go to a tertiary level since the effluent is percolated through the ground. He did not feel adding a sand filter would provide any benefit.

- Referring to the proposed restaurant and inn, Mr. Regan questioned if a grease pit or discharge to the plant is being considered. Mr. Lam assured the Board that greases will be directed to a grease pit, not the plant.
- Mr. Regan questioned if there will be a sewage pumping facility for the boats. The members were advised there would be.
- Reference was made to drinking water and whether the building(s) will be sprinklered. The Board was assured that the site will be serviced by a well across the road, which has a history of providing more than enough water.
- When boats are being fueled, the proponents were questioned if any special systems will be in place in the event of a spill. The Board was assured that the facility will meet the standards of the Provincial and Federal Governments in this regard.
- Garbage and recycling for boats? Yes.
- The plant to require a certified sewage treatment operator? Mr. Holland indicated that it is their intention to have two maintenance persons on staff, trained to operate the facility. Mr. Lam noted that there will likely not be a need for a full time operator, but someone to check the plant everyday.
- Where would water from floor drains go? Mr. Garrett indicated any gray water would be directed to the treatment plant. Mr. Lam confirmed this would be the typical practice. Runoff from roofs and foundation drains should not be directed to the plant. Mr. Holland noted that the present roof drains empty directly into the Harbour.
- Mr. Regan questioned what is proposed for parking lot drainage. Mr. Garrett indicated that plans have not been developed to this level of detail yet. When the plans are done, they would meet the regulatory requirements.
- Where would the sludge be taken? Mr. Lam indicated it would be taken to a regional disposal facility, such as Aerotech.
- Has there been any soil testing of the site, for previous oil spills, for example? Mr. Holland confirmed a low level environmental assessment was done and there is no requirement for further testing.



- Will measures be taken to collect oil and grease off the parking lots, i.e. any plans to separate out? Mr. Garrett noted that the drainage systems have yet to be designed. He assumed it will be designed to drain into a holding area, not directly into the Harbour. The plans would meet regulatory requirements for runoff. It was suggested to the proponents that it would be a good idea to incorporate an oil separator(s). This is a routine recommendation of the Board, it was noted.

In closing, the Chair indicated to the proponents that the Board would normally develop their recommendations and approve them at the next meeting and they would then be forwarded to the applicant and associated planner, plus community council members.

Later when the Board returned to this item, to draft its recommendations, concern was expressed that the proponent had come to the Board unprepared. Many questions were left unanswered. It was suggested that the problem might stem from the fact that the plan was being brought to the Board at the conceptual stage. Mr. McMenemy expressed frustration at trying to make decent recommendations based on little detail.

In the event a plan is being brought to the Board, it was felt that the Planner should ensure the proponent is aware of what information the Board will desire. Mr. Porter agreed with this comment and noted that the process would be streamlined if this practice was adopted. Unfortunately in this case, renovations had begun without proper approvals, the planner assigned to the development has been on extended sick leave, and other staff were not familiar with the application. But due to the fact that the project had already begun, staff were trying to expedite the review process. He noted that the normal procedure would require a planning amendment and by-law amendment. This is done at the concept stage. Once these amendments are approved, an application for a development agreement would be made. At this stage more details are provided. There appears to be some misunderstanding by the proponent on the procedure normally followed.

Mr. McMenemy felt that this item should be set aside until the process is further along. Mr. Haley noted that there had been no overall objection to the proposal. It was suggested that the Board could give approval in principle. Once the details of the development proposal had been completed, the Board could formulate specific recommendations to mitigate degradation of the surrounding waterbody.

Nevertheless, Mr. McMenemy did not feel the Board should review and comment on concept plans. He felt the Board should be providing detailed recommendations on final development proposal plans, in which the proponent indicated the mitigation measures proposed for environmental issues. He did not feel it was the Board's function to try and provide detailed recommendations on development in cases where the details of the development proposal are not provided, as in this case. He proposed a motion to the

effect that the item be tabled and not commented on. Motion seconded by Mr. Mandaville. *After subsequent discussions and agreement that the Board would not develop specific recommendations based on the presentation, but would provide a copy of the minutes to the proponents to indicate the Board's discussion, this motion was withdrawn with the agreement of the mover and seconder.*

Mr. Regan questioned whether there will be another opportunity for the Board to comment. Mr. Porter, if his interpretation of the process was correct, indicated that the proposal would come before the Board when they applied for a development agreement.

