



**HALIFAX AND WEST COMMUNITY COUNCIL
MINUTES
MAY 13, 2015**

PRESENT: Councillor Steve Adams, Chair
Councillor Reg Rankin, Vice Chair
Councillor Jennifer Watts
Councillor Linda Mosher
Councillor Waye Mason
Councillor Russell Walker

STAFF: Ms. Karen Brown, Solicitor
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 Halifax and West Community Council are available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/Commcoun/west/150513HWCC.php>

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m., and recessed at 7:35 p.m. Community Council reconvened at 7:38 p.m. Community Council adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 21, 2015 and April 28, 2015

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker that the minutes of April 21 and April 28, 2015 be approved as circulated.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Additions:

13.1 Case 19646 Non-Substantive Amendments to the Development Agreement for St. Joseph's Square, Gottingen St., Halifax

13.2 Case 19136: Classic Open Space Design Development Agreement – Whites Lake

Community Council agreed to deal with agenda item 7.1 following agenda item 8.2.2 and to consider 10.1.1 and 13.2 immediately following Business Arising out of the Minutes

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Mason that the agenda be approved as amended.

Two thirds majority vote required.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

Item 10.1.1 was discussed at this time.

10.1.1 Case 18510: MPS/LUB Amendments and Development Agreement, 3400 Dutch Village Road and 3343 Westerwald Street, Halifax

The following information was before the Halifax and West Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated April 10, 2015

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Mosher that that Halifax and West Community Council recommend that Halifax Regional Council:

1. Give First Reading to consider the proposed amendments to the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law (LUB) as set out in Attachments A and B of the report dated April 10, 2015 and schedule a joint Public Hearing with Halifax and West Community Council; and

2. Approve the proposed amendments to the Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy and Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law as contained in Attachments A and B of the report dated April 10, 2015.

and that Halifax and West Community Council:

3. Give Notice of Motion to consider the proposed development agreement as set out in Attachment C of the report dated April 10, 2015 to permit a mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial uses at 3400 Dutch Village Road, in association with an existing 24-unit apartment building at 3343 Westerwald Street, Halifax. The public hearing for the development agreement shall be held concurrently with that indicated in Recommendation 1.

Councillor Mason stated, for the record, that he did not support joint public hearings. He voiced concern that the process resulted in a lengthy period of time during which a Councillor cannot discuss the matter with residents.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Item 13.2 was discussed at this time.

13.2 Case 19136: Classic Open Space Design Development Agreement – Whites Lake

The following information was before Halifax and West Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated May 1, 2015

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Rankin that Halifax and West Community Council:

Give Notice of Motion to consider the proposed development agreement, as contained in Attachment A of the report dated May 1, 2015, to allow a classic open space design development on the lands located on the east side of Terence Bay Road, Whites Lake, Harrietsfield, as shown on Map 1 in the report dated May 1, 2015, and schedule a Public Hearing.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE

6. MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE

7. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS

7.1 Western Common Advisory Committee

This item was discussed later in the meeting. See page 10.

8. HEARINGS

8.1 PUBLIC HEARINGS

8.1.1 Case 19595 – R-2A (General Residential Conversion) Zone Amendments, Halifax Peninsula Land Use Bylaw

The following was before Community Council:

- *A staff recommendation report dated March 31, 2015*
- *A memorandum from the Chair of the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee dated March 6, 2015*
- *A staff presentation dated May 13, 2015*
- *A letter from Patricia Whitman dated May 12, 2015*

Ms. Jennifer Chapman, Planner, presented Case 19595 as described in the staff report dated March 31, 2015.

The Chair stated that the amendments would impose 45 rooms per lot and he questioned what the present limitations were. Ms. Chapman responded that there were no current limitations on the number of rooms per lot.

The Chair opened the public hearing and introduced the ground rules.

Ms. Patricia Whitman, resident of Wellington Street, read the letter dated May 12, 2015. This letter is available on file. She introduced Park to Park Community Association and voiced approval of the R2-A amendments, specifically the introduction of habitable rooms. Ms. Whitman raised concern about R2 uses within an R2-A zone, as they would not be subject to the amendments. She also raised concerns over density controls in R2 and R2-A zones and enforcement of the rules.

