

Port Wallace Public Participation Committee
Meeting Notes: November 1, 2018, commencing at 6:30 p.m.
Helen Creighton Room, Alderney Gate Library

PRESENT:

Adam Flick
Robert MacPherson
Catherine Lunn
Bertrand Losier
Valerie Gray

COUNCILLORS:

Councillor Tony Mancini, District 6

STAFF:

Andrew Bone, Planner III
Paul Burgess, Program Manager, Infrastructure Policy & Standards
Ben Sivak, Major Project Planner
Genevieve Hachey, Planning Controller

REGRETS:

Peter Connor

OTHERS:

Kevin Neatt, Clayton Developments Limited
Tom Swanson, P.Eng, Summit Rock Developments Limited
Brent Conrad, Conrad Brothers Ltd.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CALL TO ORDER 3

2. ADDED ITEMS / APPROVAL OF AGENDA.....3

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – JUNE 28, 2018.....3

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – OCTOBER 11, 2018.....3

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMENTS RECEIVED.....3

6. LAST MEETING REVIEW 3

7. ISSUES UPDATE

 a) COLLECTOR ROAD CONNECTION – MONTAGUE ROAD.....3

 b) BARRY’S RUN ENVIRONMENTAL.....7

8. PORT WALLACE LAND USE BYLAW WORKING DRAFT REVIEW.....7

9. GENERAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSION.....7

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS.....7

11. NEXT MEETINGS.....7

12. ADJOURNMENT7

1. CALL TO ORDER

Robert MacPherson called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2. ADDED ITEMS / APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Catherine requested clarification on the October 11th notes where there was discussion about the Wilcot Lane and Lynwood Drive possible connections, Robert explained that the committee felt like they had heard all the pros and cons and there was no more need to discuss these possibilities, there is still a possibility of putting forward a recommendation to council regarding this.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPTION COMMENTS RECEIVED

None

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – June 28, 2018

Move to approve notes from June 28 put forward by Adam, seconded by Bertrand, all agreed.

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES - October 11, 2018

Move to approve notes from October 11 put forward by Valerie, seconded by Bertrand, all agreed.

6. LAST MEETING REVIEW

Andrew briefly reviewed items discussed at the last meeting.

7. ISSUE UPDATES

a. Collector Road Connection – Montague Road

Andrew explained that the grades are too steep at this location and that it would be too expensive for council to consider.

Paul Burgess explained that a crossing at this point would have to be at an angle, that and the lanes that would have to be crossed would make the crossing approximately 40 meters. In order to go from Port Wallace to get over the highway you would need a 12% grade, on the Montague road side you'd be up about 2 or 3 meters from the road which would mean you'd have to regrade the Montague road. This project would be similar to the Margeson Road development, similar types of soil and a large grade difference. All of these issues could mean the crossing would be in excess of 20 million dollars. HRM would have a share in this payment, it would not all be covered by Capital Cost Contributions. In order for this to work you'd have to make the road alignments work in a way that would discourage short cuts being taken along one of the 3 spokes that go down to the Waverley road.

Adam explained that they cannot imagine an extra 12 thousand people on the Waverley road and that's why they keep pushing other solutions. The interchange at 102 and 103 is a 20 million dollars project and is much more work than what would be needed here, the budget on the interchange past exit 5 on the 103 is at 16.5 million dollars and is also a much bigger project than this would be, they do not agree with the 15-20-million-dollar estimate. Can we get someone to provide a more accurate estimate?

Paul explained that they stand by their estimate, when you take into consideration the grade differences. Bringing this to an external engineering firm like, Stantec, they are going to go through the same steps they have taken and come up with the same information. They agree that perhaps 20 million is on the high side, however the bridge span will make a large difference to this budget. There are issues with the grade, the proximity of the on and off ramps further down the highway and the proximity to houses to where the bridge and grading would take place.

Bertrand asked Paul if they considered extending Montague Road over the highway where you could have a 90-degree crossing?

