

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HARBOUR EAST COMMUNITY COUNCIL MINUTES

February 3, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor McCluskey, Chair
 Councillor Barkhouse
 Councillor Fisher
 Councillor Karsten
 Councillor Nicoll
 Deputy Mayor Smith

STAFF: Ms. Angela Jones-Rieksts , Solicitor
 Ms. Sherryll Murphy, Deputy Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 13, 2011.....	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.....	3
4.	PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING	3
4.1	Dartmouth Bridge Terminal Proposed Tender Changes	3
5.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES	8
5.1	Status Sheet	8
5.1.1	Sculpture Park – Dartmouth Waterfront	8
5.1.2	Applications for Beverage Rooms, Lounges and Cabarets	8
5.1.3	Development Agreement Timelines	8
5.1.4	Urban Gardening on Residential Properties.....	8
5.1.5	Accessory Shelter	8
6.	MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE	9
7.	MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE	9
8.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE.....	9
9.	HEARINGS - NONE	9
10.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS - NONE.....	9
10.1	Correspondence	9
10.2	Petitions.....	9
10.3	Presentation.....	9
11.	REPORTS	9
11.1	Staff Reports – NONE.....	9
11.2	Members of Council.....	9
11.2.1	Councillor Appointment to the Grants Committee	9
12.	MOTIONS - NONE	9
13.	ADDED ITEMS - NONE	9
14.	NOTICES OF MOTION	9
14.1	Councillor Fisher – Urban Gardening	9
15.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	9
16.	NEXT MEETING DATE – Thursday, March 3, 2011	10
17.	ADJOURNMENT	10
	INFORMATION ITEMS	10
1.	Licensed Establishments in Dartmouth.....	10
2.	Urban Gardening	10
3.	Development Agreements: Commencement and Completion Times	10

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor McCluskey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with Councillor Nicoll leading the invocation.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 13, 2011

MOVED by Councillor Nicoll, seconded by Councillor Barkhouse that the minutes of the January 13, 2011 meeting of the Harbour East Community Council be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

MOVED by Councillor Karsten, seconded by Councillor Fisher that the agenda, as distributed, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Karsten recognized Councillor Watts seated in the gallery.

4. PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

4.1 Dartmouth Bridge Terminal Proposed Tender Changes

This matter was referred to the Harbour East Community Council from Regional Council. An e-mail from Gordon Smith, Dartmouth, dated February 2, 2011 was distributed to members of Community Council.

Councillor McCluskey indicated that this was a public meeting to provide information to residents of the surrounding community and transit passengers using the Dartmouth Bridge Terminal. She indicated that staff would briefly review the proposed changes to the original design of the Dartmouth Bridge Terminal to bring it in line with the 9.5 million budget.

Councillor McCluskey indicated that members of the public would then be invited to speak and ask questions. Speakers will have approximately 5 minutes to speak and can, after everyone who wishes to speak has spoken, have an additional two or three minutes if they have additional questions.

Mr. Darren Young, Project Manager, gave a brief presentation outlining the design options for the Metro Transit Bridge Terminal. Key highlights included:

- A chronology of the project leading to this meeting
- A review of opportunities for public input which equalled five (5) times since the beginning of the project in April 2009
- Funding for the project has been budgeted at 9.5 million

- Construction cost of Option 1 which includes the bridge is \$12.1 million while construction cost of Option 2 without the bridge is \$8.8 million

Mr. Young then reviewed an evaluation matrix based on Metro Transit criteria and a second matrix based on community criteria. He then reviewed various illustrations of Option 1 and 2 from differing angles. Mr. Young indicated that staff would now respond to questions.

A copy of the presentation is on file.

Councillor McCluskey opened the public meeting calling for persons wishing to speak

Mr. Leon Keys, a member of the Canadian Council of the Blind and a client of CNIB, directed the following questions to staff:

How will persons who are seeing impaired cross five (5) lanes of traffic to determine what buses are at the stop? Mr. David Reage, Supervisor of Service Design and Projects, Metro Transit indicated that for persons coming from the Sportsplex would only have to cross two lanes and indicated that there will be a crossing with tactile provisions.

Will the sloped portion of the curb be painted yellow to assist the seeing impaired? Mr. Young indicated that the slopes would be painted yellow and be constructed with ridged concrete. The edge of steps will also be painted yellow.

Will the glass windows in the terminal be tinted? Mr. Young advised that the windows would be tinted and the Metro Transit logo would also be imprinted on the glass.

Who has represented visually impaired or the blind in the development of the proposal? Mr. Terry Gallagher, Manager, Facility Development indicated that Mr. Laughie Rutt, Diversity Coordinator with HRM has been consulted regarding visual impairment. Mr. Gallagher indicated that Mr. Rutt was a well experienced professional and had a great deal of knowledge relative to the disabled.

Mr. Paul Clarke asked what Mr. Young had meant when he indicated that the new design, Option 2, would ensure that visually impaired persons received assistance immediately if required. Mr. Young noted that the original design, Option 1 provided three accesses at grade and orientation to the information services would be more difficult than in Option 2 where there is only one access at grade and information services are immediately available upon entering.