Ms. Rebecca Jamieson, resident of Fenwick Street, stated that she recognized the limitations of previous R2A regulations and expressed support for the proposed changes. Ms. Jamieson stated concern for potential problems arising from ambiguous wording and inconsistent interpretation. She also echoed Ms. Whitman's concerns for lack of enforcement. Citing page 3 of the staff report dated March 31, 2015, Ms. Jamieson stated it was unclear whether roofline and pitch implied the height of the existing roofline and pitch. She indicated concern for additions in height matching the existing roofline and pitch and questioned if the amendment would preclude this. Ms. Jamieson questioned what can be done to prevent retrofitting to increase density and gave the example of an undivided basement. She voiced approval that gross floor area requirements applying to R2 will now also apply to R2 buildings constructed in the R2A zone. She stated that gross floor requirements would provide more protection than habitable rooms. Ms. Jamieson also noted inconsistencies in interpretation of Section 43ac of the report dated March 31, 2015 and asked for consistent interpretation for the exceptions laid out in that section. She asked that all requirements under that section be applied before developments of this type are approved.

Ms. Chapman clarified that the height of existing building calculation is worded as per the existing building as of the date of the amendments. She stated that an applicant could not increase height and then come back and request a permit. Regarding the basement example, she responded that it would come down to an enforcement issue and the maximum habitable room count would still apply.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers.

**MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Mosher that the public hearing close.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Watts, seconded by Councillor Mosher that Halifax and West Community Council approve the proposed amendments to the Land Use By-law for Halifax Peninsula, as contained in Attachment A of the report dated March 31, 2015.

Councillor Watts thanked staff and residents for their efforts in developing the amendment, given the complexity of the issue. She stated that the amendments were an improvement over the existing policy and provided clarity.

Councillor Mason thanked the public and staff for their involvement in the process of the amendment. He stated that speakers raised specific issues regarding the amendments and stated that more work would be forthcoming in the Centre Plan. Regarding enforcement, he stated that landlord licensing would be coming back to Council in the next six months.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

8.1.2 Case 18270 – Development Agreement – 5885 Spring Garden Road, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- *A staff recommendation report dated April 2, 2015*
- *A memorandum from the Chair of the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee dated January 31, 2014*
- *A staff presentation dated May 13, 2015*
- *A letter from Ms. Heather Thompson re: Case 18270, dated December 17, 2013*
- *A letter from Mr. David Ring re: Case 18270 dated April 3, 2014*
- *A letter from Roberto De Antueno dated May 11, 2015*
- *A letter from Liliana M. Colombo dated May 11, 2015*

Ms. Jillian MacLellan, Planner, presented Case 18270 as described in the staff presentation dated May 13, 2015. Ms. MacLellan noted a typo with the word “of” missing between “inclusive” and “a” in section 3.3 of the development agreement attached to the staff report dated April 2, 2015.

As Community Council had no questions for staff, the Chair invited the developer to present.

Mr. Jeffry Haggett, Urban Planner, WSP Canada Inc., on behalf of the applicant, described the planning goals for the area and the principles of the Carlton Terrace development including to increase population in the urban core, replace surface parking, support the refresh of the existing Spring Garden Terrace, locate the tower to a maximum distance from the adjacent Garden Crest condominium, minimize shadow impact on the Public Gardens and establish a view corridor of Camp Hill cemetery. Mr. Haggett noted that the project is located so as to replace the existing parking lot on site. He described the planning process involved and community engagement, stating that the engagement held exceeded the requirements and that the feedback had been incorporated in the process. As a result, he noted that in 2011, full submission of the application was postponed due to staff recommending the applicant observe the corridor study as it proceeded, which resulted in a design change from 25 stories to 20 stories.

Mr. Haggett outlined the concerns heard at the community engagement. He noted that excavation work had been a concern of neighbours and stated that work would respect municipal and provincial guidelines and use an approach to reduce its duration. He stated that the tower placement maximizes the distance from the existing Garden Crest Terrace, respecting what was heard through engagement and achieving an 88 ft distance from the existing Garden Crest tower. He stated that this distance was greater than the distance between Summer Crest and Garden Crest and also greater than the 59 ft between Spring Garden Terrace and Summer Crest Terrace. Mr. Haggett noted the commercial addition had been removed from the site plan. He also noted that the height of Carlton Terrace had been reduced a number of times and was now 18 storeys. He stated that the traffic impact statement concluded that the additional units and 230 additional parking spaces would have no significant impact. Mr. Haggett displayed site elevations, amenity areas for residents and cross sections. In regards to shadows, he stated that the design minimized any impact to the Public Gardens. Environmentally, he stated the application supported the Regional Plan's goal of utilizing existing infrastructure.

The Chair opened the public hearing and introduced the ground rules.

Ms. Robin Orr, resident of Halifax, voiced concern that the shadow study did not consider Garden Crest Terrace, where it would have a significant shadow effect, particularly on the western aspect of Garden Crest Terrace. She stated that the view and sun received by her condominium was a feature in purchasing the property and that the proposal would diminish the investment. Regarding the traffic study, Ms. Orr indicated there would be more traffic than the study suggested. She also voiced concern for pedestrian traffic on Spring Garden Road, highlighting the number of school children in the area. She requested the traffic study be redone to take into consideration pedestrian traffic.

Ms. Peggy Cameron, resident of Charles Street, stated she was representing the friends of the Halifax Common. She stated that the report did not mention the development was on the Halifax Common. She voiced concern that this proposal was coming to Council in advance of the Centre Plan and an integrated master plan for the Halifax Common. Ms. Cameron presented the Halifax Common master plan,

approved in 1994. She indicated the importance of the Halifax Common from a historical perspective. She quoted the 2013 Stantec report's conclusion that there is sufficient development capacity and regional capital to meet the density targets set out in the Municipal Planning Strategy based on existing height allowances. Ms. Cameron indicated there were a number of low-rise older homes in the neighbourhood that needed to be respected. She highlighted the objectives of the Halifax Common plan to retain public open space and suggested that common space could also be defined by view. She stated that the proposal was inappropriate and unacceptable. She highlighted that the parking lot on the site existed because of an open space requirement. She also quoted the land grant statement of the area and suggested the application would diminish the area.

Mr. David Ring, resident of Garden Crest, thanked Mr. Haggett, Ms. MacLellan and Councillor Mason. He stated he was present on behalf of the condominium board. He summarized his letter of April 3, 2014. This letter is available on file. He highlighted the issue of excavation and concern for underground watercourses. He stated concern for the HRM blasting bylaw, section 17i regarding insurance and liability. He stated that if an issue arose due to blasting, he was unaware if the certificate of insurance would cover adjacent projects.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers, there being none it was **MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Mason that the public hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker that Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Approve the proposed development agreement contained in Attachment A of the March 12, 2015 staff report;**
- 2. Require the development agreement be signed by the property owner within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval of said agreement by Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever is later, including applicable appeal periods; otherwise this approval shall be void and any obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end;**
- 3. Approve, by resolution, the discharging agreement contained in Attachment B of the March 12, 2015 staff report, to discharge two development agreements that apply to 5885 Spring Garden Road, Halifax, to take effect upon the registration of the new development agreement; and**
- 4. Require the discharge agreement be signed by the property owner not later than 120 days from the date the new development agreement has been approved by Council, or any extension thereof granted by the Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval by Council and any other bodies as necessary, including any applicable appeal period for the new development agreement, whichever is later, otherwise this discharge agreement shall be void.**

Councillor Mason acknowledged the comments of members of the public. He indicated that right to light in English law did not apply, but stated that the traffic study would be addressed, including enforcement. Regarding excavation concerns, he stated that most of them have been addressed, but requested clarification from staff.

Ms. MacLellan responded that Bylaw B600 would require a blasting permit, including a 3rd party inspection agency and notification of nearby residents and staff.

Councillor Mason stated that the 3rd party inspection would come into play. He also commented that residents at the public information meeting had requested blasting to proceed as quickly as possible. Councillor Mason stated that the Centre plan may address many issues raised. He highlighted that the Friends of the Public Gardens has raised no opposition to the development.

Councillor Watts responded to the Stantec statement, and requested anyone present in the audience engage with the Centre Plan as that is where many of these issues will be addressed.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Council recessed at 7:35 p.m and reconvened at 7:38 p.m.

8.1.3 Case 19050 – Development Agreement – 5881 and 5883 Spring Garden Road, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- *A recommendation report dated April 2, 2015, which includes the attached March 4, 2015 staff report*
- *A memorandum from the Chair of the Districts 7 & 8 Planning Advisory Committee dated May 7, 2014*
- *A staff presentation dated May 13, 2015*
- *A letter from Mr. Nidal Ismail dated May 13, 2015*

Mr. Miles Agar, Planner, presented Case 19050 as described in the staff report dated May 13, 2015.

Councillor Watts requested clarification on the existing site versus the proposed site and questioned the length of the addition from where the former Saeye Bistro was located. Mr. Agar displayed a site plan, indicating that it would be the same set back line as the current Saeye extension.

As there were no questions of clarification from Community Council, the Chair invited the developer to present.

Mr. Danny Chedrawe, President Westwood Developments, stated that the proposal would provide an opportunity to enhance the façade and expand business space. He highlighted that the proposed addition to the ground floor and 2nd floor would add 2,500 additional square feet, enhance street interaction with higher end finishes, create a greater pedestrian scale, provide weather protection, and increase roof top green space. He stated that the second floor of the addition will have extensive rooftop gardening.

The Chair opened the public hearing and introduced the ground rules.

Noting that no speakers had indicated they wished to speak, the Chair called three times for any further speakers.

There being no speakers, it was **MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Mason that the public hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker that Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Approve the proposed amending agreement contained in Attachment A of the March 4, 2015 staff report; and**
- 2. Require the amending development agreement be signed by the property owner within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval of said agreement by Council and any other bodies as necessary, whichever is later, including applicable appeal periods; otherwise this approval shall be void and any obligations arising hereunder shall be at and end.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Item 8.2 was discussed at this time.

8.2 VARIANCE APPEAL HEARINGS

8.2.1 Case 19633: Appeal of Variance Refusal – 2808 Connolly Street, Halifax

The following information was before Community Council:

- *A staff recommendation report dated March 31, 2015*
- *A letter from TEAL Architects dated May 7, 2015*
- *A presentation from TEAL Architects dated May 7, 2015*
- *A letter from Ms. Judy Haley dated May 8, 2015*

The Chair introduced the Variance Appeal procedure, explained the ground rules, and invited the planner followed by the appellant to speak.

Ms. Erin MacIntyre, Development Approvals, presented Case 19633 as described in the staff report dated March 31, 2015. She addressed an error in the staff report, stating that while the report indicates the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the proposal to be 4,200 sq. ft, the actual GFA should read 4,462 sq. ft. She confirmed that there were no ramifications from this change in terms of notification. She concluded that the recommendation of the development officer was to deny the appeal before them.

Mr. Tom Emodi, Teal Architects, stated that this process was welcomed as it provided the opportunity to work with policy that encourages densification in the peninsula. He stated that he was interested in the concept of gentle density, inclusive urban neighbourhoods, diverse housing stock and affordable housing for families. He underscored that the last concept was critical. He stated that the aim of the proposal was the creation of two family orientated developments. Mr. Emodi stated that the lot coverage was 37% or 34% if the covered walkways were removed. He addressed privacy by commenting that the building does not face Almon Street but has entrances on Connolly Street. He stated that the Gross Floor Area Ratio (GFAR) at .77 is exceeded by many buildings in the neighbourhood and illustrated this with a map. He stated that the proposal was well inside the lot coverage area. He commented that the proposal had a family format and that it would not use its full allocation of height.

The Chair called for any members of the public within a 30m radius of the appellant.

Mr. Peter Lohnes, Connolly St, voiced concern for the proposal and potential loss of sunlight. He stated concern for the volume of the building. He requested a number of controls if the appeal was allowed by Council. He stated that most buildings would have a pitched roof in the neighbourhood. Mr. Lohnes indicated concern that the landscaped patio would be looking into neighbours' backyards. He requested that controls be implemented on this matter. He also requested confirmation that a fence would be put into place between the proposed building and the neighbours' entrance.

Ms. Linda Moore, Connolly St, stated concern about the building's size, affordability, the rooftop terrace and the building's effect on sunlight.