The members questioned the time frame for this development. Mr. Porter noted that the project in part had proceeded without a permit.

The Board recognized that Coastal Communities Economic Development Co-operative Limited is a non-profit organization and as such has limited funds to engage professionals. It was also noted that the project has already started. Not commenting at this stage may cause further delays. If a recommendation is not appropriate, the Chair suggested an extract from the draft minutes be forwarded, which would capture the various questions and comments of the Board related to the aspects of the development presented.

A discussion followed on the various options for dealing with this matter. Concern was expressed that if the Board does not provide some guidance, down the road the Co-op might find itself having to correct or address an oversight they had not budgeted for.

It was suggested by Ms. McNeil that the draft minutes be forwarded to Mr. Holland. The accompanying letter will explain that the Board did not feel it had enough information to make any recommendations. Once responses are obtained to the questions recorded in minutes, the recommendations will be drafted.

Two additional questions pertaining to this project, for which answers would be required, were raised.

- Is there a shell fish industry near the discharge?
- Will they be using pressure treated wood in the marina facilities?

It was suggested that the Board to develop a check list of questions to be provided to any developer by the Planning Department. The proposed checklist could be used by the developer, so they will know that the Board expects them to focus on watershed and water quality issues, not the general attributes of the development. It was noted that Mr. Regan's list of questions may provide a first draft of that checklist. It was also suggested that the subject of acid rock should be included in this check list. (See Item 3.8).

4.4 **CASE #00071 - REQUEST BY ANNAPOLIS BASIN LIMITED TO AMEND THE MPS FOR BEAVER BANK, HAMMONDS PLAINS AND UPPER SACKVILLE TO PERMIT TOWNHOUSE AND MULTIPLE DWELLING USES ON AN ON-SITE CONTOUR SEWAGE SYSTEM WITHIN THE GLEN ARBOUR GOLF COURSE AND RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY**

Present for this item were Andrew Whittemore, HRM Planner, Jenifer Tsang, Wallace, MacDonald and Lively, Mr. Sooriyakumaran (Soori) and Mike Laycock, Assistant General Manager, Annapolis Group.

Mr. Whittemore introduced the item by reviewing his memorandum to the Board dated July 13, which had been previously circulated to the members with a copy of a draft report dated July 2000 from the Annapolis Group re Parcel D, Glen Arbour and their Stormwater Management Plan. Accompanying their report was a letter to Mr. Laycock from Willard D'Eon, CBCL on the proposed Wastewater Treatment and Water Supply Criteria.

During the review of his memo, Mr. Whittemore noted that the proposal is to develop four blocks of remaining land surrounding the existing Glen Arbour Development. A different type of use is being proposed, ie. townhouse and multi-unit development. A plan amendment would be required and each block would be need to go through the development agreement process.

To date two Public Information Meetings have been held to solicit concerns and issues of the public. The prime issue for area residents is that they would like to maintain a low density appearance. By clustering the developments, this is obtainable. Only 20% of the land would be built upon and 80% left for open space and natural areas.

The issues of concern to the Board, i.e. Stormwater and Erosion and Sediment Control are dealt with in the Stormwater Management Plan circulated.

There was also concern expressed in the community regarding water shortage. The developer is to demonstrate that this development can be serviced without adversely impacting residential development in the area. The proponent's presentation dealt with the location of the wells.

Mr. Sooriyakumaran, referring to figure 2 of the package, noted that of the 38 acre site, 29 acres will be left untouched. Parcel D was illustrated on this site development plan. He

referred to the Erosion & Sediment Control Plan to be utilized during construction and illustrated in Figure 4. Some of these practices were effectively used during construction of the golf course to control sediment leaving the site.

