



**NORTH WEST PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
January 6, 2016**

PRESENT: Ms. Ann Merritt, Chair
Mr. Paul Russell, Vice Chair
Mr. Brian Murray
Mr. Kevin Copley
Mr. Ross Evans
Ms. Dianna Rievaj
Mr. Evan MacDonald
Councillor Tim Outhit

STAFF: Mr. Ben Sivak, Major Projects Planner
Mr. Andrew Reid, Legislative Assistant

The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.

The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the North West Planning Advisory Committee are available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/NWPAC/160106nwpac-agenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m., and the Committee adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Introductions were made by all Committee members.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 4, 2015 and December 2, 2015

MOVED by Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Copley

THAT the minutes of November 4, 2015 and December 2, 2015 be approved as circulated.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

MOVED by Councillor Outhit, seconded by Mr. Russell

THAT the agenda be approved as circulated.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES – NONE

5. CALL FOR DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTERESTS – NONE

6. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

7. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS – NONE

8. INFORMATION ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD – NONE

9. REPORTS

9.1 STAFF

- 9.1.1 Case 20110 – Application by WSP on behalf of Marque Investments to enable the development of property totalling approximately 157 Ha (387 acres) in size located on Windgate Drive, Beaver Bank, NS. More specifically, the applicant is applying to:**
- 1. Enter into a Classic and Hybrid Open Space Design development agreement (being processed as Case 20110); and**
 - 2. Amend the Regional Subdivision By-law to extend the water service boundary (being processed as Case 20264).**

The following was before the Committee:

- A staff memorandum dated December 14, 2015 re: Case 20110

Mr. Ben Sivak, Major Projects Planner, presented Case 20110, explaining the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the open space design development agreement and comments were not being sought on the water service boundary as that was part of a separate case (Case 20264). He outlined the concept development plan, which included individual freehold lots (55 units), and common ownership units (210 units). Mr. Sivak stated the open space design criteria being used was according to the 2006 criteria because of the date the application had been initiated. Mr. Sivak indicated the studies that have been conducted: application report, conceptual development plan, storm water management plan, proposed sewage treatment system, traffic impact study, and archaeological resource impact assessment. He requested feedback on the application by the Committee.

The Chair opened the floor to questions and comments from Committee members.

Mr. Copley stated there were concerns at the public meeting regarding traffic. He stated that the size of the development was inconsistent with current development and rural character of the area, specifically the multiunit buildings. He also questioned the criteria of senior housing.

Mr. MacDonald questioned why a traffic impact study was not circulated to Committee members and echoed concerns relative to traffic. Mr. Sivak responded that a link to the study was included in the memorandum. Mr. MacDonald also questioned if any studies had been performed regarding habitat and endangered species. Mr. Sivak stated that no endangered species were found during review.

Ms. Rievaj questioned the criteria for senior housing. She also questioned the situation of schooling in the area. Mr. Sivak responded that he would be following up with the schoolboard.

Mr. Russell questioned what attributes of the development would make it amenable for seniors other than the building form. He also questioned the water service boundary. Mr. Sivak responded that the criteria according to the Land Use Bylaw were broadly defined as housing designed for seniors. Regarding water, he responded the issue was being considered through Case 20264.

Mr. Murray stated concern for traffic. He suggested that the applicant take on the cost of installing traffic lights at the Beaverbank Road and Windgate Drive intersection. Regarding the traffic impact statement, he also stated concern that the traffic engineer was not available for questions.

Councillor Outhit suggested that traffic was a concern and the developer consider a contribution to traffic lights, when warranted; however, Council could not make this an instruction. He also stated that the water service issues needed to be sorted out before the application could be supported.

Mr. Evans echoed concerns regarding water and also traffic at the intersection of Beaverbank Road and Windgate Drive. In response to a question regarding zoning, Mr. Sivak stated the front portion was zoned rural industrial and the back portion zoned rural resource.

The Chair stated concern for the safety of the intersection, given traffic and the rail line. She questioned if pyritic slates had been found. She questioned if lots drawn over waterbodies would be owned by individuals. She also questioned how the septic systems would function in view of the large quantity of water on the land. Mr. Sivak responded that no pyritic slates had been found on the site. He responded that watercourses would be identified and development buffered around them, as these were requirements of the Province. Regarding septic, he stated the building and septic system would be setback from the watercourses. He commented that further detail could be given in the development agreement regarding setbacks from watercourses and wetlands. Mr. Sivak responded to further questions regarding the road system. He explained that the road in the north would cross an artificial water body.

Upon request, the Chair opened the floor to the consultant to answer outstanding questions.

Mr. Kourosh Rad, WSP Inc., responded that the wetlands were required to be protected and every foot of wetland taken away was required to be compensated three times over elsewhere. He stated that wetland disturbance was minimized as much as possible on the site. He outlined how the open space design would mean 60-80% of the natural setting would be preserved and no clear cutting would occur.

Mr. Dennis Rogers, applicant, addressed a number of comments. Regarding traffic, he stated that there was congestion at Windsor Junction and Beaverbank Road but one developer should not have to finance the traffic lights. He highlighted that two acres to the North East of the site had been offered to Halifax Transit as a park and ride for seniors. He stated that the vision of the development was to look after people, providing commercial amenities such as a grocery store, pharmacy, and doctor's office for seniors. He stated that the multiunit buildings would have underground parking. Mr. Rogers highlighted that there was currently a hold on the commercial property and the seniors housing would be the last portion to be developed. He stated if seniors were not obtained the building would be rented and no

further units for seniors would be built. In response to a question he confirmed that the four multiunits on site were the only area where seniors were being sought. He stated this would be the only area affected in the development concept if the commercial properties were not developed. Mr. Rogers confirmed regarding unit counts that 120 units were located in the multiunit buildings.

Mr. Murray suggested that traffic lights be installed by the developer. Mr. Evans commented that the traffic lights should be cost shared by some means.

Mr. Sivak clarified that the concept plan divided the site into part condominium and part free hold land, as allowed by open space developments. Mr. Sivak clarified that there was a mixture of private driveways and public roads, but that any connection between roads would necessitate public roads.

Ms. Rievaj questioned why the site was being divided into common and freehold ownership. Mr. Rad responded that the two sets would allow for a variety of needs and to provide for a complete community. He also stated that the concept had gone through a number of revisions and was still being worked on before proceeding to Community Council.

Mr. Copley questioned if the development would include sidewalks. Mr. Sivak responded that road standards in the area did not require sidewalks but more emphasis in policy was placed on connectivity of trails and linear parks. Councillor Outhit stated that if the commercial/seniors aspect went forward, sidewalks would need to be in place. Mr. Sivak confirmed that connectivity would be addressed.

The Committee discussed the considerations for recommending approval of the application.

MOVED by Councillor Outhit, seconded by Mr. Russell

THAT the North West Planning Advisory Committee has reviewed the application for Case 20110 and recommends approval of the application as outlined in the memorandum and attachments package dated December 14th, 2015 with consideration to the following matters:

- **Traffic lights be installed at Beavercreek and Windgate Drive intersection.**
- **Municipal water be supplied to the lands.**
- **The developer be encouraged to contribute to the traffic lights.**

Mr. Russell requested the following friendly amendment, to which the Committee endorsed.

- **The roads be maintained as public roads.**

Mr. Russell requested municipal sewage also be included as a consideration for a friendly amendment. Mr. Sivak clarified that sewage was a different consideration because it involved the urban service boundary. The second friendly amendment was thus withdrawn.

The question was called for on the motion.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

- 10. ADDED ITEMS – NONE**
- 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – February 3, 2016**
- 13. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant