

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD

OCTOBER 18, 2000

MINUTES

PRESENT: Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair
Mr. David Dwyer
Mr. Chris Booth
Ms. Colleen McNeil
Mr. Walter Regan
Mr. Peter Shacklock
Mr. Ross Evans
Mr. Glen Williams
Mr. Mack McMenemy
Mr. Jim Holmes
Mr. Kyle McKenzie
Mr. Keith Manchester
Mr. Shalom Mandaville

ALSO PRESENT: Susan Corser, Planner
Lynne Le Boutillier, Assistant Municipal Clerk
Ms. Heike Pfletschinger & Capt. John Owen Jr., SWCSMH (guests)

REGRETS: Mr. Hope and Mr. Guilcher

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 Bennery Lake Watershed Protection Water Area Draft Regulations ... 6

 3.2 Golf Course - East Petpeswick 7 - 9

 3.3 Sempra Gas 9

 3.4 Drafting of Guidelines to be given to Proponents re Presentation to the Board 9

 3.5 Prince's Lodge/Bedford South Master Plan 10 & 11

 3.6 Fall River Plaza - Highway 2 11 & 12

 3.7 Glen Arbour - Draft Letter to Mayor on Hiring of Limnologist 12 & 13

 3.8 Case #00208: Terence Bay Fish Plant 13

 3.9 91 Cobequid Road 13

 3.10 Update on Realignment of Jurisdictions 14

 3.11 Snow Removal Policy 14

4.0 New Business

 4.1 Case 00239: Rezoning to CDD and Enter into a Dev. Agreement to Permit an Expansion to the Monarch Estates Subdivision Beaver Bank 3 - 6

 4.2 Stormwater Management Policy 14

 4.3 Wilson's/MacDonald's Gas Bar 15

 4.4 Ashburn Golf Course Monitoring Data 15

5.0 Concept Plans 15

6.0 Subcommittee

 6.1 Subcommittee on Parameters for Water Quality Testing 15

7.0 BWAC Approved Minutes 16

8.0 Status Sheet 16

9.0 Meeting Schedule - Hearings & Planning Advisory Committee 16

10.0 Information Items

 10.1 Effects of Golf Course Construction and Operation on Aquatic Environment 16

 10.2 Proposal for Official Guidelines for Nutrient Enrichment Applicable to the Province of Nova Scotia 16

 10.3 Independent Comparison of Stormwater Treatment Devices 16

 10.4 Case 00238: Rezoning and Development Agreement - Commercial Development and Extension to Parkdale Subdivision 17

Pockwock Study 17

11.0 Date of Next Meeting 17

12.0 Adjournment 17

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

The following items were added under Business Arising from Minutes and New Business:

- 3.11 - Snow Removal Policy
- 4.2 - Stormwater Management Policy
- 4.3 - Wilsons Gas Bar
- 4.4 - Ashburn Golf Course Monitoring Data

With the consensus of the Board, item 4.1 was moved up on the agenda.

2.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the September 20, 2000 meeting were adopted as circulated.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

4.1 **CASE 00239: REZONING TO CDD AND ENTER INTO A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO PERMIT AN EXPANSION TO THE MONARCH ESTATES SUBDIVISION BEAVER BANK**

Circulated in the agenda package was a memorandum dated October 3, 2000 from Thea Langille-Hanna, Planner re the above noted case. It is being proposed that 120 single unit residential dwellings, with on-site services, be constructed on the 291 acre site. The site is bordered by Duck Lake Brook and Box Mill Brook and two watercourses traverse it.

Attending the meeting were Mr. Kent Moreash and Mr. Paul Sinclair, KVM Consultants and Mr. Robin Barrett, Barrett Enterprises Ltd. together with Ms. Lynn and Mr. Kevin Marchand.

In her introduction, Ms. Langille noted that an application pertaining to the Monarch Estates Subdivision was on the Board's agenda earlier in the year. An information meeting had been held. There were subsequent changes by the developer and the item was deferred. In the intervening months some negotiations have taken place and the owners of Monarch Estates and Ramar Developments are looking into the expansion of not only Monarch Estates, but Rivendale Subdivision, utilizing the same consultants, KVM.