A conceptual Stormwater Management Plan, to arrest stormwater and redirect it into the ground was illustrated in Figure 5. Figure 6 detailed a proposed curb less street and its function conveying water and occasionally assisting in its cleaning. The intent is to disperse the stormwater into the woods.

Mr. Laycock noted that he has been involved in this development over the past six years. He noted that most of the residential lots have on site septic systems. The wastewater treatment system proposed for these low density, multi-unit sites is similar to the one used for the club house and maintenance facility, ie. intermittent sand filter designed by CBCL. Details provided in their letter previously referred to. The concept plans to be submitted to NSDOE. The proposed system will not be a 10/10 system, but a 5/5 re-circulating sand filter. While a bit more mechanical, it is felt it would provide a better level of treatment. The proposed system is similar to the one planned for Sobeys, Musquodoboit Harbour.

Mr. Whittemore noted that the development will be in the form of a condo corporation, which would be more effective in addressing an on-site system failure.

Referring to the well water, it was noted that three drilled wells will be required to service the site.

Mr. Laycock noted that one of the advantages of a condo type cluster type development, which maintains a large amount of land mass, is it reduces the potential for the land to be subdivided into smaller parcels. Mr. Whittemore confirmed that the Policy will specify that they can't subdivide.

Reflecting on the Stormwater Management Plan provided, Mr. Haley indicated he appreciated the detail provided. Mr. Laycock noted that it is similar in detail to the one provided for the original Glen Arbour application.

Questions and comments posed related to the following:

- Soil types? While the soil is generally sandy, clay appears a couple of feet down.
- Bedrock excavations? No excavations should be required thus any acid slate will not be disturbed.
- Construction to be phased? It is intended that any excavations would be timed to dry periods.

- There appears to be no mention of monitoring during construction and after.
- Is there a problem of acid slate runoff into Bottle Lake? Mr. Regan would like to see a plan for dealing with acid slate if it is struck. Mr. Laycock assured the Board that the contractors are instructed that if they encounter any acid slate, they are to notify the proponents immediately.
- Referring to the artificial pond, Mr. Haley suggested that the proponents might consider referring to it as a retention pond in future.
- Referring to the brook leaving Half Way Lake, Mr. Regan questioned whether stormwater will be directly discharged into the brook. The Board was assured that any stormwater would have to pass through an undisturbed forest floor before entering any watercourses.
- The Board's biggest concern with Half Way Lake was related to the road, the drainage from which appeared to be directed into Half Way Lake, untreated.
- Concern was expressed about the ditches and it was acknowledged that ditch maintenance has been an issue in the past. Silt has been observed running down the ditches. The Board was advised that some ditch maintenance, involving revamping the design and lining with stone has taken place. They are proposing shallow cuts to banks and not taking in machinery. No open ditches are proposed for the completed project, rather grassed swales, either sodded or seeded will direct runoff and encourage groundwater recharge.

Mr. Whittemore advised that maintenance can be a condition of the agreement. The Board will include in their recommendations.

- Referring to Figure 4, if sediment is seen entering Bottle Lake, a filter berm will be constructed, as a backup system.
- The proponents were questioned on the function of the retention pond. It was noted that it will only be used in the event the 12" pipe can't handle the flow. There is usually not much water in this pond, it was noted. While not aesthetically pleasing, it provides a lot of retention area. It has already proven itself by capturing a lot of the heavier sediment, essentially acting as a catch basin.
- Mr. Regan referred to the reference to natural percolation rates. He wondered if they are written down. Mr. Laycock indicated that a scientific study has not been done.

- ! Mr. Regan referred to a continuing problem of not enough water in the Sackville River. He felt it important to include in the development agreement that the peak rate of runoff not to exceed natural conditions. Mr. Laycock felt that there will be a lot of opportunity for rainwater to be absorbed on this site.
  
- ! Reference was made to the buffer to the Thomson Run. Mr. Whittemore noted that the draft development agreement requires there be a 50' buffer zone along the Run, where parcels A, B & C abut.

Concern was expressed that it is difficult for the Board to draft any recommendation for Parcel D, which would pertain also to parcels A, B & C. The Board was assured that while the focus this evening is on Parcel D, the others will come back to the Board for review. The Board intends to include in its recommendations that Parcels A, B & C come to the Board. Comments in the interim will be restricted to Parcel D.

Mr. Mandaville expressed the hope that Bottle Lake does not go downhill in water quality like Sandy Lake.

Referring to the dispersal trench, proposed for all the units in parcel D, it was noted it would be very shallow, as the depth of soil above the clay is only two feet. It was suggested that they might wish to locate the trench slightly further away from the units.

Mr. Mandaville reflected that the design being proposed is two to three times better than ones associated with individual single family home lots from a lake water quality perspective.

The Chair advised the proponents before their departure of the Board's practice of developing recommendations, reviewing and approving them at the next monthly meeting and then sending them out to the proponent, planning staff and community council.

It was noted that the parcel of land is part of a much larger watershed and it is difficult for the Board to envisage the whole. Mr. Haley suggested that a integrated watershed management plan would serve this area well. Later in the meeting, Mr. Regan referred to his concerns about the cumulative affect of acid slate and supported the Board looking at the whole watershed management and phosphorus standards should be written into the development agreement.

Upon returning to this item, the Chair reflected that it is difficult for the Board to comment on Blocks A, B & C with no information provided. He proposed concentrating on recommendations for Block D and indicating a desire to see specific development plans for Blocks A, B & C, before approval is given for development. Mr. Evans proposed that

the Development Agreement for Parcel D specify that plans for parcels A, B & C come back to the Board for recommendation.

As a point of clarification, Mr. Porter noted that the application before the Board is to amend the MPS to allow for development agreement provision. He assured the Board that once the Development Agreement provisions are in place, staff will come back to the Board with more detailed information on specific blocks. The application is now essentially at the conceptual level. He noted what is being proposed would not allow necessarily higher density, but higher intensity of development. In terms of persons per acre, density will remain low. He felt the Board should consider this item like a concept plan.

Reflecting that the details for the remaining blocks might be different, Ms. McNeil concluded it was inappropriate at this time to draft recommendations for the development agreement. If there were recommendations made for Block D, the reference to this particular block might be lost. An alternative proposed to recommendations was for some general statements to be made, emphasizing that should the plan be modified, the Board would expect to see detailed plans for each parcel, so the Board can make recommendations for each.

While it was felt worthwhile to draft recommendations for D at this time, while the presentation was fresh in members' minds, it was felt that they be held and simply an extract of the minutes be provided to the proponent. *(It was subsequently decided not to provide the draft minutes and recommendations would be finalized at the August meeting)*. Ms. McNeil will draft the recommendations for use at a later date.

### **3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES (cont'd)**

#### **3.2 WESTERN COMMON**

Circulated with the agenda package was a copy of the report from the Board which went to Regional Council's July 4<sup>th</sup> meeting for the members' information. Mr. Regan advised that Council approved the establishment of the 6,000 acre park. *Actual wording of Council: Council approved the staff recommendation to give Second Reading to the By-law, presented as Attachment IV to the staff report dated May 31, 2000 to amend the Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws for Mainland Halifax, Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville and Planning District 4; and, that an advisory committee be appointed to provide stewardship for the wilderness park proposed under the Western Common Study).*

A discussion followed on the set backs.

Both Mr. Mandaville and Mr. Regan attended the public hearing. The Board's recommendations were not discussed but simply identified as coming from the Board by Paul Morgan.

Also circulated in the agenda package was a memorandum from Mr. Mandaville dated June 23, 2000 on the subject of Pollutant Export (specifically TP, total phosphorus) from onsite septic systems via ground water on decadal times scales - justification of the 100 metre setback from lakes for new subdivisions only (not existing lots). Mr. Mandaville would like to see a policy from the Board that all future septic systems should not be located closer than 100 metres in new sub-divisions. At present the NSDOE only requires 100'.

### **3.3 PERFORMANCE BOND REQUIREMENT DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

Deferred. Will be transferred to status sheet.

### **3.4 POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM**

In his update, Mr. Porter advised the Board that he spoke with John Sheppard and was advised that HRM is hiring a Coordinator for the program.

