

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX REGIONAL COUNCIL
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

December 10, 2013

PRESENT:

Mayor Mike Savage
Deputy Mayor Darren Fisher
Councillors: Barry Dalrymple
David Hendsbee
Bill Karsten
Lorelei Nicoll
Gloria McCluskey
Waye Mason
Jennifer Watts
Linda Mosher
Russell Walker
Stephen Adams
Reg Rankin
Matt Whitman
Brad Johns
Steve Craig
Tim Outhit

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Butts, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. John Traves, Municipal Solicitor
Ms. Cathy Mellett, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Quentin Hill, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. CALL TO ORDER..... 3
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – NONE..... 3
- 3. RP+5 DRAFT 3 – RECOMENDATIONS 3
- 4. ADJOURNMENT 18

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Savage called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – NONE

3. RP+5 DRAFT 3 – RECOMENDATIONS

The following were before Council:

- Staff Recommendation Report dated November 25, 2013
- Community Design Advisory Committee Recommendation Report dated November 15, 2013
- Staff Recommendation Report to Community Design Advisory Committee dated September 18, 2013
- Regional Municipal Planning Strategy - Draft 3
- Staff presentation dated December 3, 2013
- Revised staff presentation slide 83
- Table of CDAC recommendations and Staff Responses
- Summary of motions passed at the Committee of the Whole on December 3, 2013
- Correspondence from Burkhard Plache; Ben Young & J. Michael Hanusiak Urban Development Institute of Nova Scotia; Alex Rhineland; Stella Lord; Deborah Jones; Jennifer Fifield; Louise Mussett; Elaine Bennett; and Brigid Garvey.

The Committee did not provide amendments to CDAC recommendations 15 and 16, 16(a), 17 or 19 and continued on CDAC recommendation 20.

Councillor Mason requested staff explain the modal split projections for active transportation and transit in the plan.

Mr. Dave McCusker, Manager Strategic Transportation Planning, noted that the projections for both active transportation and transit were based on a 25 year investment in infrastructure and services. He added that in the first 5 years none of the modal splits have changed but it is expected that the investment will happen over the next 25 years.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Watts, that the time frame for the modal split targets remain at 2026 rather than the proposed 2031.

Councillor Nicoll clarified that the modal splits were also mentioned in CDAC recommendation 21. She wanted further explanation on how the suburban and urban and rural edge is defined.

Mr. McCusker explained that in the demand simulation model, the expected investment in transit is input along with the settlement patterns. He stated it is difficult to define the urban and suburban edge as there are over 10,000 different areas with such edges to consider. He added that the simulation model is only intended as a working tool for staff and they had attempted to provide general commonalities as requested by CDAC.

Councillor McCluskey questioned if the target date was changed would it be able to be accomplished .

Mr. McCusker replied that if the investment was made the targets could be accomplished, adding it is difficult to know the projected costs. He clarified that the active transportation piece is projected to cost 100 million in investment but it is the transit investment that was unknown.

Councillor Hendsbee questioned if the transit would be accomplished and at what cost. He reminded Council that in the last Regional Plan, there were promises of Metro X and Metro Link as prime examples of how transit would work and there has only been a small investment in those projects.

Councillor Adams commented that many of the recommendations in the draft are based on a 30 – 35 year land supply. He noted that there is a proposed development in the Spryfield area which has 126 units but they have no approvals and are unable to change the Land Use Bylaw (LUB). He added that there are no applications before staff and the Plan is presupposing outcomes and developing a Plan without knowing what developments will be approved or are yet to come. He suggested that it would be more beneficial to have a joint recommendation from CDAC and staff to Council.

Councillor Watts stated that residents have continued to stress the importance of addressing transit and how residents are moved around the city. She added that there was a need to set an achievable expectation about what will move active transportation and transit projects forward.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. McCusker stated that the percentages in the draft were referring to the number of person trips generated in the areas that travel to the Regional Centre.