Mr. Clarke asked the hours of operation for the information services to which Mr. Young indicated that the hours of operation had not been determined, however, consideration will be given to the fact this is not a 9 to 5 operation.

Ms. Joanne Cunningham, noting that she had not attended any other meetings with regard to this matter, confirmed the orientation of the terminal. She further asked the purpose of the bridge in Option 1, to which Mr. Young indicated that the original purpose had been to give some of the green space back given that a portion of the Commons was being utilized in project.

Mr. Trevor Parsons, Tulip Street, Dartmouth asked why the grade was changed in Option 2. Mr. Parsons suggested that the rationalizations being given were in fact about money.

Mr. Young noted that the grade in Option 1 was required to ensure the flatness of the roof area for the bridge. In Option 2, less excavation is required and the grade is to be raised five feet to meet the grade on Nantucket and a lesser grade change at Thistle.

Mr. Parsons suggested that the grade in Option 1 provided a bit more barrier between the high school and the terminal. Mr. Young indicated that in fact there is very little difference in the view plane from the High School in Option 2. In response to a statement from Mr. Parsons that the buses would be closer to the school, Mr. Young indicated no, the platform will still be in the same location.

Mr. Parsons further noted that the grade change in Option 2 was due to pyritic slate. Mr. Young indicated that the excavation of the slate would drive the cost up so less excavation meant less cost.

Mr. Parsons went on to comment that residents have gone through a significant process and the change to the legislation relative to a portion of the Dartmouth Common being used for the terminal. He went on to indicate that residents had been convinced to grudgingly accept the original design. Mr. Parsons indicated that he did not expect to see the trees depicted in Option 2, what he expected was to see was a bus terminal. He went on to note that he believed the entire matter should be revisited and alternatives found. Mr. Parsons suggested that the residents of Dartmouth were the victims of a bait and switch; they approved Option 1 only to be told there was not enough money for the proposal.

Michael Cosgrove, Slater Street, suggested that the arguments for both Option 1 and Option 2 are interchangeable (i.e. green roof with grade lower was going to integrate better with landscape and acoustics). Mr. Young indicated that when he spoke of acoustics he was referring to the noise at the platform area and as a concern for the rider rather than the high school. Mr. Cosgrove suggested that the sound will be heard more clearly at the high school. Mr. Young noted that the School Board has reviewed Option 2 and believe the second option is more appropriate.

Mr. Cosgrove commented that he did not believe the second design was better than the first. He suggested there were better locations and noted that the proposed site did not integrate with businesses. He reiterated that members of the community had begrudgingly agreed with Option 1 as noted previously. He asked why Dartmouth was

not worth spending a little more money to ensure a terminal that is acceptable to the community.

Ms. Pamela Galboyd, CNIB asked how pedestrians who are blind or partially sighted will get on the platform. She noted that the previous design had provided for the visually impaired to use the bridge and not walk in front of buses which were idling. In response, Mr. David Reage, Planning and Project Delivery Coordinator, indicated the access under Option 2 is the same as it is at other transit terminals. He went on to note that pedestrians accessing the terminal from Dartmouth High School will use crosswalks which will be placed at either end of the terminal. He further responded that pedestrians would have to cross three lanes of traffic at a maximum. In response to Ms. Galboyd's concern regarding idling buses, Mr. Reage indicated that given the driver facilities planned for this terminal, it is probable there will be fewer idling buses.

Ms. Galboyd asked if there would be an opportunity for staff to meet with representatives of CNIB to discuss the new proposal, Mr. Reage noted that he had been in discussions with a member of CNIB staff and that travelling this terminal would not be any different that travelling terminals throughout HRM. He went on to note that 75% of those accessing the terminal will do so from the Dartmouth Sportsplex.

Ms. Galboyd noted that although the access will be the same as with other terminals, she is concerned that safety and access for the visually impaired is not at the desired level. She went on to note that CNIB is disappointed that the bridge option is not available to the visually impaired.

Ms. Jill MacGillicuddy, on behalf of the Halifax Regional School Board, addressed the meeting thanking Community Council and staff for the opportunity to speak and to provide input to the project. Ms. MacGillicuddy noted that Option 1 mitigated concerns the School Board had about idling buses on Thistle Street; however, Option 2 is a better fit for Dartmouth High School. Ms. MacGillicuddy noted that the Board believed that Option 2, without the bridge, would be safer both for students and reduce access to the school lands during business hours.

Gerry Irwin clarified the cost difference between the two options as being 3.3 million dollars and suggested that the cost on the tax rate across HRM would be minimal. She went on to indicate that Dartmouth deserves Option 1.

Mr. Clarke further asked why the terminal could not be arranged like the Acadian Lines terminal which would address concerns about crossing two lanes of buses.

