

SHALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
BEDFORD WATERFRONT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
PROJECT 01149 - Vision HRM Bedford Waterfront (Amendments to the Bedford Municipal
Planning Strategy to implement the Bedford Waterfront Vision)

7:00 p.m.
Wednesday, October 20, 2010
Bedford Junior High School Library

PRESENT: Doug Kolmer, Chair
Councillor Tim Outhit, District 21 - Bedford
Terry Drisdelle, Waterfront Development Corp.
Victoria Dymond, VIC
Rosemarie Sampson, VIC
Alan McIver, VIC
Eric Burchell, Waterfront Development Corp.
Virginia Bonn, Empire Co. Ltd.
Sharon McCready, VIC
Ellis O'Neil, VIC
John Merrick, VIC
Patrick LeRoy, United Gulf Developments Ltd.
Brad Harnett, United Gulf Developments Ltd.

HRM STAFF PRESENT: Paul Morgan, Senior Planner, HRM Regional Planning
Jennifer Weagle, Planning Controller, HRM Regional Planning

1. Call to Order/Welcome

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. The Chair noted condolences for the family of Peter Klynstra. Peter was a consultant with Ekistics and worked on the Bedford Plan. He passed away last week.

2. Agenda Review

The Chair reviewed tonight's agenda.

3. Review Meeting notes June PIM, July 14, and September 20th meetings

The Chair noted that it was previously requested that any changes to these minutes be forwarded to Paul and Jennifer.

Members noted a few further minor corrections, and agreed that the minutes are ready to post to the HRM website.

4. District 21 Update

Councillor Outhit discussed issues surrounding the location of the new high school. He commented on the importance to choose the right location to incorporate a community centre and an artificial turf field. He will keep the Committee updated on the process.

5. Continue Deliberation on Design Study

The Chair directed the Committee to page 67 of the Plan, item 4.4 Bedford Highway.

The Committee discussed the topography of this site, noting that the basin cannot be seen from the highway because of a hill and trees on this site. Figure 2.3 on page 23 shows the basin bathymetry overlay on this location of the plan.

The Committee discussed the protection of views of the basin, noting that the preservation of public views is important, but it is not always possible to protect all private views. Paul indicated that the Vision Statement of the Committee clearly outlines the preservation of public views.

Terry noted that item 4.4 discusses building orientation so as to open up views of the waterfront, however the building orientation in the diagram does not follow this. He suggested a recommendation may be for the orientation of buildings to be placed in such a way as to provide optimum views toward the basin.

Terry went on to suggest that another recommendation be made to address the requirement for access to the Phase 2 lands. He also suggested a recommendation for the provision of public amenity area, to compliment or instead of having pedestrian traffic along the Bedford Highway.

The Committee discussed the creation of a pedestrian trail through the property, that would provide an efficient alternative to walking along the Bedford Highway, which can be hazardous due to the high volume of traffic. The Committee agreed that parking would be best situated behind the buildings instead of along the highway.

The Committee agreed that #3 of the “Key features of the Bedford Highway” on page 67, item 4.4 be reworded such as “Water views will be optimized through the placement (or siting or orientation) of buildings.”

The Committee discussed height and density on this site.

Brad inquired as to lot ownership, and Terry clarified that streets would be turned over to the Municipality for ownership. Eric clarified that they have not determined land ownership yet, with regard to either apartments or condos.

Brad further inquired as to the lot frontage requirements. Paul indicated that if there are problems with applying standard frontage requirements, the requirements can be varied through the Subdivision By-law.

Rosemarie commented on the importance of qualifying the rationale behind decisions made by the Committee, so that the public understand why these decisions were reached. Paul clarified that this can be outlined in the staff report.

Councillor Outhit also noted that it will be important to clarify in the FAQ who will be paying for the bridges, roads, sewers, etc., that tax dollars will not be used for this.

After discussion surrounding the communication strategy, the Committee requested a diagram on the approval process, which would help the public better understand the process.

Virginia commented on the importance of communicating the need for sustainable development, or “eco-density”. The Bedford Waterfront presents a unique opportunity to do something special.

Back to the suggested recommendations discussed earlier, Terry reviewed his suggestions, as follows:

1. That key feature #3 on page 67 make reference to the siting of buildings to optimize views of the basin; and
2. That key feature #7 be added for the provision of a public multi-use corridor on the site from north to south, from the access road to the Clearwater property.

Paul clarified that such a trail could either be publically owned or privately owned by the developer with an easement for maintenance.

Terry requested that access be secured prior to United Gulf having to go for any Municipal approvals. The Committee discussed the issue and the Chair suggested that, as a first element, the provision of a second entrance to the study area over the railway from the Bedford Highway be allowed.

Paul clarified that it is clear under the current policy that the developer has to provide access to the WDCL lands.

MOVED by John Merrick, seconded by Terry Drisdelle, that Item 4.4 Bedford Highway be accepted with the following revisions:

1. **That key feature #3 on page 67 make reference to the siting of buildings to optimize views of the basin;**

2. That key feature #5 be edited to clarify that there are no current “existing views” from the Bedford Highway at this site.
3. That key feature #7 be added for the provision of a public multi-use corridor on the site from north to south, from the access road to the Clearwater property.
4. As a first element, the provision of a second entrance to the study area over the railway from the Bedford Highway be allowed.

The Committee further discussed bonus heighting. It was agreed that for the sake of consistency, the provision of bonus heighting be considered.

The Chair noted that he had previously emailed to the Committee the CMHC definition of bonus density.

The motion was amended as follows, with the agreement of the mover and seconder:

MOVED by John Merrick, seconded by Terry Drisdelle, that Item 4.4 Bedford Highway be accepted with the following revisions:

1. That key feature #3 on page 67 make reference to the siting of buildings to optimize views of the basin;
2. That key feature #5 be edited to clarify that there are no current “existing views” from the Bedford Highway at this site.
3. That key feature #7 be added for the provision of a public multi-use corridor on the site from north to south, from the access road to the Clearwater property.
4. As a first element, the provision of a second entrance to the study area over the railway from the Bedford Highway be allowed.
5. The provision of bonus heighting be considered.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chair directed the Committee to Chapter 4.

Paul indicated a change on page 49, under Commuter Rail. The document states that “Commuter rail is not currently a viable alternative for HRM” however this has not been determined. It was decided that this point will be clarified in the staff report.

John suggested that the site design on page 44 is insufficient for pedestrian, bus and transit traffic.

Alan suggested to support in principle the design study for the transportation interface between pedestrian, rail, ferry and vehicular traffic, contingent upon the completion of additional transportation studies.

Terry reminded the Committee that the design in the study is only what it could be, not necessarily what it will be.

The Committee agreed that there is a need for such a facility, that this is the right location for the facility, and that it should be labeled “Civic Building” until further determination on the exact use of the facility.

MOVED by Alan McIver, seconded by Tory Diamond, that with regard to item 4.2.1 The Landing at Bedford Waterfront, that the Committee agreed that there is a need for such a facility, that this is the right location for the facility, and that it should be labeled “Civic Building” until further determination on the exact use of the facility. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chair noted that the next meeting is on Wednesday, November 3, 2010 at Basinview Community School in the cafeteria.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:05 p.m.

Jennifer Weagle
Planning Controller