Paul responded that in order to keep with the developers proposed concept plan and to stop short cutting through the development this was the only place that would work for putting a crossing.

Adam circulated a document showing two possible crossings. They believe this would work, that it deserves another look and that the province may be interested in this as a lower-cost solution to their future proposed interchange.

Paul replied that HRM did approach the Province with an at-grade roundabout at the proposed site for the future Provincial interchange is planned. The response received was that the Province is planning the Cherrybrook by-pass with a massive fly-over interchange connecting the 107 to the new Forest Hills Extension and that they were not interested in changing that plan.

Kevin Neatt spoke about how they sent a proposal to NSTIR, their proposal was modelled after a study done by UNB and another university in New York. This is why the concept plan has a "future road corridor" for future connection to the 107.

Bertrand added that it's great to be looking at all the options but will council decide to spend this money?

Andrew replied that for council to approve anything it has to make financial sense. HRM staff will have a recommendation, they envision a version of the issues table that we are working on to be included in the staff report to council. We are not here to make decisions, we can make recommendations. The committee's role is to make recommendations. Council will receive many recommendations, from technical staff, from the committee, from the public and it's council's role to look at all these recommendations and come to a decision. They can ask for additional information. The recommendation of the committee should be based on what the committee feels is best.

Bertrand would like to see more talks between the councillors of the area and the province, more "political talk".

Andrew replied that typically at the end of this process is when the "politics" talk happens. Council would be made aware of the NSTIR's position and HRM's recommendation. It is not the committee's responsibility to be involved in the "politics" of these discussions. If the committee has concerns, those concerns should be addressed in their recommendation to council.

Robert added that perhaps this is the time where we should be putting forward a recommendation. Despite the citizens of the area who feel like the Waverley road is at capacity, the engineering reports show there is still capacity for this new development. The committee and the members of the public want an alternative, something that connects to the 107, this will probably come down to cost.

Adam feels that adding all that traffic will be a safety concern, that the Waverley road is not safe enough to be considered a collector road.

Robert asked if staff could write some sort of policy that would address these concerns, something that they could bring forward as a recommendation?

Andrew replied that the committee could suggest that we consider a policy that deals with attempting to get a connection to Montague Road with a bridge crossing, however that may not be something staff would recommend. It should be written as a recommendation from the committee, staff could write a policy around this but if it is not staff's recommendation to build a bridge we would not include this in staff's recommendation to council.

Based on the analysis of the technical issues around grade for a bridge crossing, it would make this proposal very challenging. Planning can assist the committee in drafting recommendations. There may draft policies that the committee will agree with and some that the committee won't agree with, it is the committee's responsibility to document these things and put forward their recommendations based on this. In the end there will be a draft policy put forward, a staff recommendation document and a document that shows the committee's comments on the policies. Any differences should be discussed in the staff report.

It sounds like the committee would like to request further analysis be put forward as a recommendation; that the committee would like the connection to/crossing of the 107 to be studied further. That is something you could recommend, we just can't say that staff will recommend that same thing. They cannot say that this will achieve the goal you are trying to reach, but that doesn't mean you shouldn't still put it forward as a recommendation.

Valerie asked if the Cherrybrook flyover from NSTIR has a planned connection to Avenue du Portage.

Adam replied that there is no current plan, Paul added that there is no timeline, the only thing NSTIR has said is that it is not in their 5-year plan.

Valerie asked if they, as a committee, can recommend that a connection to the 107 be discussed with NSTIR, as this is extremely important to the residents of this area, and if for some reason if this is not possible that a bridge to Montague Road be looked at?

Andrew replied that based on the current plan, the right-of-way that would in the future connect to the 107 is a reserved space, it will allow for that future connection if there can be one. The Province has ownership of the 107, we cannot tell them what to do, we can discuss with them and tell them what we would like, but we do not have jurisdiction over them. You can still recommend that this happen, Council will make a decision on what can be done and what conversations. We do not have the ability to force the province the committee can recommend it to council.