Mr. Vince Santilli, Almon St., stated that thoughtful development was welcome on the site. He indicated that a well-designed two unit family dwelling, two stories above ground and built with a reasonable GFA ratio could be a positive contribution to the area. He stated that the building could be improved by being scaled down, with added setbacks, pavilion, or bays to add more visual interest. He encouraged a high end exterior envelope with an appealing finish. He voiced concern that parking on site would cause greater congestion.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers.

Mr. Emodi responded as property owner. He stated that to comply with the land use bylaws, the family room in the basement would need to be removed with the ceiling lowered and the room made into a storage area. He stated that the proposed building was one foot longer on both ends, with an 8 foot ceiling in the basement family room area. He responded to the question of affordability, stating that if the

building was divided into two and provided with the family room, then the variety of people living in the area would be increased. He highlighted this appeal as an opportunity to create gentle density on the peninsula. He also stated that he would be willing to work with the neighbourhood to ensure privacy is maintained from the rooftop patio and privacy of neighbours is retained. He also stated that he would work with the neighbourhood to consider architectural expression.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers within the area and there being none, **MOVED by Councillor Mosher, seconded by Councillor Walker that the hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Mosher seconded by Councillor Mason that Halifax and West Community Council allow the appeal of Variance Refusal – 2808 Connolly Street, Halifax

Councillor Mosher asked that the motion be defeated. She stated concern for the minimum front and rear yard, lot area and gross floor area requirements not being met. She listed a number of concerns for neighbourhood compatibility and indicated that it would set a negative precedent. She stated disapproval of the rooftop patio in terms of neighbourhood privacy, sunlight, and parking. Councillor Mosher expressed support for the development officer's recommendation.

Councillor Mason stated he would be voting against the motion. He stated that the development could work in the neighbourhood; however, indicated that the variance appeal process should not be used for updating or changing the land use of an area. He stated that a broad and comprehensive discussion would need to be held on the set of rules regarding gentle density.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

8.2.2 Case 19666: Appeal of Variance Approval – 918 South Bland Street, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- *A staff recommendation report dated March 31, 2015*

The Chair invited staff, the appellant, and the applicant to speak.

Mr. Sean Audas presented Case 19666 as described in the staff recommendation dated March 31, 2015. He stated that the recommendation of the development officer was to approve the variance before them.

Councillor Mosher left the meeting at 8:21 p.m.

Ms. Marlene Biechele, appellant, voiced a number of concerns for the variance approval including unacceptable noise levels, garbage disposal, unattractive property, and attraction of rodents. She stated concern for the unattractiveness of the addition and the possibility of property values being lowered.

Mr. Geoff Keddy, Architect, representative of the owner, stated that initially the proposal was to create an addition on the back of the house to create two units. He stated that he had a building permit to create the 770 sq. ft. addition as a single family home with five bedrooms. He stated that if approval was received then there would be a two unit dwelling with two bedroom units. Mr. Keddy indicated there was currently a garage built without a permit on the property and it would be removed.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers within the area and there being none, **MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker that the hearing close. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Watts that Halifax and West Community Council allow the appeal of the variance approval – 918 South Bland Street, Halifax.

Councillor Mason asked that his motion be defeated. He stated that the majority of issues by the appellant were land use bylaw enforcement and police enforcement and he could offer assistance in that regard. Councillor Mason stated that those aspects were not part of the variance appeal process and that it would not be fair to hold up the application and allow the appeal of the variance approval.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

Item 7.1 was discussed at this time.

7.1 Western Common Advisory Committee

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff supplemental report dated April 23, 2015
- A letter from John Cascadden dated May 11, 2015
- A letter from Peter Lund dated May 12, 2015
- A letter from Cathy Crouse dated May 13, 2015

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Walker that the Halifax and West Community Council recommend that Regional Council confirm there is no requirement, at this time, to establish an advisory committee to advise Regional Council regarding the implementation of the Western Common Wilderness Common Master Plan and that there is sufficient direction in regard to consultation within the Public Engagement Policy adopted by Regional Council to undertake required consultation with the community and stakeholders as required.