Referring to the question posed by Mr. Mandaville at the June meeting regarding Concentration Limits of 30 milligrams per litre for total Phosphorus in the draft by-law, Mr. Porter reported this measure was taken out of a Provincial Bylaw.

The Chair questioned whether the Board should make a presentation to Council indicating 30 milligrams per litre is too high. Mr. Mandaville withdrew his earlier concern, however the Chair noted there appears to be some concern whether the measurement is at source or at the end of the pipe. Mr. Mandaville noted that the preamble to the draft by-law W-100 indicates it is a source control program.

### **3.5 PRINCE'S LODGE/BEDFORD SOUTH MASTER PLAN AREA PRESENTATION**

Mr. Regan reported that he had attended the June 28<sup>th</sup> Public Information Meeting. Approximately seventy (70) people were in attendance. The principal concern related to whether the Bedford MPS provisions would be applied to the Bedford half of the master plan. The consultants assured those present that the provisions being applied were even better than those contained in the Bedford MPS.

Friends of Hemlock Ravine related that a new water line is being installed which will cross Hemlock Ravine. Mr. Mandaville noted that the installation will follow an old right-of-way of



Downs Avenue down to the Bedford Highway. Attendees were assured that no blasting will be done unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. Porter advised that he contacted Peter Bigelow regarding the Hemlock Ravine Park Management Plan. The report was approved July 11<sup>th</sup> by Regional Council. There are still opportunities for input by the Board. A copy of the report was provided to Mr. Regan. He will peruse and bring any concerns to the Board's attention.

**3.6 SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FALL RIVER PLAZA - UPDATE MR. WILLIAMS ON HYDRO SEEDING**

Although Mr. Williams was not in attendance, Mr. Mandaville noted he had visited the site yesterday. He confirmed that the south part of the site is not yet hydro seeded. It was requested that Mr. Porter contact the Development Officer associated with the project and ask him to contact Glen Boone.

**3.7 GLEN ARBOUR - DATA AND TABULATIONS**

Mr. Porter was in receipt of the last of the data, which was passed to Mr. Mandaville for the Web site. Mr. Mandaville will provide a summary report for the next meeting. Mr. Regan sought a complete set of the data. Once provided to the Clerk, she will provide Mr. Regan with a copy and place a copy in the Corporate Library.

**3.8 MCINTOSH RUN WATER QUALITY**

Before this item was discussed, Mr. Haley declared a conflict of interest as he is employed by SCN-Lavalin and withdrew from the meeting.

The Board reviewed the draft letter provided by Mr. Shacklock to Mr. Dhillon and the following changes made:

- C 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph in caps to be relocated to the bottom of the first page.
- C A last sentence be added to the new 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read "SND - Lavalin recommended or suggested that additional testing be conducted. (*Quote from report*)
- C Typo paragraph 6, 7<sup>th</sup> line - remove 'ly' from inadequately.
- C Paragraph 7 - Caps to be used for the sentence which reads "This is a health concern so the origin of the sewage should be identified and action taken to prevent its discharge into McIntosh Run."

Reflecting on an earlier presentation this evening related to the fish plant, Mr. Regan noted that an advanced secondary system is being proposed for their sewage system while the last sentence of this letter refers to "tertiary treatment should be the minimum acceptable treatment level". He felt the Board should be consistent. (See item 4.1)

Mr. Shacklock will make the changes to the draft and it will be sent out under the Chair's signature.

**3.9 SANDY LAKE, HAMMONDS PLAINS**

See item 3.7 - Glen Arbour.

**3.10 MUSQUODOBOIT HARBOUR SOBEYS**

Copies of the Board's recommendation pertaining to this development were circulated in the agenda package for the members' information.

Also circulated was a memo from Mr. Mandaville dated June 22, 2000 re Enlightening new Policy of NSDOE, titled "Policy for the Accreditation of Laboratories". Mr. Mandaville noted it will come into effect in 2002. The actual Policy was enclosed which was signed May 9, 2000. Mr. Mandaville was very pleased with the adoption of this policy. In response to a question from Mr. Hope, Mr. Mandaville indicated that CRWS will have to become certified.