Councillor Rankin requested to know what the implications to the Municipality would be to reduce the timeframe of the active transportation and transit programs. He expressed concern that there would need to be a shift in priorities to move it forward.

Ms. Fraser explained that they went with 2031 instead of 2026 because staff cannot predict what the implications would be. She added that there are too many variables to consider but the 2031 date would be a minimum, if the right conditions were available projects would go forward sooner.

MOTION DEFEATED.

The Committee did not provide any comments on CDAC recommendation 22.

On CDAC recommendation 23, Councillor Watts advised that staff have requested that the recommendation should read: shall “require”, **which was accepted by Council.**

The Committee continued discussion on CDAC recommendation 24a and 25.

Councillor Karsten questioned if an annual report on the implementation to Regional Council was required.

Ms. Fraser explained that staff was supportive of providing Council with an annual report as it helped guide staff to ensure that Council was updated on how the Regional Plan was moving forward. Ms. Fraser added that it would not be an exhaustive list but a report card of where the plan is and any timelines that staff committed to.

Councillor Mosher requested how the definition of suburban is determined. She noted a number of large buildings in her constituency that have all the amenities of urban living and are considered a suburban area. She added that many of the buildings are located directly across the street from areas that are considered urban.

Mr. French explained that the area referred to by Councillor Mosher is just outside the regional center. He further added that drawing boundaries to differentiate urban and suburban areas was difficult as there will always be areas which could be considered in either designation.

Councillor Mosher stated that she believed that the suburban numbers were inflated and the boundaries needed to be redefined.

MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Whitman that staff prepare a supplementary report to look at redefining the urban boundary in the generalized future land use map.

Mr. French reminded Council that the Committees work was defined in a Council resolution with a specific scope. The question being raised goes to the generalized future land use map and its designations. This request was outside the scope of the RP+5 review, originally provided by Regional Council.

Mayor Savage ruled the motion **OUT OF ORDER**, as it was outside the scope of the RP+5 Review that was determined by Council.

A number of Councillors requested a clearer definition of urban growth areas outside the urban center, noting it is important to Council and the public.

Ms. Fraser indicated that staff would work on a better definition of the three areas of growth.

Councillor Nicoll requested that Council have a presentation from Finance regarding aligning taxation with regional planning boundaries.

Councillor Whitman wanted to know why Hammonds Plains was not included in Map 1 as a rural growth center. He also wanted to know if there was money in place for the Tantallon Crossroads.

Mr. French responded that Hammonds Plains is not identified as a growth center on Map 1. He noted that at the time the original plan was adopted there was some growth control measures put in place to control the rate of subdivision activity. There were two areas where the interim controls were not lifted and those were Hammonds Plains and Beaver Bank. The reason they were not lifted is the infrastructure was not robust enough to support future growth. He advised that there are no specific capital budget items for areas such as the Tantallon Crossroads. The commitment was made in the original plan that an investigation would be taken as to whether or not there would be opportunity to pipe water and sewer to those communities. It was found in these studies that the cost of providing servicing was deemed too great to place on the residents in the area. Mr. French went on to explain that the reason for identifying the centers was to encourage growth and create the critical mass to provide those services in the future.

Councillor Johns advised that he disagreed with Beaver Bank being placed in a growth restricted zone in the first Regional Plan, although he noted he was aware that traffic issues were the reasoning. He added that Beaver Bank has received over 40 million in infrastructure over the past ten years and he again does not agree that Beaver Bank should be in a growth restricted zone.

The Committee did not have any comments or amendments to CDAC recommendations 26, 27, and continued discussion on CDAC recommendation 28.

Councillor Hendsbee wondered what the cost implication would be for undergrounding of utilities. He added that he did not think it should be mandatory in areas where the geology would be cost prohibitive to implement.

Ms. Fraser advised that through an economic impact study and depending on the location there would be a \$3500 cost per household to implement undergrounding of utilities.

In response to Mayor Savage, Mr. French explained that it would not be full undergrounding of services it would be secondary undergrounding of services from the pole underground to the building. Mr. French advised that a report in this regard would be before Council before the public hearing on the Regional Plan takes place.

