

Port Wallace Public Participation Committee
Meeting Notes: October 11, 2018, commencing at 6:30 p.m.
HEMDCC room, Alderney Gate

PRESENT: Adam Flick
Robert MacPherson
Valerie Gray
Bertrand Losier
Peter Connor

COUNCILLORS: Councillor Tony Mancini, District 6

STAFF: Andrew Bone, Planner III
Paul Burgess
Ben Sivak, Major Project Planner
Genevieve Hachey, Planning Controller

REGRETS: Claudia Curry
Catherine Lunn

OTHERS: Kevin Neatt, Clayton Developments Limited
Brent Conrad, Conrad Brothers Ltd.
Kim Conrad, Conrad Brothers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CALL TO ORDER3
2. ADDED ITEMS / APPROVAL OF AGENDA.....	3
3. APPORVAL OF MEETING NOTES – JUNE 28, 2018.....	3
4. APPORVAL OF MEETING NOTES – SEPTEMBER 27, 2018.....	3
5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMENTS RECEIVED.....	3
6. LAST MEETING REVIEW.....	3
7. FUTURE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OPPORTUNITIES.....	3
8. ISSUE UPDATE.....	4
9. PORT WALLACE SECONDARY PLANNING STRATEGY WORKING DRAFT.....	6
10. PORT WALLACE LAND USE BYLAW WORKING DRAFT REVIEW.....	9
11. GENERAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSION -PARKING LOT ITEMS.....	9
12.PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	9
13.NEXT MEETINGS.....	9
14. ADJOURNMENT.....	9

1. CALL TO ORDER

Robert MacPherson called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

2. ADDED ITEMS / APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Robert advised that Councillor Mancini would like to address the committee. Agenda was approved.

Councillor Mancini addressed the committee about the passing away of one of the committee members' sons.

Councillor Mancini thanked the committee for all of their hard work and spoke about the importance of the committee and all the work that is being done.

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – JUNE 28, 2018

Andrew will provide the committee with the correct minutes.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – SEPTEMBER 27, 2018

Small correction to the notes, Peter Connor was in attendance however he is stated as not attending. There is a typo under #7 in the second paragraph. This should read "Adam replied.... A lot of what they have been discussing has not gone into the document.

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPTION COMMENTS RECEIVED

No comments were received.

6. LAST MEETING REVIEW

Andrew briefly spoke about what was discussed at the last meeting.

7. FUTURE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OPPORTUNITIES

Andrew received an email from a committee member regarding the thought that the committee should go to the public very soon to seek additional public comment. It is staff's opinion that the draft documents still have many holes in them, the committee is still giving feedback on many of these items and that they would like a more complete document before they go to the public. There will not be resolution about the environmental issues for quite a while. They believe that once more of the policy sets are complete that the committee could then go to the public.

Valerie agreed with this.

Adam asked how they would come to a conclusion if we don't have more information about the environmental component? That information could change many things.

Andrew replied that if new information becomes available that may affect the policy that policy would then be reviewed.

8. ISSUES UPDATE (see table)

Paul Burgess addressed the committee. As per the committee's request, more traffic counts have been conducted, the information is currently being put together and this will be presented to the committee once complete.

Adam added that there will be more counts from TIR done this month as well.

Peter asked if those counts will be part of HRM's analysis.

Paul replied that it depends on when their counts are available.

Peter suggested that they should wait for the NSTIR data to allow for this to be added to the HRM data.

Robert asked if the speed of traffic on the highway is taken into account, this morning at 8 am traffic on this 100 series highway was moving at 10km per hour. That would change the traffic counts.

Paul replied that he cannot speak for the Province however they do know that average travel speed is looked at.

Peter spoke about a project they worked on at MicMac Mall, the interchange at the 111 and Micmac boulevard were at capacity at seasonal peaks that would cause backups onto the 111. The trigger that cause TIR to make improvements was that it was said to be unsafe conditions.

Robert asked if there is a way to voice the committee's concerns to the Province.

Paul replied that there are ongoing discussions with the Province in regard to twinning the 107, TIR has not made any commitments. They added that the safety review that NSTIR did shows that that stretch of the 107 shows less accidents per 100 million vehicle kilometers than some of the other 100 series 2 lane highways. This could be attributed to most of the people at peak hours on this highway are commuters and are familiar with traffic trends.

Peter added that arterials are designed with a particular speed in mind and while there may not be a lot of reported accidents that that metric alone may not be enough to say if that stretch is safe or not.

Valerie spoke about an incident she witnessed where two merge lanes come onto a highway and one lane is backed up and the other lane is free, someone was frustrated that cars cut in by going up the lane that was free and that a car in the waiting lane came out to block the car trying to pass in the open lane. This could very easily cause an accident. This happens frequently where Hwy 118 meets Hwy 107.

Robert asked if it's possible to ask the Province for a response to some of the issues discussed here?

Andrew replied that the committee's role here is to provide advise on policy. This is something we can take back and discuss, it may be something the municipality can bring forward.