Councillor Rankin stated that he would be voting against the motion and asked that it be defeated.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

MOVED by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Walker that Halifax and West Community Council recommend that Regional Council:

Direct staff to draft an Administrative Order to create an advisory committee to advise Council through the Halifax and West Community Council on the implementation of the Western Common Master Plan.

The terms of reference to reflect a mandate to advise, monitor and report on the phased development of the Western Common.

The composition to be made up to a maximum of 8 members nominated by HWCC and appointed by Regional Council in accordance with the Public Appointment Policy adopted by Regional Council.

To meet no less than twice annually and to provide an annual progress report through the HWCC on the community perspective on the implementation of the Western Common.

To refer the recommendation to the Audit & Finance Standing Committee prior to going to Regional Council to determine, on the recommendation of staff, a source of funding for support of the Committee.

Councillor Rankin highlighted page 97, of the Western Common Master Plan, approved at Regional Council on June 15, 2010. He stated that the implementation chapter was a large part of the proposal. He stated that the implementation plan suggested an advisory committee be established. He described the challenges of accommodating the mixture of uses and developing trails in the park. He also highlighted the collaboration performed by Five Bridges Heritage Trust, other trails and ATV groups. Councillor Rankin stated that the terms of reference would set the Committee up to make recommendations on

modest amenities. He indicated that the intent of the Committee would be to collaborate with the community, not to seek additional funds. Councillor Rankin requested support for the recommendation.

Councillor Walker supported the motion. He questioned the last bullet in the motion regarding referring the recommendation to the Audit & Finance Standing Committee. He also questioned the amounts described in the financial implications of the April 23, 2015 report regarding meeting space and meals.

Councillor Mason commented on the experience of the Point Pleasant's Park Advisory Committee, as an advisory body to Regional Council. He noted the difference between an advisory committee to staff and an advisory committee to Council, where the latter is supported by the Clerk's Office. He also stated concern for the last sentence of the recommendation. Councillor Mason questioned if a Regional Parks Committee might be a future consideration, as many other parks could be perceived to require an advisory committee.

Councillor Rankin highlighted the work on trails already performed by trails groups for the benefit of the Council. Councillor Rankin questioned if the report would require a recommendation by the Audit and Finance Standing Committee. Mr. Peter Bigelow, Manager Policy and Planning, Parks & Recreation, suggested that this matter be discussed further.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

9.1 Correspondence

The following was before Community Council:

- *A letter from Ms. Kathy Jones re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated January 15, 2015*
- *A letter from Ms. Susan McDonald Wilson re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated February 23, 2015*
- *A letter from Ms. Irene Phinney re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated February 23, 2015*
- *A letter from the Honourable Geoff Regan re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated April 14, 2014*
- *A letter from Mr. Larry Pope re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated April 8, 2014*
- *A letter from Ms. Nancy Jennings, Mr. Scot Jennings, Mr. Glenn Taylor, and Ms. Peggy Taylor re: case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated April 23, 2014*

9.2 Petitions

The following was before Community Council:

- *A petition from 152 residents re: Case 19112 Eastlink Cell Tower, dated August 20, 2014*

10. REPORTS

10.1.1 Case 18510: MPS/LUB Amendments and Development Agreement, 3400 Dutch Village Road and 3343 Westerwald Street, Halifax

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting. See page 2.

11. MOTIONS

12. IN CAMERA – NONE

13. ADDED ITEMS

- 13.1 Case 19646 Non-Substantive Amendments to the Development Agreement for St. Joseph's Square, Gottingen St., Halifax

Consideration of this matter was deferred to the next meeting of the Halifax and West Community Council during the setting of the agenda.

- 13.2 Case 19136: Classic Open Space Design Development Agreement – Whites Lake

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting. See page 3.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION

15. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. John Cascadden, Five Bridges Wilderness Trust, thanked Community Council and staff for their support. He agreed that 10 meetings a year may not be required, but a case by case basis could be used. He highlighted that current trails in the plan were not identified for bicyclists; however, it was known that bicyclists would want to use the trails. He stated that he was not looking to make major changes but rather to see the park implemented correctly. He highlighted that the ecotourism aspect in the plan has yet to be identified.

16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – June 3, 2015

Council agreed to add a special meeting on June 3rd, 2015 to their meeting schedule.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Andrew Reid
Legislative Assistant