Councillor Nicoll questioned who is responsible to maintain the trenches after the residents make the investment into the necessary undergrounding infrastructure from the pole to the dwelling.

Councillor Whitman questioned why the undergrounding of services was in the Regional Plan. He stressed that the homeowner should have choice of implementing undergrounding of services. He added that it is not something that is necessary for rural areas.

The Committee began to discuss CDAC recommendation 29.

Councillor Adams requested clarification on how green belting would benefit HRM's economy.

Mr. French explained that the concept of green belting becomes a fiscal benefit by enhancing the attractiveness of an area which draws people to reside in those areas.

Councillor Adams disagreed that green belting showed any financial benefit to HRM. He felt it provided possible health benefits, and a buffer between properties

Mayor left the Chair at 11:55 am and Deputy Mayor Fisher assumed the Chair.

Councillor Hendsbee stated that having a green belt would hold back development in rural areas. He requested explanation from staff as to how the green belting would be implemented in rural areas.

Ms. Fraser pointed out that in Chapter 3 Table 3.4, the Plan talks about conservation design where there is a high density conservation design which allows rural areas to have greater concentration of development. She added that there are mechanisms in the plan to address those concerns.

Councillor Mosher suggested that there be greater emphasis placed on securing open public spaces when approving developments.

Ms. Fraser added that staff will be doing an open space priority plan that will address securing of open spaces as outlined in Policy E-11 and would be brought back to Council for approval.

Council recessed at 12:00 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m. with Mayor Savage in the Chair.

At the request of Councillor Hendsbee, Council agreed to return to discussion on CDAC recommendations 15 and 16.

Councillor Hendsbee questioned what kind of administrative support would be put in place to ensure timely completion and implementation of some of the community planning processes.

Mr. Richard Butts, CAO advised it is difficult to come with an implementation strategy for a policy or Regional Plan until it's approved. Once the Regional Plan is approved they would be able to start implementing the plan and then start bringing implementation strategies to Council.

Councillor Hendsbee wondered why Musquodoboit Harbour was not included on page 9 of the staff report. He added there were other areas that participated in a visioning process and why were they not included in the list. Councillor Hendsbee noted that North Preston should include East Preston. He explained that North and East Preston have a number of similar growth and development issues and he did not feel it was fair to involve one without the other.

The CAO advised that the plan is about need and requirements and not about fairness. He added that community planning is not based on a geographic plan; it's based on the scoping of need.

Mr. French explained that the areas listed in the report were areas that staff considered to be a priority. However, he added that Council has the ability to add to or change the areas on the list. The areas on the list are the ones driven by the growth potential. Musquodoboit Harbour was not included in the list because it was perceived as not having strong growth potential. It was also one of the communities that the potential for servicing was deemed so expensive it was an unrealistic option.

Councillor Karsten raised concern that there has been no completion of some of the community planning processes. He noted that it makes it difficult to review some of the older secondary plans that have been in place for many years. Councillor Karsten stated that Eastern Passage/Cow Bay Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) has been in place since 1992 and it is in a dire need for review. He requested that Eastern Passage/Cow Bay be added to the list to be considered. He requested clarification from staff about the difference between the secondary planning process and the community visioning process.

Mr. French advised that following the adoption of the regional plan in 2006 there were a number of communities that were identified by Council for a visioning program. They were time consuming and involved a lot of community stake holder input. At this time, Policy G-3 of the proposed Regional Plan says that when preparing secondary planning strategies HRM shall incorporate a visioning program in conjunction with the planning process. The difference between a visioning plan and a secondary planning is that secondary planning is inclusion of work regarding revisions to land use bylaws, regulations and changing property rights. Previously, the visioning program was about establishing some ideals or understanding from the community on what they would like to see achieved over the life of the plan. Staff is proposing it all be one process to include the changing of regulations, land use bylaws and property rights.

Councillor Whitman requested that Hubbard's be included in the list.

