

Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2020 – 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Virtual Meeting via Skype for Business



Attendees:

Ken Burrows (KB), Industry Sector Representative.....Development
Phil Francis (PF), Community Representative.....Fall River
Barry Geddes (BG), (*Vice Chair*) Watershed Manager.....Halifax Water
Bev Lawson (BL), Customer Representative.....Collin's Park WSP
Rosemary MacNeil (RM), Development Officer.....Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
Keith Manchester (KM), Community Representative.....Lake Fletcher
Anna McCarron (AM), (*Secretary*) Source Water Planner.....Halifax Water
Tom Mills (TM), Representative.....Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society (SWEPS)
Dick Pickrill (DP), (*Chair*) Community Representative.....Wellington
Wayne Stobo (WS), Community Representative.....Waverley

Regrets:

Mike Allen (MA), Watershed Planner.....Nova Scotia Environment (NSE)
Janice MacEwan (JM), Principal Planner/Development Officer.....Halifax Regional Municipality

1. Welcome and Introductions

- AM/BG distributed copies of:
 - a. October 19, 2020, Meeting Agenda;**
 - b. DRAFT June 25, 2020 Meeting Minutes;**
 - c. Education Strategy Outline**

Meeting called to order by CPWAC Chair (DP):

- Introductions;
- Regrets as listed above;
 - RM sitting in for JM.

2. Review and Approval:

- a. Agenda:**
 - Add: Runoff from new car wash development in Fall River (Item 4.i. page 8);
 - Motion to approve Agenda by WS, seconded by KM; all in favour.
 - b. June 25, 2020 Meeting Minutes:**
 - Minutes Approved as circulated;
 - Motion to approve Minutes by TM, seconded by KB; all in favour.
-

3. *Education and Awareness (AM):*

a. **Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (ESCP) applications (HRM speaker):**

The origin of this agenda item was explained by AM as follows:

- this item arose at the October 2018 CPWAC meeting over concerns of poor development practices that allow muddy runoff into watercourses;
- the CPWAC wants to learn how ESCPs are handled within HRM;
- a speaker from HRM will be invited to a meeting to inform the Committee about how ESCP are handled, when the time is right;

Action: Seek a presenter to educate the Committee on how erosion and sedimentation control plans are applied to development in HRM, when the time is right.

AM/BG

b. **Education strategy and draft materials:**

AM displayed the education strategy draft matrix previously circulated to the members on an excel spreadsheet, thanked those who provided input to it and clarified its elements. Prior to the meeting, DP and AM discussed threads of commonality to help organize the matrix. Further explanation/input was provided by the Committee through the following discussion:

- the top education priorities, in order of preference, are as follows:
 1. riparian area preservation;
 2. on-site sewage disposal system (OSSDS) maintenance and failure;
 3. development activity;
 4. stormwater management; and
 5. erosion and sedimentation;
- the target audiences, in order of preference were as follows:
 1. residents; and
 2. government agencies;
- target area preferences (i.e., IPZ or whole watershed) were as follows:
 - most everyone who responded said the whole watershed should be targeted, rather than just the IPZ;
 - a few exceptions warranted targeting the IPZ; e.g., with respect to fire.

Q: *Where should we go from here? (AM)*

A: Simplify the five (5) education priorities further.

Erosion and sedimentation (E&S) issues are inherent in the other four priorities and could be removed. If we educate about the impacts to water quality and the values of maintaining riparian buffers, for example, we wouldn't have E&S resulting; it is a product of poor management of the other four. (DP)

A: E&S sounds like an outcome; i.e., mitigating the impacts of E&S would maintain or improve water quality, the outcome we are ultimately striving for. Define the outcome by explaining what we are worried about and why; and show how to tackle the problem to achieve the desired outcome. Targeting the education in this format will lead to preventing the undesirable outcomes. (BL)

- targeted outcomes would consider the following:

- impacts to water quality; for example, toxic minerals, biogenic material leading to algal blooms, and failure of septic systems and an explanation of what we want to preserve; (DP)
- the other four identified education priorities; (BL)
- people can relate more to the outcome; i.e., this is what *you* can do/avoid, to help prevent it; (BL)

Q: *How are we going to get the messages out there? Brochures? Newsletters? This exercise prioritizes our main topics of concern, each of which may have a different or multiple audience(s). Who are our target audience(s) and what tools do we need to reach them?(AM)*

A: It may involve writing letters to government agencies to raise awareness of the impacts of the activities and how the agency can help. (AM and BG)

Q: *What we are asking for? How are we educating people? Is there a process? (BG)*

A: If we agree on the top four topics, the matrix target areas and the tools to get out the message can be rejigged in simpler terms and circulated to the members again. If the Committee has more information that you didn't have a chance to talk about today, please submit them to me.

Q: *Does that meet with everyone's approval? (AM)*

A: I would like to help put it into a schematic to bring back to the table next time. From there we will establish our priorities. Come to the table next time with a straw proposal. (DP)

Action: Create a schematic to bring back to the table at the next opportunity and circulate to the members.

AM/DP

4. Old Business

a. Riparian Buffer enforcement during the permitting process:

The Chair, DP, summarized this agenda item issue as follows:

- There is general concern about maintaining a riparian buffer along watercourses and that perhaps it is not being taken as seriously and not being adequately enforced by HRM. With the Committee's support, KB wrote a letter to HRM. We have received no response to date. We cannot let this go. We deserve a response from HRM.

Discussion:

Q: *How can 12 permits be issued without any site assessment? That is disturbing. The plan doesn't mean anything to the property owner. (KB)*

A: I cannot speak to those particular applications. I can say that we are enforcing what we are able to enforce based on the way the bylaw is written. If you need something more strongly written, I am not sure how that would be done.

The reason it was written this way in 2006 was to try to tie it to our business, which is issuing permits. We went a step further in 2014 to require that it be added to the survey plans even though, from 2006 on, when a new lot is approved and if it is vacant, that buffer is required to be shown. The information is in the registry already, as of 2006, for new vacant lots. It's not perhaps as readily accessible for existing developed lots.

Even though the bylaw didn't require it, we felt it was important that new lots being created would show this, since it would form some kind of encumbrance on the lot. So, what we are trying to enforce is what we are able to enforce based on how the legislation is written. And the written legislation is tied to the permit. (RM)

Q: *Can that explanation be written in the response to the letter, from the Committee to HRM? It would satisfy that we got a response to the letter, explain what the rules are now and might*

give the Committee some guidance or ideas on how the policy might be strengthened. Is the policy a Regional or Secondary Plan policy? (AM)

A: The requirement came out of Regional Plan policy. (RM)

Q: With the Regional Plan review process underway now, could this perhaps be strengthened through the Regional Plan? (AM)

A: You would need to put it in each land use by-law (LUB) to be strengthened. You could write policy that matches up with the Regional Plan and put it into the MPS for the local areas and then put stronger terminology in the LUB. When we put it in the original document in 2006, it pretty much said the same thing. Then it was realized many of these riparian sections were amended over time. For example, there was a specific requirement for the communities of Herring Cove and Tantallon, so they put a general provision in the LUB that was the same and then realized that more stringent requirements were in some of the original MPS policies they were amended over time. So, if you want something stronger you have to write it into the LUB and be very clear about what the requirements are. (RM)

Q: What is a good starting point? I suggest having HRM respond to our letter and then have another discussion. Could a letter be drafted and provided to your supervisor, RM? (AM)

A: A letter has already been drafted and provided to my supervisor for further action, who has not had a chance to respond. (RM)

Subsection (6) of Section 4.17 Watercourse Setbacks and Buffers (RC-Jun 25/14;E-Oct 18/14), of the Shubenacadie Lakes (District 14/17) LUB was read out by KB to the Committee as follows:

“Every application for a development permit for a building or structure to be erected pursuant to this section, shall be accompanied by plans drawn to an appropriate scale showing the required buffers, existing vegetation limits and contours and other information including professional opinions, as the Development Officer may require, to determine that the proposed building or structure will meet the requirements of this section.”