Included with the memorandum was a copy of the preliminary concept plan and preliminary drainage, erosion and sediment control plan, together with an aerial photo of the area. The Board indicated it was very pleased that the aerial photo and plans with contours had been provided.

Ms. Langille explained that as a result of a detailed review of the Beaver Bank, Hammonds Plains, Upper Sackville MPS recently, this area can only be developed at a rate of 20 lots in four years under its MU-1 Zone unless rezoned to a CDD and a development agreement entered into. By this route, the lands can be developed at a faster rate but a number of provisions have to be met. Reference was made to Policy P-4 which deals with aspects of the natural environment, retention of watercourses and drainage. The Board's input on the potential impact on the area's watercourses was being sought.

Another Public Information Meeting is scheduled for October 30th.

During her review of the application, Ms. Langille referred to the existence of a large wet area and the interest the Recreation Department has expressed in the Duck Lake Brook.

The floor was turned over to the consultants to review the preliminary drainage, erosion and sedimentation control plan. Highlighted on the map were the drainage patterns for the area.

Questions were posed by the Chair regarding provisions which had been taken in the existing developments to protect watercourses. Mr. Barrett noted that they have not developed the phase along Duck Lake Brook. He described the restrictive covenants associated with Monarch Estates to afford protection. Reference was made to the depth of existing lots being 300' to 350' and because of the topography, it is most feasible to locate homes close to the road, with the septic field on the plateau behind. This leaves a distance of 150' to 200' to the brook. The developer has encouraged the homeowners to leave the back half of their lots, which are on average 1.25 acres in size, natural. He felt, as a developer, home owners have to be educated on measures to protect the environment. At present only a 15' buffer is required on the side and back of lots. They are considering increasing the width of the buffer at the back of the lots.

Referring to their Rivendale Subdivision, Mr. Marchand noted these lots are 400' plus in depth. The majority of the lots leave 250' to 300' undisturbed to the lake. He could not recall any development within 200' of Duck Lake. He observed Glen Arbour's requirement of a 15 meter buffer/no disturbance zone. He was not opposed to such measures, particularly in relation to Duck Lake Brook.

Ms. Langille confirmed that the Land Use By-law specifies 50' must be maintained.

The condition of Duck Lake Brook was discussed. Mr. Barrett noted that it appears a portion of the brook was dredged sometime ago. Since Woodbine Mobile Home Park was connected to the central sewer system, there appears to be an improvement to the water quality of the Brook. The condition of Duck Lake was raised. As with the Brook, the situation likely improved when Woodbine Mobile Home Park's discharge ceased, but stormwater runoff is still directed to the Lake. The long term impact of heavy metals on the lake isn't known. It was noted that it had been a swampy, shallow lake before Woodbine Mobile Home Park discharged into it and it continues to be a swampy, shallow lake, with a lot of wetland around its perimeter.

During the review of the drainage, erosion and sedimentation control plan, the following were suggested:

- End of Road F - consideration of the use of a CDS unit.

The consultants indicated that they were not aware of such units being installed in rural subdivisions. They were aware of their use for commercial sites. They noted that they have to be maintained.

Mr. Mandaville referred to an installation associated with the Sackville River. The consultants indicated they would discuss with HRM Engineering.

Ms. Langille reflected that HRM has indicated maintenance is the responsibility of the owner/developer. It is a matter which can be discussed further. She noted that in rural areas, HRM eventually takes over roads. She will explore further.

- Mr. Evans posed questions regarding the construction of the ditches along Joan Drive. It was noted that a fairly substantial flow can be expected toward Duck Lake Brook and if measures are not taken to slow the flow, etc. it will be negatively impacted. An engineered wetland was suggested to protect this pristine section of the Brook, which was considered a very attractive feature as well as Duke Lake. It is recognized that such a measure might have an impact on the first lot.

The consultant indicated he would take these comments under advisement.

- A study of pre-development runoff should be conducted. Mr. Regan had a concern that there could be significant erosion if peak flows are not held back and this will have a negative impact on Kinsac Lake. The consultant indicated

they could run a model. Mr. Regan felt some lots should incorporate detention ponds to collect drainage.

Mr. Regan questioned what provisions had been made for public access. 50' corridors for drainage easements can be used for walkways. These have been discussed with Recreation.

It was indicated that a foot bridge will be used to cross the water course.