Valerie asked if cameras can be put up to see how often this lane cutting and other safety concerns are happening.

Paul replied that the cameras are used for traffic counts, they are not sure if the cameras could be used for this purpose.

Andrew has noted these comments and they will be added to the issue table. A response will be provided once one is available.

Speaking about the collector road connecting to Wilcot Lane:

Paul reiterated that current policy asks that collector roads be connected to collector roads as opposed to local roadways. Wilcot and Lynwood are classified as local roadways.

Using Wilcot Lane would make the new collector road 250 meters longer than the current proposal and it would bypass 300 meters on Waverley Road. Preliminary analysis on the Waverley Road at Montague is that it will likely be traffic signals, they are still considering traffic signals or a roundabout at the ramp intersection. We believe in order to the Wilcot Lane alignment we would need to acquire right-of-way to be consistent with how the rest of the collector road would be built, this collector road has a wider right-of-way and active transportation infrastructure that would have to be continued. For all of these reasons staff recommendation is to not consider Wilcot Lane.

Robert asked for clarification, is it engineering and design constraints or cost restraints?

Paul replied both, primarily cost constraints, it is very costly to acquire land.

Andrew added that from a planning perspective there has always been a road reserve in the location where the road is currently proposed.

Peter added that it was the committee's wish to not connect to Waverley road at this location because that road does not have the lane width and room for capacity needed. Could staff reply to these concerns?

Paul replied that traffic counts show that this section of Waverley road is not at capacity, it is less busy than other parts of the Waverley road. There is more capacity available at this section.

Bertrand asked if that road is considered to have enough capacity at that location to accommodate all the new people expected from this development.

Paul replied yes.

Bertrand asked if it is possible to put the road in the wooded area next to Wilcot, there is a 150 feet wide area of wooded land here.

Paul replied that it would still have to connect to Wilcot and that they would not want to introduce a road into people's back yards. You want to make this collector roadway as smooth as possible, with less sharp turns. This location would not be desirable for these reasons.

Adam introduced a suggestion that may solve many of these issues. If you were to build a two-lane bridge (no ramps) with an active transportation lane, connecting the Montague Mines Road to Avenue du Portage it would alleviate many of the traffic issues, many of the people in this development would use this bridge instead of going onto the Waverley road. This could be like the how Kearny road now connects to Larry Uteck. This connection would also connect the Montague road area to this development. Think Washmill lake Drive.

Paul replied that looking outside the box is good and that staff would have a look at this. Cost may be an issue.

Peter asked if they could now consider the Wilcot lane and Lynwood drive considerations are off the table.

All members agreed.

Peter asked one of his previous requests to have an active transportation trail that crosses the 107 somehow is still being addressed.

Andrew replied that it isn't in this particular table (referring to the issues table) however it can be added and it was still something staff was looking at.

The committee agreed that most of the other issues on this table should be addressed when the time comes, most of these issues can only be resolved when data is received from traffic counts, environmental details ect.

9. PORT WALLACE SECONDARY PLANNING STRATEGY WORKING DRAFT REVIEW

The committee went through the "Working Draft v.1 Port Wallace Secondary Plan" one item at a time.

The committee would like to see further information on estimated number per acre in each area, they do not believe the numbers portrayed as 21/per acre in all area is correct. Especially in PW-19

Andrew said staff will seek clarification on this.

PW-3

Peter would like to make sure the policy here shows the importance of having a mixed-use area similar to the Village at Dartmouth Crossing. Could the word "village" be added here to stress the importance of that feel?

Valerie would like to add language to encourage street access.

Andrew replied that the language here does show street and sidewalk access to the mixed-use buildings.

PW-4

Adam asked if it was possible to see two levels of low density residential? Something similar to R1, R2 and another level.

Andrew replied that the challenge here is that the Master Plans are made so far in advance that without allowing a reasonable amount of flexibility it could make it difficult for future development. We do not know exactly what areas will be what zones, the concept plan shown by the developers may not be exactly what is brought forward at the time of permitting. The language in the transition section of zones would solve many of these issues. By having policy that regulates what types of low/medium/high density building can be within a certain distance from existing development or future low/medium/high density zones you would eliminate the need for levels within zones. The transition policy could cover all of these things. Traditionally in past Master Plan areas staff have negotiated Development Agreements that have included Land Use and then have had to amend them, sometimes more than ten times, because the needs of the community can change over time. With doing it the way we are proposing we would eliminate that need in the future. For example: The low density residential zone may allow auxiliary dwelling units, semi-detached dwellings and townhouse however the transition policy may state that those specific types of buildings cannot be within 150 meters of existing single-family homes. All of this should be further discussed by the committee as we are here to get advise on the wording of these policies.

PW-6

Bertrand would like clarification on "cluster-housing".

Andrew replied that cluster-housing could be used in areas where properties aren't square or where there is not enough land to create a subdivision but there is enough land for homes and it's done through a condominium with a shared driveway.