Q: It is pretty clear there that they want information. I believe, as RM said, that the lots that are being recorded now have buffer zone information on them at the registry. It is pretty clear that they want this information at the registry. Did I hear that correctly? (KB)

A: When a new lot is surveyed and request is made for approval and it is on the water, any required buffer has to be identified on that plan. Since ~ 2006 there were a number of plans that were grandfathered that had already been submitted ahead of the new legislation and they might have gone forward without the buffer being shown. They might have been approved shortly after 2006 but might not have shown the information. Most of what was approved after 2006, if you were on the water, the buffer would have been shown. (RM)

- from the Committee’s position then, under the permitting process, when that permit comes to the Committee, that is where the Committee could say, where is the buffer; which would help out the homeowner after the fact. (BG)
- it is more about enforcement; if you have a riparian buffer associated with the lot, it is registered with the registry of deeds; (TM)
- it is easier to provide information to the public right out of the LUB; (RM)
- they all have to know about buffer zones before the construction starts. The damage is done when the homeowner is made aware after the fact; (KB)
 - that could fit into our education strategy; we ask could ask HRM to include a fact sheet when a permit is issued that highlights the regulations; (AM)
 - HRM already has it; (KB)

- perhaps we could ask that a fact sheet be supplied when there is a new deed transfer; (TM)

Q: *Is it on the deed, that the buffer has been recorded?* (KB)

A: A line on the plan is shown on the approved subdivision plan. The required buffer is calculated by the surveyor based on the criteria laid out in that section of the bylaw so they have to consider the grades in accordance with what they found on the ground. (RM)

Discussion:

When a subdivision takes place, the surveyors show what the bylaw (i.e., the regional subdivision bylaw that was amended in 2014) is requiring, on their survey plans, to spell out that they had to show that riparian buffer line and that they needed to calculate the location on that line, based on the criteria laid out in the LUB. We have certainly been making sure that that gets put on the subdivision plans and that those plans get filed in the registry.

The additional information that KB is talking about is what is laid out for the permit. I believe a determination was made some years ago that as long as it was clear that they were outside of the required buffer, we weren't necessarily asking for all that detail because some felt that it was a lot of information for them to have to provide. Also, there is more to it than that.

Now that we can access things like Google Earth and pictometry and you can actually see what is on the ground, we get a pretty good sense of vegetation coverage on a lot that we didn't have access to before. So, it is easy enough to tell if someone has skimmed their lot off down to the lake, and it had trees on it, say two or four years ago, based on the actual information we have available to us now. That is part of the reason that that determination was made. As long as it was very clear on the plan that anything that was being proposed was outside of the buffer, we weren't asking for much more than that. (RM)

We are not talking about what was outside the buffer; it is what is inside the buffer. (KB)

A surveyor, or anyone can take a picture. Within the permitting process, you could require that a picture be taken. (TM)

That would be a big help. (KB)

Regardless of how/what is done, there is still concern that lot development may be taking place to the detriment of the riparian zone. This is probably without full knowledge of the prospective owner of that property and what their responsibilities are. I think the concern we have, overall, whether it is in the planning, or the developer, or the owner, is a gap in the responsibilities. (DP)

Let's come back to the responses in the education strategy – that the riparian buffer is one of the prime issues to inform the public about – independent of the discussion of riparian zones. We have a genuine concern. There is a gap. People are able to do development that doesn't respect the value of the riparian zone. (DP)

We need a letter from HRM in response to our letter, or send another letter stating how much of a concern this is for us. To resolve this issue, we need to know where HRM stands and take it from there. We need to stay “out of the weeds” and not overstep the Terms of Reference (ToR). Let's determine the power we do have, what we are capable of doing to resolve this issue and at the very least get a response to our initial letter. (AM)