The Chair advised the proponents that the Board will develop their recommendations at the November meeting. Ms. Langille felt this time frame will not pose a problem to the developers, given there are a number of issues yet to be addressed, including traffic matters.

Mr. Mandaville thanked Ms. Langille for her excellent presentation. As earlier noted, the Chair congratulated both the developers and the Planner on the provision of the aerial photo and maps with contours.

3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

3.1 BENNERY LAKE WATERSHED DRAFT REGULATIONS

A volunteer was sought to draft the recommendations. It was suggested by Mr. Mandaville that this may not be necessary. A letter to the Mayor might suffice, given the extra care given to drafting of the regulations. There was agreement that a letter would suffice in this instance, simply referring to the Bennery Lake Watershed Regulations and indicating the Board's support of the initiative. Mr. McMenemy offered to draft the letter.

Mr. Regan indicated he had some concerns. He felt there should be a land acquisition policy. A policy in place to buy land to protect drinking water quality. At the September meeting, it had been indicated by Mr. Brady that there were not sufficient funds to purchase all the lands involved.

Mr. Manchester suggested that in the event a private land owner wishes to sell his property, HRM be given first right to purchase.

A proactive land acquisition policy for inclusion with the letter will be drafted.

Mr. Regan's second concern related to membership on the Bennery Lake Watershed Management Committee. He felt a member of the public at large should be included.

Thirdly, he felt the area should be open to passive recreation. A lengthy discussion ensued on the pros and cons. It was noted that use of Pockwock lands is not promoted. Mr. Mandaville referred to the NSDOE Guidelines on how to protect watersheds. They are very strict. He was personally not in favour of the area being open for passive recreation.

No mention to passive recreation will be included in the correspondence.

3.2 **GOLF COURSE - EAST PETPESWICK**

As requested at the September meeting, Mr. McMenemy's draft of a letter to the Mayor seeking information on the powers of HRM to stop work on projects was circulated in the agenda package. At the meeting, Dr. Stobo provided copies of a second draft to the Mayor pertaining to concerns regarding the developers of the above noted golf course ignoring Stop Work Orders.

Mr. McMenemy reflected on conversations he has had with Ms. Spencer, the Development Officer on this situation. He obtained a flow chart of the procedure followed. Copies will be provided in the next agenda package.

One of the problems Ms. Spencer identified was the difficulty of getting By-law Enforcement Officers out to various locations in a timely fashion. The Eastern Region is very large and will be broken into sections. The schedule allows for visits to each section on a specified day of the week, unless there is an urgent matter.

Ms. Spencer advised that staff had met last Thursday with the consultants for Mr. Baker, the golf course owner.

Mr. McMenemy reflected that there does not seem to be a whole lot staff can do in the way of enforcement of the Stop Work Orders. Once the letter has been sent out fourteen (14) days is given for compliance with regard to minor items; most are thirty (30) days, with ninety (90) days given if an agency such as the Tenancy's Board is involved. Once the matter gets to the legal stage, the wheels turn even more slowly. Once the matter reaches the judge's docket, it is given lowest priority. He concluded the whole process to be one of frustration.

Starting November 6th, a new process is being initiated. A By-law Enforcement Officer and Development Technician will be going out to enforce bylaws. They are hoping to be given the power to issue Summary Offence Tickets. This initiative is part of the on going policy review process. It is essentially an experiment in this area.

Mr. McMenemy indicated that he mentioned the blocked culvert, but it could not be located. He asked Mr. Dwyer to provide staff with directions. Mr. Dwyer noted that Mr. Baker has built his home and the driveway goes over the plugged culvert. This is also the area of the main entrance to the golf course and club house.

Based on the above, the Chair felt his draft to the Mayor regarding concerns the Board has related to the golf course development still applied. He had reviewed the minutes of the last seven months for background. He felt the letter will re-emphasize and encourage HRM to try something different. He noted that Stop Work Orders can be issued but unless there are Summary Convictions with fairly heavy fines associated, they are to no avail. Summary fines in the order to \$3,000 to \$4,000 have been issued.

Mr. Regan referred to comments he had overheard that a development at Springfield Lake proceeded without any permits. Apparently HRM has no authority to issue Stop Work Orders for subdivisions. It was recalled by Jim Holmes that the Construction Association of Nova Scotia had lobbied for this provision in the Municipal Planning Act. It was felt that the letter drafted by Mr. McMenemy should include some reference to the above.