MOVED by Councillor Karsten, seconded by Councillor Hendsbee to request a staff report in regard to adding Eastern Passage, Cow Bay, and Hubbard's to the list of communities where a Community Planning Process would be undertaken as outline on page 9 of the staff report.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. French advised it was not staff's intention to include the list on page 9 of the staff report, in the Regional Plan. He explained that it would be administrative advice to Council on priority community planning. It would go to Council at the same time as the Regional Plan, but would be included in the cover report and not as a policy piece in the Regional Plan.

Councillor Dalrymple stated that only Phase one had been completed of the Fall River Visioning process and wanted to make sure it was not removed from the list.

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Adams, that Fairview be added to the list of communities being considered for the Community Planning Process outlined on page 9 of the staff report.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor McCluskey expressed frustration with the current community visioning process. She stated that the community gets involved and have an expectation to see the process move forward and often there are no funds to see the visioning projects through.

MOVED by Councillor Nicoll, seconded by Councillor Hendsbee that Cole Harbour and Main Street, Westphal be added to the list of communities being considered for the Community Planning Process outlined on page 9 of the staff report.

Ms. Fraser advised that when the list comes before Council, there needs to be some prioritization on which areas are dealt with first.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Whitman to request a staff report to investigate including Spryfield and Musquodoboit Harbour to the list of communities being considered for the Community Planning Process outlined on page 9 of the staff report.

Discussion ensued.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

An overall discussion regarding the Regional Plan Review ensued.

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Adams that Policy SU- 27 of the Regional Plan be amended to new SU-28 to state “subject to the provisions of the Halifax Municipal Charter, to develop through a citizen led multi-stakeholder, multi-stakeholder, consensus decision making process, an integrated solid waste resource management strategy for the Regional Municipality, and any strategy adopted continues in force until altered, amended or approved by the Council following a similar process.”

Councillor Rankin advised that the original process had been removed from the Act in 1998. He added that this motion would only be restoring that provision that the community members felt had worked in the past.

Councillor Craig advised he could not support the motion brought forward by Councillor Rankin but did offer to bring forward an amendment. He explained that the process involved in Councillor Rankin’s amendment was 18 years old. He suggested there must have been a good reason for the Province to not include it in the Charter. He added that there is currently a strategy being developed that is set to come before Council on January 14.

Councillor Karsten questioned if there would be a request for a staff report. He cautioned Council from trying to replicate using the same processes that were used many years ago, citing that many things in waste management strategy has changed over the last 18 years.

Councillor Rankin advised that he would not support an amendment for a staff report.

Mr. Traves raised concern that the way the motion is drafted it would capture the current process that is ongoing. If it was intended to be forward speaking then it should be changed to clarify that. He explained that if there is a will of Council to look at it, staff needs to be able to have the opportunity to look at it from the authority of the current Charter. He further added that it would go against the current community engagement strategy adopted by Council. Adopting this in the current Municipal Planning Strategy would tie Council to this approach and unable to change it without public consultation.

Council agreed to add to the motion that **“following the conclusion of the current Solid Waste Strategy Review, HRM will strive to develop.”**

Further discussion ensued.

Councillor Craig clarified that Councillor Rankin’s motion takes the authority away from staff and Council and places it in the hands of the community. He added he could not support that because that would cause more governance issues in the future.

Mr. Traves advised that, unless amended the motion if it were to be passed would not come back to Council.

Councillor Outhit advised that he could support the motion only if the process was subject to the approval of Council.

The Committee agreed to amend the motion to include that “**subject to the approval of Regional Council.**”

Mr. Traves advised that the current Charter does provide that there is an obligation and responsibility on the CAO to coordinate and direct the preparation of plans and programs to be submitted to Council, including the solid waste facilities. The motion as before Council would be subject to that provision.

The CAO added that in its current form the motion only speaks to the citizen’s role and to Council’s role. He requested in the future that Council also define the role of staff.