As an advisory committee, we can provide advice on what we think is valuable to those who make the decisions. There are written bylaws that specify what the development plan or the surveyors, or whoever, are supposed to provide. What the bylaw doesn't have is what to provide, or spell out within that line and what are you allowed or not allowed to do. They can do whatever they want. That may be the failure of the LUB. A picture may provide a pretty

good indication of what level vegetation was there. On the education side, we could provide the potential developer the information as to what they are, or not allowed, to do. The failure may be ignorance, but that may be because it has not been properly defined. Some may take advantage and others may not realize what the purpose of the riparian buffer is for. (WS)

Our power is as an advisory committee. We want answers to allow us to provide advice, and from there we know what we have to work with. (AM)

There are restrictions as to what may or may not be removed. There is quite a bit of information available that needs to get into the right hands. We need to figure out how to enforce these things. Once the land is cleared, then it is too late. (KB)

Action: RM will take this back to her supervisor to get a response.

Action: AM to provide a copy of the minutes as soon as they are ready for RM to provide to her supervisor.

Committee members to indicate their priorities.

Bring education agenda item to the top.

Prompt committee to prioritize education items.

Defer this agenda item until a response to the letter is received.

Action: Include importance of riparian buffers in CPWA Committee's education program.

Action

RM

AM

Complete

Complete

Complete

Complete

All

b. Aerotech Park Connector to Hwy 2 (TM):

i. Environmental Assessment (EA):

- TM informed the members that SWEPS Trails has been trying to get the K road put aside for a trail when the highway is built;
 - originally, an underpass was to be installed; now the plan is to have an overpass walkway to connect Old Holland Road to the Coach trail;
- if the Committee wants to make additional comment on the EA it has to be within a certain timeframe, which is not clear;
- our letter, in response to the initial EA submission, was included (along with all the other comments on the EA submission) in the Minister's decision on it, announced October 30, 2019, requesting further information, which the proponent, (Nova Scotia Transportation and Infrastructure Renewal) NSTIR, was to provide by October 30, 2020;

AM recited the latest Notice posted by the Minister regarding the EA registration by NSTIR to build the Aerotech Connector Road, dated October 30, 2019, regarding what is expected of NSTIR, and subsequent public information that may be provided, as follows:

“The Proponent shall publish a notice in the same manner as the original notice under Section 10 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations announcing the release of the additional information to the public and stating that written comments may be submitted about the additional information to the Department.”

- the Committee was not clear what this meant.

Action: Determine next steps of this EA process and the timeframe for further response.

Determine how EA letters and any other notifications are responded to; and send the Committee the link to all EA projects on the website.

AM

Complete

ii. Wetland compensation opportunities for SWEPS in watershed: (TM)

- TM comments:
 - Bob Pett from NSTIR is responsible for wetland compensation funding, which is, by and large, directed to saltwater marshes;
 - the Committee feels the compensation should be retained in the watershed from which the wetland compensation application is derived, instead;
 - there are plenty of small opportunities in the Shubenacadie watershed area;
 - the only large wetlands in the watershed area are both downstream, both off Halls Road, truncated by the CNR tracks;
- BG added:
 - Recently, Halifax Water was tasked to compensate for a very small portion of a wetland inside the Bennery Lake Watershed;
 - however, on the advice of a wetland consultant and NSE, it was determined that due to the small size of the wetland, it was not worth creating a new wetland inside the Bennery Lake watershed area to compensate for it;
 - instead, that wetland's value was added to that of a much larger one elsewhere;
 - also, there is a monitoring component attached to compensation awards, which is why so much money is going to Dykelands restoration and why so much goes to Ducks Unlimited, who do a lot of monitoring;
- there appears not to be any desire/ability to conduct wetland compensation within the watershed; (DP)
- we should know where that wetland compensation is being directed and express that we feel our wetlands are important; (WS)
- the Johnson Brook Halifax Water Wastewater Treatment Facility, hosts a wetland – a finishing wetland – that drains into Soldier Lake; perhaps we should ask Halifax Water's wastewater division whether they want/are able to capitalize on the funding to enhance their existing wetland; (TM)
- until we know the Minister's decision on the highway development, we have nothing to talk about; (DP)
- the question is, has any action been taken to programming and where wetland the compensation has been assigned. (WS)

Action: Send a letter asking where the wetland compensation for the wetlands being destroyed has been directed. Has a compensation area been identified?