During the review of the Chair's draft letter to the Mayor, it was noted that it is not Regional Council but the Community Council for the District which has the authority to approve development agreements.

Referring to the reference to a sediment and erosion control plan, specified in the Development Agreement, Ms. Corser did not know if one was ever submitted. This being the case, the letter required modification.

Ms. Corser understood that the only permit issued was for the Club House. No permits were issued to proceed with the golf course construction. The Chair reflected that the Stop Work Order for the golf course was issued because they did not have permits.

Reference was made to the fact that associated with the continued development, sediment was entering Petpeswick Inlet. The Chair will modify his letter to reflect the above. Ms. Corser will research pertinent dates associated with the Stop Work Order, etc. and provide to the Chair.

Mr. Manchester felt the development agreement(s) should be repealed if developers violate their terms, rather than a fine being imposed. The Chair cautioned that they are likely to ignore this as well.

Ms. Corser was questioned regarding fees charged by HRM for a Development Agreement. She indicated the standard fee is \$2,000 and there is no fee for a Development Permit. Building Permit fees relate to the value of work undertaken.

Mr. Williams suggested a bond be required in the amount of, for example, \$100,000. Ms. Corser noted that such bonds are associated with stormwater management and recreational lands to 120% of value. No bonding was associated with the golf course development. The Chair felt that bonding could be an option to include in the correspondence.

Ms. Corser made reference to a letter from the Paper Mill Lake Advisory Committee, signed by Mr. Goucher to Ken Meech, Paul Dunphy, etc. a copy of which was enclosed with the North West Community Council's agenda package. The correspondence reflects similar concerns.

The Chair will revamp his draft to reflect the above debate. There was consensus that this version need not come back to the Board, just be sent off.

It was felt that both letters should be copied to the DLAB and BWAC. It was also felt that a copy of Len Goucher's letter should also be provided.

Mr. Mandaville proposed that reference to the Topsoil Removal By-law be included in the Chair's letter. This by-law does not apply to all districts or residential development. It is also restricted to areas more than one hectare in size. He would like to see the provisions of the by-law applied to any type of use, residential and commercial. Since the Chair's correspondence is only meant to be a fact finding letter, once a response is received, it was suggested that this recommendation could be considered for the follow-up letter. Mr. Dwyer, in the interim, would like to know what is exactly involved in these regulations.

This second letter could also address the topic Mr. Regan brought up earlier pertaining to the HRM not being able to issue a Stop Work Orders for subdivisions. Thirdly, it was felt that it should be recommended that there should be an MPS Planning Strategy for the whole of HRM.

This item will dealt with when some response is received. Hopefully, in the interim new policies will deal with the problem.

3.3 **SEMPRA GAS**

Mr. Regan requested that the item be deferred. It was moved to the status sheet.

3.4 DRAFTING OF GUIDELINES TO BE GIVEN TO PROPONENTS RE PRESENTATIONS TO THE BOARD

For the September meeting, the members were provided with two examples of requests for details of a project provided by Ms. Corser. Circulated at the meeting were copies of an Environmental Checklist Executive Summary proposed by BWAC. Ms. McNeil volunteered to draft up a check list for the Board. As a point of clarification, the Chair indicated the check list is for Planners, so they can tell developers what the Board expects as background before they make a presentation.

Reference was made by Mr. Mandaville to a memo on this subject from the Soil & Waters Conservation Society of Metro Halifax.

The Chair encouraged the members to review the above noted documents for the next meeting.

3.5 PRINCE'S LODGE/BEDFORD SOUTH MASTER PLAN

At a previous meeting the Board had been presented with a Background Report from Wallace Macdonald & Lively, together with the MPS and Land Use By-law dated June 2000. Included in the agenda package was a memo dated October 9, 2000 from Mr. Mandaville expressing disappointment that it appears the Board's recommendations are not reflected in the document. Mr. Mandaville referred to Section 5.3 Stormwater Management on page 35 of the report being very philosophic. He felt that the recommendations, in full, should be included in the document, otherwise he feared they will be lost.