Mr. Reage noted that the volume of vehicles involved is significantly different with this terminal being developed to handle approximately 16 buses. In addition, different standards of operation apply. For example, Acadian lines buses can back out of their bays, while Metro Transit buses are required to drive through. He went on to note that the terminal was the standard design for terminals across North America.

6:55 p.m. Councillor Nicoll left the meeting having earlier provided notice to the Chair.

In response to questions from members of Council, staff provided the following information:

- Option 2 has three access points, two are stairs and one is accessible for those having mobility issues
- There are more than 150 trees included in the contract
- The design was not intended to provide cover from the sideways rain common at this location. It was simply a transition from the building to the platform. There will also be bus shelters at the stops that are away from the platform
- There is no park and ride at this location, however, Dartmouth Sportsplex does have pay parking for users. Transit does have 15 spaces for operator use.
- No additional fencing will be utilized on the front of the terminal. There is a significant slope at this location. Fencing will be installed between the school and the terminal.
- Any money originally budgeted and not utilized for the project will put it back in the Metro Transit budget for other capital projects
- A significant percentage of the terminal under either option will be uncovered, so the noise issue will not be significantly worse in either scenario

Referring to the issue of noise/acoustics, Mr. Gallagher indicated that he would like to go back to the consultant to provide a more complete answer to Council.

Mr. Kenny Wilson, President, Amalgamated Transit Union, addressed the meeting indicating operators do not have a place to use the bathroom. He urged Council to move forward suggesting that providing a safe terminal would encourage people to use transit more.

Jane McKay, Dartmouth, indicating that she believed there is a need for a new bus terminal. She expressed concern regarding fumes and the intake vents to the high school and the Sportsplex. She went on to express concern regarding the impact of the terminal on the playing field at the high school and asked how close will users of the field be to fumes. She noted she believed there were other issues to be discussed before a decision is made, for example she understood that Metro Transit has told the School Board they do not have the capacity to handle Dartmouth High School students.

Shane O'Leary, Vice President, Amalgamated Transit Union, advised that children from Dartmouth High use the bus. He encouraged Council to move forward with the project.

Gerry Irwin encouraged Councilors to continue to address concerns re accessibility and safety. She would like to see Option 1 move forward. She further noted that some action should be taken to

Ms. Joanne Cunningham addressed the meeting a second time noting that she, as a rider, would rather see an open air terminal. She confirmed that bus departure/arrival times would be displayed, mapping of bus routes would be displayed and public washrooms would be available at the new terminal.

Catherine Kieran noted that the matrix is subjective and does not focus on the riders and users in this community.

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Jim Smith, seconded by Councillor Karsten that the comments/concerns received from the public be referred back to Council for their consideration prior to making a decision with regard to the Dartmouth Bridge Terminal Project. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

5.1 Status Sheet

5.1.1 Sculpture Park – Dartmouth Waterfront

No update was received relative to this matter and it is to remain on the Status Sheet.

5.1.2 Applications for Beverage Rooms, Lounges and Cabarets

An Information report dated January 18, 2011 was received (see Information Items below). At the request of Deputy Mayor Smith, this matter is to be added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Community Council.

5.1.3 Development Agreement Timelines

An information report dated January 18, 2011 was received (see Information Items below). At the request of Deputy Mayor Smith, this matter is to be added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Community Council.

5.1.4 Urban Gardening on Residential Properties

An information report dated January 18, 2011 was received (see Information Items below). Later in the meeting, Councillor Fisher gave a Notice of Motion relative to this matter.

5.1.5 Accessory Shelter

No update was received relative to this matter and it is to remain on the Status Sheet.

5.1.6 Ball Hockey Rink – Lealman Drive

No update was received relative to this matter and it is to remain on the Status Sheet.

6. **MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE**
7. **MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE**
8. **CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE**
9. **HEARINGS - NONE**
10. **CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS - NONE**
 - 10.1 **Correspondence**
 - 10.2 **Petitions**
 - 10.3 **Presentation**
11. **REPORTS**
 - 11.1 **Staff Reports – NONE**
 - 11.2 **Members of Council**
 - 11.2.1 **Councillor Appointment to the Grants Committee**

This matter was referred from the Administrative Standing Committee.

**MOVED by Councillor Karsten, seconded by Councillor Fisher the Harbour East Community Council recommend that Deputy Mayor Smith be appointed to the Grants Committee as the Harbour East Community Council representative.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

12. **MOTIONS - NONE**
13. **ADDED ITEMS - NONE**
14. **NOTICES OF MOTION**
 - 14.1 **Councillor Fisher – Urban Gardening**

Councillor Fisher gave notice that at the next regular meeting of the Harbour East Community Council to be held on the 3rd day of March 2011, he intends to introduce a motion that Harbour East Community Council request staff to undertake Public Consultation and determine the appropriate amendments to consider urban gardening and the sale of urban gardening produce in residential zones.

15. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No members of the public came forward at this time.

16. NEXT MEETING DATE – Thursday, March 3, 2011

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- 1. Licensed Establishments in Dartmouth**
- 2. Urban Gardening**
- 3. Development Agreements: Commencement and Completion Times**