All/AM

c. Scotian Materials (Goff's) Quarry:

i. Environmental Assessment of Goff's Quarry

- the Minister has decided to allow Phases I and II of the requested quarry expansion, but not Phases III and IV;
- SWEPS has taken water samples from the brook 3 times since the quarry has been approved and there has been no indication of metals, as of September 2020.

Action: Remove from Agenda

AM

ii. Community Liaison Committee (CLC)

- AM was away for the last meeting and didn't attend;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BG had initially been invited to attend the next meeting as a guest but was not invited to the last meeting, so he did not attend, either. 	<u>Action</u>
<p>Action: Sit on the Goff’s Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC) on behalf of the CPWA Committee and report back.</p>	BG
<p>d. Fall River Committee member vacancy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This position has been filled, so remove this item from the agenda. 	
<p>Action: Remove from Agenda</p>	
<p>e. Source Water Protection Plan (SWPP) Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at the request of the Committee, a chapter summary was created in the SWPP; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ this was created by summarizing the recommendations that emerged from the SWPP in a final chapter and using them to create an implementation strategy; • it now needs to be submitted to NSE, which BG will do ASAP. 	AM
<p>Action: Submit Collin’s Park Watershed SWPP to NSE.</p>	BG
<p>f. Subdivision Application 22471 – Montague Mines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there were no concerns regarding this subdivision application other than the slope and the distance from the gold mine; • there is no indication of impact to any mine tailings sites; • the preliminary plan proposed 4 lots; and • it appears the file is closed. 	
<p>Action: Remove from Agenda</p>	AM
<p>g. Logo/Branding</p>	
<p>Action: Remove from Agenda</p>	
<p>h. HRM Shubenacadie River watershed Floodplain Mapping Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TM informed the Committee that this Study is still in the review stage; • Peter Duncan at HRM is TM’s contact now, although Yousef Habboush is the lead at HRM regarding this study; • there will not be a presentation to Council until after the municipal election; and • no presentation to the public until after it has been presented to Council. 	AM
<p><u>Find out if this mapping study is a planning exercise.</u></p>	<u>Complete</u>
<p><u>Check on status of Floodplain Study and who the lead person working on this is.</u></p>	<u>Complete</u>
<p>Action: Draft a letter requesting a joint presentation about the Floodplain Study to both Committees (SWEPS and CPWAC) signed by TM and DP.</p>	BG
<p>i. Runoff from New Fall River Carwash Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep on agenda and follow up with the wastewater branch at Halifax Water 	
<p>Action: Find out if we need to be concerned about runoff into the storm drain from the new carwash in Fall River.</p>	AM
<p>5. New Business:</p>	

a. HRM Regional Plan Review

- BG asked the manager of Regulatory Services, Kevin Gray (KG) about the status of the Regional Plan (RP) review and Halifax Water's role in it;
- KG thought the review process was on hold due to Covid-19 restrictions;
- while discussing other matters with Andrew Bone, an HRM Planner, AM asked about the RP review status; AB directed AM to Leah Perrin (LP), the technical advisor on the Regional Plan;
- AM talked to LP about the RP review process who advised AM of the following:
 - The RP review was to begin this year, but due to Covid-19, it has been stalled;
 - LP's group is creating a scoping document for the public to review, probably more likely in February, which is something to watch for, but won't be a lot of opportunity for us to have a lot of input to until then;
- In the meantime, we might consider providing something in the Regional Plan to strengthen watershed protection, in general, regarding the riparian buffer topic;
- BG and AM submitted changes to the RMPS in 2014;
- we will need to update the [Regional Plan's Water Supply Areas Map 12](#), submitted in 2014, since the watershed boundaries have changed slightly and one water supply (Miller Lake) has been removed;
- considering there may be opportunity to provide input this coming spring, Committee members may want to consider something to submit; for example, should we ask for a 30 m buffer on watercourses (in line with NSE regulations) in municipal drinking water supply watershed areas?