A discussion followed on who the consultants are working for, i.e. HRM and/or the land owners. Ms. Corser noted this is one of four areas identified by the HRM which should go through a Master Planning process before development.

Having reviewed the Background Report, the Chair felt that he doubted the Board's recommendations would have changed anything. Nevertheless, it was suggested that a letter should be sent to the Mayor and the Community Councils indicating the Board's disappointment that the document does not reflect the Board's recommendations provided to the consultant and HRM. The Board still feels strongly that they should be incorporated into the Plan or as an appendix. Reference would be made to the terms of reference requiring interaction of the consultant with the WABs.

Mr. Mandaville gave an example of a similar plan in Dartmouth. The DLAB's recommendations were included in the appendix. It was proposed that the above noted

letter suggest that the Board's recommendations be attached to the report. It was observed that the report indicates that the consulting team had met regularly with the WAB and BWAC. It is implied to the reader that they took the advice of both groups and incorporated it in the document.

Mr. McKenzie questioned whether a staff report will be written on this report or is this report considered a staff report. Mr. Regan noted that the company was engaged by HRM to come up with the Master Plan. It was noted that there is concern that this firm is also working for the property owners in the area.

A discussion followed on the sequence of presentations made to the Board involving this area. Ms. Corser recalled that originally representatives of the Armoyan group came in with their Royale Oakes proposal. In the Board's recommendations, it was suggested that a master plan for the whole area was required.

Mr. Regan noted that the Board has yet to comment on the Background Report dated June 2000. Technically, the Chair agreed that Mr. Regan was right. He questioned whether the Board wished to review the Report in detail or wait until specific development proposals come in. He assumed that as different sections are developed the Board would see the specifics of, for instance, the Stormwater Management plans. As there is reference to development agreements in the Report, Ms. Corser felt this would be the case.

Mr. Dwyer proposed that research be done on what has been done over the past two years via the minutes and documents.

The Chair will write to the Mayor indicating the Board has a serious problem with the Report, because the Board's recommendations are not included. As a result, the Board feels from an environmental point of view, there are serious deficiencies in the report. A copy of the recommendations to be attached. Mr. Regan cautioned that it appears some aspects of the recommendations are contained in the report. Mr. Williams reflected that the report can't be too specific.

The Chair encouraged the members to review the Report to identify areas of the document the Board may wish to comment on and see if any of the Board's recommendations have been incorporated or distorted. If not, the Board could emphasize that they should be incorporated in the master plan.

In the interim, Susan Corser will check into the time frame. If it is determined that work on the policies is proceeding soon, input should be provided as soon as possible. For example, the Board would like to see an environmental assessment and overall stormwater management plan undertaken.

Mr. Regan sought a clarification from Ms. Corser regarding the effect of this document being passed by Council. Ms. Corser confirmed it would become a legal document, setting out policies and land use requirements. Developers will have no choice but to follow its policies.

For the time being, it was decided to postpone writing the above noted letter. The Chair felt that should an individual or group wish to relay to Council Mr. Mandaville's comments that the Board's recommendations are not adequately represented, they should feel free to do so.

Reference was made to last night's Regional Council meeting and a report being deferred on this subject.

3.6 **FALL RIVER PLAZA - HIGHWAY 2**

In his update, Mr. Williams indicated he had spoken to Mr. Boone and Mr. Thompson and it appears the acid slate pile will be looked after. The contractor, who is doing this work of stabilizing the bank, has been awaiting approvals from HRM to start work on another associated project. Mr. Williams described the interim measures planned to stabilize the bank. They intend to remove the bank next spring, but have not found a site to dispose of the acid slate.

Reflecting on the above and the promises made over an extended period of time, once the matter is resolved the Chair felt a letter should be written to Sobey's, indicating the Board's displeasure in the way the matter had been handled. Item to status sheet.

3.7 **GLEN ARBOUR - DRAFT LETTER TO MAYOR ON HIRING OF LIMNOLOGIST**

Circulated at the meeting was a memo dated October 18, 2000 from Mr. Mandaville outlining three specific points to be addressed in the proposed letter. The points relate to the following:

- A sampling protocol, both chemical and biological, was recommended. Monthly testing was asked for. Staff altered the recommendations radically, thus watering them down in the contract with the developers. For example, seasonal testing not monthly required. Neither the requirement associated with benthic macro-invertebrates or mercury sampling included.
- HRM employ an independent Limnologist/Biologist to conduct a study of Sandy Lake. If tests of total phosphorus and chlorophyll, compared to 1996 values, are

elevated, the lake be restored to values which existed prior to development.
Cost to be borne by the developer.