**3.11 MEETING PROCEDURES**

Mr. Porter advised that he has discussed this item with Mr. Wells. It was felt that a meeting of Roger Wells, Gary Porter, the Chair and Vice-Chair would be appropriate to develop an approach. Either Roger Wells or the Board could then make recommendations to the Planning Department or HRM. While it may be determined that there are a few things which could be done to improve the process, it may require a radical approach, i.e. split the Board's jurisdiction in two. A meeting will be set up and a report given to the Board in September.

**3.12 CLARIFICATION OF DR. STRAIN'S PAPER**

Referring to a report circulated at the June meeting entitled "The Relationship between Chemical Measures and Potential Predictors of the Eutrophication Status of Inlets", Mr. Mandaville alerted the members that the conclusions are only based on one set of data. The testing had not been an extensive as he had originally claimed it to be.

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

4.2 **PROFESSIONAL CREDIBILITY**

Mr. Mandaville requested that this item be added to the agenda. (deferred)

4.3 **APPLICATION - MR. DOUG WELSH, STRADBROOK PROPERTIES LTD. TO PERMIT A MIXED USE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - 91 COBEQUID ROAD, LOWER SACKVILLE**

Mr. Whittemore requested that this item be deferred to August.

4.5 **LOCKVIEW ROAD**

Deferred as Mr. Manchester not present.

4.6 **FORMAT OF REPORTS**

Circulated with the agenda package was a copy of the template used by HRM for its various reports. The Chair questioned whether the Board wished to use this format or continue its current practice. The Clerk explained the benefits of using the format Councillors are used to seeing.

The Board adopted this format and copies of the template can be obtained from the Clerk.

5.0 **CONCEPT PLANS**

Nil.

6.0 **SUBCOMMITTEE**

6.1 **PARAMETERS OF WATER QUALITY TESTING**

No responses have yet been received. It was noted that this item is on the next agenda of both BWAC and the DLAB.

7.0 **BWAC APPROVED MINUTES**

The June 14<sup>th</sup> approved minutes were not available. They will be circulated in the next agenda package.

**8.0 STATUS SHEET**

During the review of the status sheet the following were noted:

- C Midyat Investments Mainland South - Still in staff's hands. Few problems with the report. Still being worked on.
- C Subdivision Concept Plans - Mr. Morgan is being reminded of the Board's interest.
- C Membership, Municipality of East Hants, Parkdale Development Proposals, Water Resource Management Study, Wilsons Gas Bar and Alum in Treatment Plants - to be deleted.

During discussion of the Water Resources Management Study, Mr. Haley pointed out that the scope of work, did not include looking at the role of the waters advisory boards. Mr. Mandaville explained why he did not think this was necessarily a bad thing. The Board will have an opportunity to review it before the final version is prepared.

- C Web site - Ms. McNeil advised the contact persons is likely Marilyn MacKenzie of the Clerk's Office, not Kelly Marney.
- C HRM Snow Removal Policy - The Board was advised of current practices related to snow dumping in the three districts. Staff was not aware of any policy if a contractor wishes to use a site.

**9.0 MEETING SCHEDULE**

Reference was made to a Public Information Meeting held July 5, 2000 regarding an application to enter into a development agreement for the master planning of a residential/commercial/golf course community in Timberlea. It is anticipated that the application will be coming before the Board in due course.

**10.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

**10.1 TREATMENT LEVELS IN SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS**

Memo on the subject provided by Mr. Mandaville dated June 26, 2000.

**10.2 THE PROPER SCIENTIFIC WAY AN STP HAS TO BE ASSESSED PRIOR TO (NOT AFTER) AN STP IS APPROVED**

Memo dated June 28, 2000 provided by Mr. Mandaville.

**STORMCEPTOR MODEL**

Mr. Mandaville displayed to the Board a model illustrating how stormceptors work.

**11.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Chair gave his regrets for the next meeting to be held Wednesday, August 16, 2000.

**12.0 ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Dr. Wayne Stobo  
Chair

Lynne Le Boutillier  
Assistant Municipal Clerk