b. Montague Mines Reclamation Project (BG)

DP asked BG to provide a synopsis of the project:

- Nova Scotia Lands (NS Lands) is a government agency responsible for overseeing the gold-mined lands and tailings area clean-up initiatives for the province;
- Montague Mines is where a significant gold mine once operated, which has been identified as one of the priority clean-up areas;
 - streams run through the tailings area through Barry's Run, which is impacting Port Wallace development plans; and
 - streams run toward Lake Major through Black Barren Brook;
- the clean-up project involves first assessing the area, which involves studying the water and soil quality;
 - monitoring-wells were installed this summer as part of the assessment;
- BG has asked the consultant for the results of the study, but they need permission from NS Lands to release the data, which has not been provided; and
- a reclamation plan will be based on the assessment findings, which will not be created until a report has been put together.

6. HRM Planning and Development Update:**a. HRM [Planning Applications](#) in CP Risk Areas:**

RM provided an application drawing to illustrate the first application, which AM displayed:

i. Subdivision 22893

- an application for 6 or 7 lots, approved on Perrin Drive, was provided by HRM Planning and Development officer, Trevor Creaser;
 - this drawing is not the approved plan, though it was approved; (RM)

Q: *Is the brook that is flowing into Miller Lake, Tillman's Brook? (TM)*

A: No. The brook is farther south, just above Scout Camp Sespenack. (BG)

- these lots surround a wetland;
- the wetland/watercourse buffers have been delineated, demonstrating due diligence in meeting the bylaw's minimum requirements, which provides confidence to the development officer in issuing a permit;

Q: *Is this what we like to see regarding the 20 m buffer? (BG to KB)*

A: Yes, that also includes some narrative. (KB)

- a shame to put the lots on the edge of a total wetland;

Q: *Did a qualified wetland delineator delineate this wetland? (BG)*

A: The surveyor would not put the lines on a plan without a qualified delineator, though, in this case, the delineator is not identified on the plan;

- we want to know whether the wetland was delineated by a qualified wetland delineator; (BG)

Q: *Given HRM is recognizing that this is more or less a wetland, does it matter whether it is delineated by a qualified delineator? (RM)*

A: Yes. (BG)

Q: *HRM should be requesting it, should they not? (BG)*

A: We are relying on the information provided by the surveyor. None of us forces certain things to be said. We've said we'll accept what the surveyor tells us, because we know surveyors have been taken to task, since a few have been sued over not showing wetlands on the plan. Most of them have become quite gun shy about not having other professionals determining this. Some surveyors who are quite confident in what they are providing will do the work themselves.

HRM planning and development is not pushing them, one way or the other, because the subdivision bylaw requires them to provide a survey, which they have prepared in this case. Their argument since 2006 is that they are not qualified wetland delineators. Most surveyors, when they come across this situation, will work with licensed delineators. I have no reason to doubt that this is what surveyor did, because that is what most of them are doing.

I have had surveyors submit plans that do not show a wetland, when there has been one, so it is not always accurate, but most of the time we can trust that they have done their due diligence. They don't like putting their names on the plan and taking the responsibility for someone else's work. They are clearly saying on this plan that someone else ("others") delineated the wetland.

Most of the time they will name the agency that did the work, though most of the time we do not require it. Nothing in the subdivision bylaw forces them to have a licensed person show this. And nothing in the bylaw requires them to show who is the wetland delineator, should they work with one. Most surveyors are uncomfortable showing a buffer unless they work with a delineator, when necessary, to get the information – i.e., the layer – to put on their plan; so, they seek it out from another, licensed source.