Robert suggested that in order to move along we need to put the traffic issue behind us. We've heard from the Engineer, we've heard from staff and the committee. We should simply put forward a recommendation based on all of this. Is there perhaps another option here that we could explore?

Paul replied that they've been looking at this since 2009. We've shown how the roundabouts could work and when we went to TIR their response was that they had other plans. The challenge with going over is the grade, perhaps we could go under?

Brent Conrad reminded the committee that there are also lots of improvements coming to Waverley road within this current plan. Turning lanes, double lanes, signals, all of these things will have a positive impact.

Paul added that there is talk of narrowing some of the Waverley road in order to put the bike lanes and sidewalks separate from the road, on the outside of the curb. By narrowing the width on these roads the speed of the vehicles would be a bit slower and the cyclists and pedestrians would be safer.

Robert asked if any of the other developers would like to add anything.

Kevin Neatt wanted the committee to know that they are listening intently to what is being discussed at these meetings. When Adam brought up the idea for the bridge to Montague Road they brought that back to their engineers and they looked at all solutions, going over, going under and came up with the same results as what Paul was discussing. The grades here are just too steep, the cost would be too high. They've spent thousands of dollars looking at the connection to the 107, this is why they've put aside land to potentially connect to the highway, the fact is they cannot force the Province to do this. If there was any sense that a bridge or tunnel could work, we'd be all over it.

Bertrand asked if the connection to the 107 was, in Kevin's mind, the best option.

Kevin replied that in all honesty, the modelling has shown that the Waverley Road has the capacity, it showed that a connection to the 107 at Avenue du Portage would have minimal impact. There would still be improvements needed, those improvements would be included in this plan. The developer's position is that the current plan works, however they are not there to give recommendations or hinder the committee's recommendations.

Kevin and Paul commented that there is a possibility that the Province changes their mind, that the roundabouts at this location may be something they would consider in the future.

Valerie would like to see a policy stating that the cycling and pedestrian areas be separated from the Waverley road.

Paul added that there would be room for a "boulevard" pathway on parts of the Waverley road.

Tom Swanson wanted to add that the length of the ramp to get up to a bridge that would cross the 107 would be too long.

Adam added that perhaps this could be done at an area where the grades aren't as steep.

Andrew suggested that in order to get past this, the committee should come forward with a recommendation.

Paul added that if they want a new bridge here it would change the concept plan and Andrew added that they would need a new concept plan and a new traffic study because this would change too many things.

Ben Sivak added that there is still a lot of work to do, the committee doesn't have to make a decision and come up with a recommendation for this today.

Bertrand suggested that they draft a recommendation in the near future and send it by email.

Valerie put forward a motion to have staff draft policy that puts more research into separating (off-roading) the bike and pedestrian lanes from the Waverley road and on traffic safety improvements to the Waverley road.

Bertrand seconded, all in favour.

Adam and Catherine have concerns about the narrowing of the Waverley road.

Andrew stated that yes, that is the direction staff was going in and we can spend more time on this, it is something we could add to the policy revisions.

b. Barry's Run Environmental

Andrew stated that staff is planning a report on Barry's Run, it is anticipated to go to council later this month, it identifies an action plan for Barry's Run. Once this is released to council a copy will be sent to the committee.

8. PORT WALLACE LAND USE BY-LAW WORKING DRAFT REVIEW

Andrew went through the Low-Density Zone requirements with the committee.

With time running out for tonight's meeting the committee decided to take this document home and collect their comments and questions to bring forward to the next meeting.

Andrew suggested that members email him with questions or comments and that he would reply to the whole committee.

All agreed.

9. GENERAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSION – parking lot items

Deferred to next meeting

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

10. NEXT MEETINGS

There will be a meeting on November 15th and 29th, 2018

11. ADJOURNEMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:24.