

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

**REGIONAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Wednesday, October 24, 2007**

PRESENT: Mr. Fred Morley, Chair
Councillor David Hendsbee, Vice Chair
Councillor Gloria McCluskey
Ms. Cheryl Newcombe
Ms. Bonnie Ryan
Ms. Margo Grant
Mr. Paul Pettipas
Ms. Heather Bown
Mr. Robert Batherson

REGRETS: Councillor Brad Johns

STAFF: Mr. Roger Wells, Supervisor, Regional & Community Planning
Ms. Susan Corser, Senior Planner
Ms. Sheilagh Edmonds, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER	3
2.	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES:	
4.1	Wind Turbines Update	5
4.2	Overview of Criteria for Prioritizing Communities for Community Visioning	5
4.3	Regional Plan Policy / Regulation Change Checklist	4
4.4	Team Building Session	5
5.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS:	6
6.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS:	
6.1	Correspondence	6
6.2	Petitions	6
6.3	Presentations	6
7.	REPORTS	6
8.	NEW BUSINESS:	
8.1	Community Energy Functional Plan	3
9.	ADDED ITEMS:	6
10.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	6
11.	ADJOURNMENT	6

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in the Helen Creighton Room, Alderney Gate Library.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - None

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

At the request of the Chair, the Committee agreed to move up item 8.1 on the agenda to be dealt with as the first order of business.

The agenda was accepted as presented.

8. NEW BUSINESS:

8.1 Community Energy Functional Plan

Mr. Steve King, Manager, Environmental Performance, HRM Sustainable Environment Management Office and Mr. David Lea, Consultant on the project addressed the Committee and provided a presentation on the Community Energy Plan (CEP). They began their presentation by providing background information on how the Plan came about, noting that increasing energy costs for HRM, both corporate and community, and greenhouse gas emissions were significant factors.

Additional points of the presentation are noted as follows:

- C The Community Energy Plan is a functional plan from the Regional Plan.

At 3:13 p.m. Mr. Rob Batherson entered the meeting.

- C HRM spends over \$20 million a year in corporate energy costs.
- C Energy consumption initiatives have not been keeping pace to mitigate energy cost increases.
- C HRM's obligation under the Partners for Climate Protection program is to reduce GHG emissions below the 2002 levels by 20% in both HRM corporate and community by 2012
- C HRM, along with NRCan, developed the terms of reference for this CEP, which is to be a template for other municipalities across Canada.
- C The CEP's main goals include:
 - C improve the energy efficiency of buildings
 - C increase transportation choice and efficiency
 - C increase industrial energy efficiency
 - C encourage energy efficient land use planning and neighbourhood site

- planning
- C increase efficiency of infrastructure
- C increase energy security and diversify energy supply
- C educate and engage residents and businesses
- C demonstrate local government leadership

Mr. Lea reviewed the CEP Deliverables, the expected outcomes, and the Implementation Actions. He noted that over 150 action items were initially generated and, through an evaluation criteria, this list was shortened to consist of about 40 items, all of which are recommended for implementation.

Mr. Lea and Mr. King responded to questions.

In response to a question by Councillor Hendsbee, Mr. King advised that they originally intended to give their presentation to Council in the fall, however, they extended the consultation process, and are now targeting a Committee of the Whole meeting in December.

A discussion ensued and Mr. Wells noted that since the CEP is a functional plan under the Regional Plan, it may be appropriate to have a recommendation from this Committee.

The Chair concurred, pointing out that the Plan is comprehensive and well thought out.

Mr. King indicated that he could share with the Committee the list of the 40 action items and a proposed executive summary, and he indicated that he would follow up with Mr. Wells.

Mr. King also noted that a senior planner on their team has met with staff to make sure the Actions fit with the Regional Plan.

A brief discussion ensued in regard to what role, if any, the Committee has in this process, and Mr. King advised that he was looking for approval in principle, noting that he has also taken the presentation to the Energy and Underground Services Advisory Committee. He explained that the Committees provide an additional review of the Plan for the CEP team.

In response to a question by Councillor Hendsbee, Mr. King advised that he would provide the 40 short-listed actions and the original 150 actions to the Committee.

The Chair thanked Mr. King and the consultants for their presentation.

At 4:30 p.m. Councillor McCluskey retired from the meeting.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES:

4.3 Regional Plan Policy / Regulation Change Checklist

A draft copy of the Regional Plan Regulation/Policy Change Criteria Check List was

submitted.

The Chair noted that feedback was still coming in on this item, and that he did not think there would be any fundamental changes.

4.4 Team Building Session

The Chair advised that the consensus seems to be that Friday would be best for a team building session. It was agreed that the team building session would be held on the afternoon of November 16, 2007.

4.1 Wind Turbines Update

A memorandum dated October 23, 2007 from Mr. Shayne Vipond, Regional and Community Planning was submitted.

Mr. Wells provided a synopsis of the memo.

MOVED by Mr. Pettipas, seconded by Ms. Newcombe that the Regional Plan Advisory Committee endorse the commencement of a community consultation process for Phase 2 of the HRM Wind Energy Project. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Mr. Pettipas questioned if the new proposed Farmers Market would be permitted to have wind turbine structures.

In response, Mr. Wells indicated he would look into this matter and respond back to the Committee.

4.2 Overview of Criteria for Prioritizing Communities for Community Visioning

A document entitled *HRM Community Visioning Criterion Description (last revised, October 2007)* was submitted.

Mr. Marcus Garnet and Ms. Maria Jacobs, HRM Community Development, provided a presentation on the method for selecting the next communities for the Visioning Program. The presentation began with an overview of the context of community visioning, explaining how the growth centres were identified in the Regional Plan and the way in which the criteria was chosen. Mr. Garnet and Ms. Jacobs then reviewed the list of criteria and concluded by outlining the next steps in the process.

The following are highlights of the presentation:

- c last year there were three community visioning pilot projects: Musquodoboit, Fall River, and Bedford Waterfront. These communities were chosen based on the level of interest expressed; they were organized communities; they had a network of communications; and they were three different communities with

their own unique qualities.

- C The method for selecting the next communities will include:
 - C an evaluation matrix containing 25 criteria, and it will strike a balance between land use and social planning issues, and it is intended to be a base tool and a starting point.
 - C the 25 criteria include 12 under the land use criteria and 13 under social criteria.
 - C additional criteria that goes beyond the 25 social and land criteria (this includes how other projects by HRM or other agencies can feed into or benefit from it)

- C The next steps in the process: Should the Committee endorse the program, staff will carry out the analysis, and present a proposed multi-year program to the Committee, and then the Committee will present the recommendations to Council.

The Committee entered a discussion and there was general consensus that the list of criteria was too long and that it should be grouped into five or six categories (e.g. Growth, Environment, etc). The Chair noted that objectivity and clarity in the criteria is important, and that some of the criteria may need tightening-up. He advised that when the matter is brought back, the Committee will review it and provide direction at that time.

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS: None

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS: None

- 6.1 Correspondence - None
- 6.2 Petitions - None
- 6.3 Presentations - None

7. REPORTS - None

9. ADDED ITEMS: None

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - November 21, 2007

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Legislative Assistant