Q: *Should we request that the surveyor reveal who the wetland delineator was? (BG/AM)*

A: I could ask if this is important, but the bylaw doesn't say this is something that I have to get. It just has to be certified by the surveyor. (RM)

Q: *If the surveyor is certifying that this plan is correct, they are also essentially certifying that the buffers on that line is relatively correct. If the owner of the property of the developer chose to fill in this area, would HRM be able to act in an enforcement manner or require restitution?* (WS)

A: If we know the integrity of the buffer has been compromised, we will go in and say you will need to reinstate it. That is what our practice has been, when we know for certain that there has been interference with the buffer during the permitting process. That is where the buffer and requirements for certain information come from, i.e., when we are issuing a development permit.

If someone clears the land before there is a permit, we don't have a lot of teeth in the bylaw to have any recourse. Not to say that there shouldn't be, but it is not the way the bylaw is written now. The bylaw states that the final survey must show the buffer; and when the permit is issued, they must demonstrate that they are not inside the buffer.

There are a lot of situations where they have taken everything off the property after the permit has been issued. In such cases we have confronted them to say this was against the permitting rules. We don't have a lot of examples enforcing this because we don't have the manpower to enforce these permits; however, when we receive a complaint and we know that the buffer has been interfered with, we can require that they reinstate it. (RM)

Everything on this plan, from a regulatory perspective, meets the requirements. Therefore, the Committee is satisfied that the survey and plan met the HRM bylaw requirements. (DP)

ii. Case 23060 – Spider Lake Conservation Design Development

- there is no explanation of this Case included with the illustration on the interactive planning application map online; and it lies in the Waverley Game Sanctuary;

RM looked the case up on her Hansard and described it as follows:

- it is a planning application;
- it is possible that it just hasn't been moved into the full review stage;
- Jacqueline Belisle is the planner on the file and could be contacted for an update;
- these cases are confidential until they are moved into the public domain.

Action: RM to send AM the number for Jacqueline Belisle

RM

Action: AM to call Jacqueline Belisle about the case

AM

AM reminded members that they are welcome to connect to the [Planning Applications](#) link on the agenda, when they are circulated, to review them and raise any questions or concerns about them to the Committee.

b. [Port Wallace Development](#) (displayed on screen):

Ask Andrew Bone (AB), the planner on this case, for an update.

Complete

i. Comments on second draft of policy:

- the project is not dead;
- the mine closure details are about a year behind, due to Covid-19 restrictions;
- all environmental aspects are going through NS Lands;
- development is on hold until the mine reclamation project is determined;

- mine reclamation objectives are available on the website;
- decisions on the Port Wallace development will not occur until the consultant's report is released;
- Halifax Water is concerned about stormwater, which is also in the consultants' hands through the report.

ii. Measure water volume:

- stormwater volumes are not permitted to exceed the net volume that flows into Barry's Run, to ensure the base sediment is not disrupted; i.e., water quantity equals water quality.

iii. [Barry's Run Environmental Site](#) Assessment:

- soil site assessment found nothing in the soils surrounding Barry's Run, but found contaminants in the sediment;
- this site assessment was a pre-cursor to the Montague Mines reclamation project;
- Barry's Run assessment was conducted to understand what is going on in the brook;
- there was a search for mercury contamination in fish samples;
- people are warned about potential Mercury exposure if swimming in the area;
- believe assessment has been completed.

Action: remove from Agenda

AM

c. Development on Carr Property in Fall River ([Case 20954](#)):

- It has been rezoned and it is moving forward;
- The RLRC zone is showing up now

Action: Remove from Agenda

AM

7. Election of Officers:

- Spring 2022 (Summer now due to Covid-19);

8. Next meeting:

- Conduct Doodle Poll to determine next meeting date.
 - Thursday/Friday/Evenings/Days choices;
 - Meet virtually until Covid agency protocols are lifted.

9. Motion to adjourn:

- DP at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted: AM, Secretary