- No guarantee, even if the above is done, that irreparable harm has not been done, as measured by the Benthic Macro-invertebrates, as there is no base line study of them. All that can be measured is water quality.

The Chair summarized, the Board had made specific recommendations not entered into the development agreement and as a result there are no indicators now of how badly degraded Sandy Lake is. The Board wants to emphasize that its recommendations be accepted as is versus being watered down.

Secondly, someone should be engaged to check out whether the data provided by the proponent reflects the actual situation.

A letter, copied to the NSDOE, will be drafted reflecting:

- The watering down of the Board's recommendations by staff and as a result no baseline for benthic macro-invertebrates or mercury.
- Recommending that the water quality study be repeated to see if in fact the lake is as bad off as it looks. The mechanism by which restoration is done is recognized to be out of the hands of the Board, as is who will finance. The Board is restricted to advising on watershed issues.

3.8 **CASE #00208: TERENCE BAY FISH PLANT**

No response has been received to Ms. McNeil's correspondence. Moved to status sheet.

3.9 **91 COBEQUID ROAD**

Circulated in the agenda package were draft recommendations prepared by Ms. McNeil.

The only changes made were:

- Reference to Little Sackville River should read Sackville River.
- The second sentence of recommendation 1, should have the words "installed a CDS unit and", after the words "intend to".

- It was felt the reason why the Board is asking for a detention pond or similar device to reduce the velocity of stormwater leaving the site, referred to in Recommendation 6, should be cited, i.e. increased velocity will cause erosion and decrease base summer flows.

The whole issue of whether brand names should be used was debated. It was felt that the Board should be using a generic term consistently, ie. stand alone stormwater treatment system, CDS/Stormceptor, etc.

Mr. Mandaville reflected that the CDS units are larger in size and work more as gross pollutant traps versus the Stormceptor units.

The Chair reflected that the format of the report containing the recommendations has changed, i.e. the recommendations are now addressed to the proponent and planner. The letter accompanying the recommendations is copied to the Community Councillors for information. It was noted that the change came about as a result of communications between Ms. Corser, the Vice-Chair and Clerk in recent months. Ms. Corser noted the change was required when recommendations appeared on a Community Council agenda before staff's report. Since at this stage comments are being requested by Planning staff, the change was felt necessary.

The Chair just wanted to be assured everyone agreed with the current procedure. He wanted to ensure the members were conscious that a change had occurred. No one expressed an objection to the change.

3.10 UPDATE ON REALIGNMENT OF JURISDICTIONS

Circulated at the meeting were copies of an extract from HECC's February 4, 1999 minutes in which the following motion was adopted:

MOVED BY Councillors Cooper and Sarto that the Harbour East Community Council appoint the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board as an Advisory Board to the Harbour East Community Council for all lakes under the jurisdiction of the Harbour East Community Council with the exception of Lake Major.

Ms. Corser explained that this had been an added item. It appears staff was not advised of the motion. The only member, who represents a District which now falls under DLAB's jurisdiction, is Michael Guilcher, who resides in Colby Village. The Chair will contact him.

The Clerk noted that a recent advertisement was placed in the newspapers for volunteers for HRM boards, commissions and committees. She expressed concern that

she was not clear on when the members' terms were up. Assurance was given by Ms. Corser that this had been previously ironed out. Essentially the advertisement would be soliciting representatives for the various districts which fall within the Board's jurisdiction. The majority of members on the current Board are appointees of the organizations they represent.

The Clerk had application forms if any of the members knew of individuals interested in volunteering.

3.11 SNOW REMOVAL POLICY

Mr. Manchester had drafted a letter to the Mayor with respect to snow removal and use of road salt.

The draft was adopted, with a few typographical changes required. The Clerk will reformat and have it signed.

4.0 NEW BUSINESS (cont'd)

4.2 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT POLICY

This item was added to the agenda by Mr. Williams. Ms. Corser advised that the tender was awarded two weeks ago by Regional Council to Porter Dillon and EDM.