Kevin added that it sounded as if they were saying it is geometry driven to create yield and that would be false. It creates enclaves of like-minded people. This is being done in West Bedford, there are several pockets of these types of developments. In our opinion our community can lack in the social component and we are trying to bring that back. You may have a driveway going in and cluster housing around a green space where social gathering can happen. It may replace a cul-de-sac, it's not always to jam in more houses. There is real opportunity here for creating small social communities for certain groups of people.

Andrew added that cluster housing is very popular on the West Coast, there are many interesting developments going up where let's say you have 24 single units on a lot with communal gardens, recreation facilities and workshops, things like that. In my experience cluster housing allows the developer to do more innovative housing forms and to attract a market segment that had been ignored in the past. You could have a variety of housing types.

Bertrand would like to know if this type of housing belongs in low-density residential or if it would be better suited for medium density residential?

Andrew replied that there are no frontage size requirements however there is a minimum lot size and the types of units you are developing here are considered low density units, they are simply in a different configuration without road frontage.

PW-11

Robert asked if this gets evaluated under the "Green Network Plan"?

Andrew replied that they believe that before it's completed they will do their review.

Pw-12

This will be discussed after the data from Paul is in.

PW-15

Peter asked if the mapping of future trails that was done during brainstorming sessions could be included in this package that would be presented to council.

Andrew replied that if the committee desires it could be part of the mapping for PW-15.

The committee agreed.

PW-17

Robert requested that a road reserve be included to facilitate future connection from Avenue du Portage to the 107.

Adam added that we could do the same for the proposed bridge if that does not become part of this plan.

Andrew replied that they could do that.

Robert would like there to be some sort of policy or wording that shows that even though Council cannot make decisions about the 107 that they have concerns and would the province to address them.

Peter agreed with this.

Andrew replied that they would be able to create some wording.

PW-23

Adam would like to see something done at the Charles Keating/Montague/Waverley road intersection before the 400 unit count and years of construction.

Andrew will ask Paul Burgess if they've done a signal warrant for this intersection, to see if this can happen earlier.

Peter would like to see a similar request at the Montebello intersection for the turning lane, could this be included in Policy 23? Perhaps a safety audit?

Andrew replied that it could be its own policy. That this does not have to be started from a trigger but that it could be a recommendation of the committee to have a safety audit done for the Waverley Road.

Valerie agreed.

Bertrand would like to know if the building that was to be built at the corner of Waverley and Montebello still being built?

Andrew replied that he believes it is.

PW-25

Trees that will be planted will be approved by NS Power and the HRM Urban Forester.

PW-27

Bertrand asked if there is a need to specify the amount of time that the monitoring will take place after construction.

Andrew replied that that would be part of the agreement, HRM has learned not to put the details in the policy but to place it in the agreement in order to benefit the Municipality in case of changes that may need to occur to the water monitoring.

PW-29

Peter would like the policy to indicate that the mitigation measures be naturalized solutions, no "storm water jail".

PW-31

Peter feels that this is weakly worded. More needs to be done to help the water quality in our lakes and this is directly related to use of pesticides and lack of water management best practices.

Valerie would like to see the municipality use more of these best management practices.

Bertrand would like to see the words "shall" instead of "may"

Andrew replied that there is going to be more push from HRM in general with regards to managing storm water. Staff will revisit this wording however they cannot bind council to decisions that will incur budgetary costs.

Robert asked if the developer does anything on their own for this type of education?

Kevin replied that yes, in all of our projects we provide a homeowners guide and this guide educates about fertilizer, cutting grass too short and more, all the things that have been mentioned here.

Bertrand asked if they rate the success of this over time.

Kevin replied that the water monitoring suggests that some of these things are working, however it is hard to measure how well an education program is working.

Valerie asked if anything is done to ensure this education is passed on from one homeowner to the next.

Kevin replied that no, there is logistically no way for the developer to do this, something like that would fall onto the responsibility of HRM.

Adam added that perhaps HRM could publish something that is given to new homeowners that covers some of these issues.

Robert suggested that policy could be added that binds the developer to create a public education program and that would leave the municipality with the non-binding wording that is in the current policy.

Peter requests that the fact that roads and infrastructure being done by development and buildings being done by zone be more clearly explained at the beginning of this document.

Ben added that this is explained in the introductory paragraph of the Implementation section before PW-32.

Andrew added that they could add language at the front to make that clear.

10. PORT WALLACE LAND USE BYLAW WORKING DRAFT REVIEW

Deferred

11. GENERAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSION – PARKING LOT

Deferred

12. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kevin spoke about how the developer is still going through this document and asked if he could assist in providing examples or answering questions at the next meeting, if he is able to sit at the table it may be easier for everyone.

Andrew added that they will be meeting with the developer and stakeholders in the near future, this document will evolve and will contain tracked changes.

Adam would like to see illustrations of examples of buildings that would be built here.

Kevin replied that he could bring in examples of houses that were built in West Bedford as this is what they envision in the Port Wallace area.

Peter would like to speak about the field trip that took place and speak about the quarry lands elevations.

13. NEXT MEETINGS

There will be a meeting on November 1, 2018

10. ADJOURNEMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.