In response to questions from Council Mr. Traves advised that all policies and administrative orders take their authority from the Charter that would include any previous legislation.

Ms. Fraser advised that the community engagement strategy was updated in 2008 Councillor Craig recommended that Council defeat the motion as he did not think that Council should not abdicate their authority on making decisions.

The amended motion was before Council as follows:

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Adams that Policy SU-27 be amended to new SU-28 to state: “Following the conclusion of the current Solid Waste Strategy review that HRM shall strive, subject to the provisions of the Halifax Municipal Charter, to develop through a citizen led, multi-stakeholder, consensus decision making process, an integrated solid waste resource management strategy for the Regional Municipality, subject to the approval of Regional Council, and any strategy so adopted continues in force until altered, amended or approved the Council following a similar process.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Hendsbee requested that more detailed mapping be provided in the report before the next step of the Plan adoption begins. He also requested that consistency be put in place on how communities are identified as community centers. He noted that on Maps 1-4, it lists Lake Charlotte as the rural local centre. He stated that it is incorrect as there are few services that would qualify Lake Charlotte as the local centre. He stated that Oyster Pond would be considered as the community local centre. He also requested that the correct area of Jeddore be listed on the maps. He further clarified that North Preston and East Preston are the main community boundaries and there is no generic Preston area as indicated in the maps. Councillor Hendsbee requested that in the rural road network that the Lawrencetown connector should be included in the list of critical road infrastructure.

MOVED by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Outhit that Policy SU-27 be amended to include that: An integrated solid waste strategy review will be conducted every 10 years, unless staff recommends that the review be conducted in a shorter period of time, after Regional Council approves the current strategy review. All HRM in-force written agreements/contracts shall be considered before, during and after the strategy review process. HRM will consider amendments to community planning strategies; land use by-laws to implement the resulting HRM Regional Council approved integrated solid waste resource strategy. And, an information report on the integrated solid waste resource system key waste stream performance indicator targets and results will be produced on an annual basis.

Councillor Craig advised that his motion is to round out the previous motion voted on and approved by Council. He felt the ten year review and the performance indicators were an important piece that had not been included.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Council recessed at 3:00 p.m. and resumed at 3:15 p.m.

MOVED by Councillor Nicoll, seconded by Councillor Watts to request a staff report regarding the inclusion of a “Strategic Objectives and Implications” section to each staff report, as outlined in CDAC recommendation 27.

Ms. Fraser explained that this was something that could be directed by Council or the CAO and did not need to be noted in the Regional Plan. In response to questions from Council, she added that it would not be something that would have to be noted in reports regarding tenders but that staff would take their direction from Council or the CAO to include the request.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor McCluskey reminded Council that even though there was many amendments coming forward, that the report was not finalized. She added that there was still public hearing portion of the Regional Plan to come forward.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Whitman that Maps 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9 and Appendix B for Oyster Pond be clarified and replace Lake Charlotte as the designated local center. Maps 1, 8, 9 and appendix B should be shown as Head Jeddore and Maps 8 & 9 delete community name of Preston and identify them as North and East Preston.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Whitman to add to Table 4-1 on page 63 of the Regional Plan Draft, Road Network Projects, the extension of the Lawrencetown connector from Highway 7 to Highway 207 to the Road Networks Functional Plan.

A brief discussion ensued.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Johns, seconded by Councillor Walker to request a staff report in regard to the implications of aligning sewer services boundary areas with the current water service boundary throughout the municipality.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Outhit that in section 8.4 Stormwater Management: add to the preamble a statement in regard to climate change an increased emphasis on Stormwater management for the protection of people and property.

Councillor Craig noted that stormwater is recognized throughout the plan as an environmental issue and he wanted it to highlight the property damage.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Whitman that in section 4.2.3 Public Transit, to add a section to acknowledge the importance of system wide accessibility to Transit.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Outhit that Section 2.3.4 Flood Plains, acknowledge the identified flood plain areas within HRM that have been identified federally.