Mr. Mandaville referred to two public meetings held and noted that everything the Board had asked for was included in the terms of reference. The contract was for \$120,000 and is to be completed in six months.

4.3 WILSONS GAS BAR

This facility is located across from the Sobeys development in Fall River, Mr. Williams noted. The gas station had been at this location for sometime, adjacent to Lake Thomas. He expressed surprise that the matter had not been brought before the Board. A recommendation had been asked for from SWEPS.

Ms. Corser explained that it was not required that the replacement of the existing station come before the Board as it is an as of right development. Some confusion arose as the Planner associated with the case, had originally been with the City of Dartmouth and it was their practice to take such cases to the DLAB for comment.

4.4 ASHBURN GOLF COURSE MONITORING DATA

Mr. Mandaville noted that in the Board's recommendations for the Ashburn Golf Course water quality monitoring data had been requested. He would like to obtain copies of this data. Ms. Corser recalled the members receiving copies of the Development Agreement. The first step would be to see if the recommendation were included in the Development Agreement.

If it is determined that the Board's recommendations were not included or altered in some way, this should also be included in the correspondence being sent re the Glen Arbour situation. It would add more weight. It was decided to hold off on the letter re Glen Arbour until the Ashburn Golf Course development agreement is checked into.

5.0 CONCEPT PLANS

Information pertaining to a concept plan was provided to the Clerk by Mr. Regan. It will be circulated in the next agenda package.

6.0 SUBCOMMITTEE

6.1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARAMETERS FOR WATER QUALITY TESTING

No response has yet been received from BWAC or the DLAB. The Chair will endeavour to contact Dr. Silver and Ms. Manzer.

This item will be transferred to the status sheet. It was suggested by Mr. Mandaville that the consultants may incorporate in the above noted Stormwater Management Policy.

8.0 STATUS SHEET

Ms. McNeil will endeavour to contact someone at HRM regarding the Board's **web site**.

The HRM's **Snow Removal Policy** and **Performance Bond Requirement for a Development Agreement** were removed.

Referring to the **Hemlock Ravine Park Management Plan**, the Board indicated it fully supported the plan as presented. It was not felt necessary to send a letter of support as the plan has been approved by Council.

7.0 BWAC APPROVED MINUTES

Approved minutes for the September 13, 2000 meeting were not available as BWAC did not have a quorum at its October meeting.

9.0 MEETING SCHEDULE - HEARINGS & PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A schedule dated October 17, 2000 was circulated at the meeting.

10.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

10.1 EFFECTS OF GOLF COURSE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION ON AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

A memo from Mr. Mandaville attaching a Progress Report by Jennifer Winter, Trent University Golf Course Research Group was provided in the September agenda package for the members' information.

10.2 PROPOSAL FOR OFFICIAL GUIDELINES FOR NUTRIENT ENRICHMENT APPLICABLE TO THE PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA

Two memoranda on this subject from Mr. Mandaville, dated September 5 and 7, 2000 were circulated in the September agenda package for the members' information. Essentially he is asking that the Province adopt the OECD standards.

10.3 INDEPENDENT COMPARISON OF STORMWATER TREATMENT DEVICES

In his memorandum of July 31, 2000, originally circulated with the August agenda, Mr. Mandaville provided a report which evaluates four stormwater treatment devices. In summary, he noted that the CDS units are only good for large particles, while the Stormceptor systems are better for smaller particles. CDS units are about a third of the cost of Stormceptor units.

10.4 CASE 00238: REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION TO PARKDALE SUBDIVISION

A copy of the final recommendations sent to Mr. VanZeumeren, EDM were provided for the members' information.

POCKWOCK STUDY

Mr. McMenemy referred to an ongoing study in Pockwock involving cutting down of sections of the forest to determine the effect on the water and banks of the brooks. The study is being conducted by Bowater, the Federal Government and the University of New Brunswick.

11.0 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, November 15, 2000, 6:30 p.m. preceded by a discussion with staff in Council Chambers at 5:45 p.m. re Roaches Pond Pumping Station.

12.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Dr. Wayne Stobo
Chair

Lynne Le Boutillier
Assistant Municipal Clerk

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD, October 18, 2000Pg. 19