Councillor Craig clarified that this would highlight areas that have been considered high risk zones for flooding in HRM. It would also emphasize not building on flood plains.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Outhit raised concern that the Regional Plan assumes that proposed developments are going to be built to a specific scale and asked what would happen if those proposed developments decided to be built at a smaller scale.

Mr. French explained that the maps were provided for illustrative purposes they are not predictions of what would occur. He added that the policies approved by Council are

permissive by nature only. It does not presume that building would happen, but it would allow for the ability for it to happen. Staff believes that the way to proceed is to talk about the broader growth targets. He advised that they could add something in the preamble to note that there is a large supply of land, and indicate that they could not predict where that future development would occur, so that no misunderstanding would arise.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Watts that Regional Council request a legal opinion regarding the extent to which Halifax Water is bound to comply with the Regional Plan, MPS and Land Use Bylaws and options for requesting legislative amendments to ensure Halifax Water is subject to the Regional Plan, MPS and other land use strategies if required.

Councillor Outhit asked if HRM is required to increase sewage capacity in areas where increased development is possible.

Mr. Traves advised that he would not be able to give legal opinion on Halifax's Water capacity to provide services but could only provide on their obligations to HRM.

Ms. Fraser added that there is a Request for Proposal (RFP) with HRM to go out with Halifax Water to go out and answer some of the capacity questions brought forward by Council.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED

MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Walker that staff prepare a report assessing the definition of suburban and regional centre in regard to growth targets, the assumptions and rationale which need to be evaluated to ensure that they reflect the objectives in the Regional Plan such as "focus new growth centres where supporting services and infrastructure are already available."

Councillor Mosher noted that the definition in the report is quite broad. She noted in her area the Craigmere building, on one side of the street is considered the Peninsula Urban centre while across the street is a 17 story building which is considered suburban. She noted if you go further up the street, the Superstore is considered urban and across the street is considered suburban. She felt that a staff report needed to look at some of the specific instances, since the included many of the amenities that are considered in the urban definition. She added she was not looking to greatly increase the boundary but noted that there are many discrepancies. She felt that if Council was going to be held accountable for the focused growth of the urban center; Council needed to have an accurate depiction of the areas

Councillor Nicoll advised she would support getting more information as requested by Councillor Mosher, as it would help define a 'complete community' and she requested that the definition of complete communities be captured in the staff report.

Deputy Mayor Fisher questioned if the motion would be asking to extend the boundaries of the Regional Centre to include the buildings discussed by Councillor Mosher.

Councillor Mosher clarified that the goal is to see if the definitions achieve what the objectives are, when looking at community design.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Karsten requested staff clarify what the statement 'Phase 2 is being re-examined' in relation to the Mount Hope Interchange and Extension on page 62.

Mr. McCusker advised that there was question about the ability to make the connection across lands owned by the Department of National Defense (DND). He noted that this was recognition by staff that an issue had arisen

Councillor Karsten also questioned if the north part of Caldwell Road was captured in the Morris Russell Lake Plan.

Mr. French advised that as far as the Regional Plan is concerned the lands north of Morris Lake have been identified as a growth center, staff would undertake secondary planning at the appropriate time, however, that time is tied to the construction of a bypass road to go through Shearwater.

Councillor Karsten questioned if Policy S -29 would allow additional dwelling units within R-1 zones throughout the Municipality.

Mr. French advised that when preparing secondary planning strategies it can be considered.

Mr. French confirmed that correspondence received would be included in the staff report.

Councillor McCluskey was concerned that Council had not received a report regarding the old Dartmouth City Hall to be used to display Dartmouth artifacts. She added that there is no mention in the Plan of this or any mention of any facility to place artifacts. She added that they are deteriorating and place needs to be found to properly store them.

Ms. Fraser stated that the Cultural Priorities Plan would speak to the cultural artifacts of HRM and what the plan is for them.

Mr. Anguish advised there is nothing in the Regional Plan that precludes this. He advised that the report that Councillor McCluskey was speaking of would be before Council in January 2014.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Whitman that Table 3-3 of the Regional Plan Draft be updated to include Rural local centers Jeddore, Head Jeddore and Oyster Pond need to be noted and that Tangier, Moser River, Upper Musquodoboit and Lucasville should be included in another table as non-growth centres.

Mr. French advised that it would be possible to amend the table to include more communities. He added that they are listed in the table as they have specific design criteria associated with the anticipated growth.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Staff confirmed that the most up to date list of species at risk would be included in the final report for Council..

MOVED by Councillor Johns, seconded by Councillor Dalrymple that staff prepare a report on the implications of removing the community of Beaver Bank from Policy S-24.

Councillor Johns clarified that Beaver Bank has had over 40 million dollars in infrastructure over the last 10 years. He added that HRM has not invested any money in the area during that time. He explained that the area is running into a problem that the area is stagnating with no new growth and was worried about losing services in the area.

Council agreed to Councillor Whitman's request that Hammonds Plains Road be added to the request for staff report.

The motion before Council now reads:

MOVED by Councillor Johns, seconded by Councillor Dalrymple to request a staff report on the implications of removing the community of Beaver Bank and Hammonds Plains Road from Policy S-24.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Outhit to add the Bedford Highway expansion to four (4) lanes to the project list related to the Road Network Priority Plan.

Mr. McCusker clarified that the list of projects on the Functional Road Network Plan are only those projects that are necessary to support the settlement patterns outlined in the Regional Plan. He added that one of the goals of CDAC was to ensure that land use decision and transportation investment were tied more closely together. He further explained that adding more projects to that list would create more of a division.

Councillor Outhit stated that he was pleased to hear that the projects should be linked to growth. He listed many areas in Bedford that all come off the Bedford Highway and are scheduled for growth. He did not understand why Bedford Highway was not listed as one of the roads required for the Functional Road Networks Plan.

Councillor Watts questioned the need to add more projects when there has not been any consultation on the road network plan. She felt that Council should wait to add projects to the road network functional plan after the public consultation takes place.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Adams that consideration be given to widening Barrington Street to four lanes or more between the bridge.

MOTION DEFEATED.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Rankin that the Regional Plan include the 3rd Harbour project be included as a potential Road Network Project.

MOTION DEFEATED.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Karsten that staff prepare a report in regard to the inclusion of Lake Eagle as a Regional Park in Table 2-3.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Hendsbee expressed frustration that there is no recognition of growth targets in the rural areas in the Plan. He wanted to know why it was not included in the report.

Mr. French stated Councillor Hendsbee is correct that there are no targets awarded to rural growth. He said that through the work of CDAC the emphasis of growth was shifted to the rural centre. He noted that there is recognition of the concern for growth in rural areas on page 69.

The main motion with amendments passed during Committee of the Whole was before Council.

MOVED by Councillor Nicoll, seconded by Councillor McCluskey that Committee of the Whole:

- 1. Accept the amendments recommended by staff in the discussion section of this report with such amendments as passed by Committee of the Whole at its meetings of December 3, 2013 and December 10, 2013.**

2. **Direct staff to prepare a supplementary report and amendments package for referral to the Heritage Advisory Committee and the Design Review Committee.**
3. **Direct staff to bring forward the amendment package to Regional Council to initiate the adoption process (1st reading & set a date for a public hearing).**

Councillor Adams asked if there would be opportunity for amendments if Council approved the draft Regional Plan.

Councillor Johns asked if all reports that were asked for would come back to Council before the public hearing process went forward.

Ms. Fraser advised that only amendments that were non substantive would be permitted. She added that any substantive amendments would have to go back out for public consultation. She noted that all reports would be back before Council prior to the public hearing.

In response to questions from Council Mr. Traves clarified that Council always has the option when the proposed strategy comes back to make additional changes. Some changes might require it be sent back to CDAC or any other stakeholder in the process. If it goes forward to public hearing and there are changes then, it would need to be determined if the changes were substantive or not.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Cathy J. Mellett
Municipal Clerk