

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

Council Meeting Agenda

June 25, 2024 - 6:00 p.m.

In-person, Sanford Council Chambers, 76 Morison Dr, Windsor, NS

Virtual via Zoom (also FB Livestream)



West Hants
something inspiring awaits

-
1. Call to Order
 2. Attendance
 3. Announcements
 4. Approval of the Agenda, including additions or deletions
 - a) Dashboard Action Items – Information Log
 - b) Dashboard Action Items – Dangerous or Unsightly Premises
 5. Declaration(s) of Conflict of Interest
 6. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - a) 2024-05-28 Council Meeting Minutes
 - b) 2024-05-29 Council Meeting Minutes (Continuation of 2023-05-28 meeting)
 - c) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes Payzant Drive, Windsor Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382
 - d) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes 586 O'Brien Street, Windsor PID 45054350 Development Agreement
 - e) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes Willow Street, Hantsport HLUB Map Amendment PID 45045879
 - f) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes Albert Street, Portion of PID 45058872 (August House)
 - g) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes West Hants LUB 1781 King Street, Windsor PID 45162005
 - h) 2024-05-28 PH Minutes Hwy 215, Summerville, PID 45180635 Development Agreement
 7. Public Hearings
 - a) Payzant Drive, Windsor Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 – Senior Planner Dunphy
 - b) WMPS Text Amendments: Policy 5.4.6 Criteria for Development Agreements – Director Poirier
 8. Second Readings (as it pertains to Public Hearings)
 - a) Payzant Drive, Windsor Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382– Senior Planner Dunphy
 - b) WMPS Text Amendments: Policy 5.4.6 Criteria for Development Agreements – Director Poirier

9. Unfinished Business/Postponed Motions
 - a) Home Flood Protection Pilot Program Policy – Coordinator Ogilvie
 - b) Rename Cottage Street to Paris Street (Deferred from June 11th COTW meeting)
 - c) Purchase of Combination Vacuum Truck Decision Request – Mayor Zebian
 - d) Updated Falls Lake West Owners Association Uniform Charge 2024-2025 Resolution
 - e) 2024 Grants and Contributions Decision Request Report – Director Kehoe
10. Mayor’s Report
11. Committee(s) of Council Excerpts/Recommendations
 - a) Committee of the Whole Excerpts (June 11, 2024)
 - i. Deer Management Report
 - ii. Flood Risk Infrastructure Investment Program Application
 - iii. Letter of support to hire a fulltime equity coordinator in both the WHMS and AVHS
 - iv. Nesbitt Street Renewal
 - v. Operations Building
 - vi. PCAP Funding and FRIPP Funding for Windsor Flood Study Phase 2
 - vii. Explore residential property buyout information/options
 - viii. WHRMPW24-05 Supply of Treatment Chemicals Recommendation
 - b) Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee Recommendations (June 13, 2024) (as it relates to First Readings)
 - i. Windsor Back Road, Three Mile Plains Development Agreement, PID 45402831 – Senior Planner Dunphy
 - ii. West Hants Municipal Planning Strategy Amendments: Large scale wind turbine setbacks – Director Poirier
 - iii. West Hants Municipal Planning Strategy Amendments and Windsor Land Use By-law Amendments: 368 Nesbitt Street, PID 45056447 and PID 45227279, Colonial Road – Director Poirier
12. Councillor Municipal Business/Activity Reports
 - a) Councillor Ivey, District 11 Information/Activity Report
13. Correspondence
 - a) Information
 - i. Avon Causeway Activity Log – None
 - ii. Ever Wind/Bear Lake Wind Farm - None
 - iii. Correspondence Received Activity Log

- i. Jennifer Moore Re Stannus Street
- ii. K. Zwicker Re DAR Rail
- iii. K. Zwicker Re Surplus equipment/Tractors
- iv. K. Zwicker Re Municipal Vehicles
- v. Kim Lake, ARHS Re Berm Thank You

b) Requests

- i. Hants North Legion Letter requesting funding
- ii. Amanda Dunfield WHRM Utility account request

c) Outgoing Correspondence Log

- i. 2024-06-19 WHRM letter Re Dyke maintenance along the St. Croix River beside Highway 14, the Kennetcook River off route 236 in Scotch Village and the Herbert River

15. New Business - None

16. In-Camera

- a) 2024-05-29 In-Camera Meeting Minutes
- b) MGA 22(2)(a) Legal Matter

17. Next Meeting Date / Adjournment – July 9th, 2024 Council Meeting 6 p.m.

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

Public Hearing Minutes – Payzant Drive, Windsor Development Agreement

PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382

Tuesday, June 25, 2024 6:11 pm – 7:08 pm

In-person Sanford Council Chambers and virtually via ZOOM

(also Facebook Livestreamed)



1. Call to Order

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:36 pm.

2. Council:

Rupert Jannasch, Councillor, District 1

Scott McLean, Councillor, District 2

Mark McLean, Councillor, District

Jeff Hartt, Councillor, District 4

Bob Morton Councillor District 6 (6:15 p.m.)

Paul Morton, Deputy Mayor, District 8

Ed Sherman, Councillor, District 7

John A. Smith, Councillor, District 9

Laurie Murley, Councillor, District 10

Jim Ivey, Councillor, District 11

Staff and Guests:

Mark Phillips, Chief Administrative Officer

Carlee Rochon, Director of Financial Services

Erin Amirault, Project Engineer

Kathy Kehoe, Director Community Development

Alex Dunphy, Planner

Deanna Snair, Municipal Clerk

Sara Poirier, Dir. Planning & Development

John Ogilvie, Climate Action Coordinator

Todd Richard, Dir. Public Works

Regrets:

Shelleena Thornton, Municipal Ops Supervisor

Presenter and Gallery

17 in the Gallery

3. Public Hearings – All public hearings and presentations are available on the Municipal website.

a) Payzant Drive, Windsor Development Agreement (DA) PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382

Planner Dunphy reviewed the report. On March 15, 2023 a completed application was received from Noel Taiani of Parsons Green Developments on behalf of Abraham Zebian to allow for a proposed development including a total of 280 apartment units, across 4 multiple-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units grouped on the subject lots by development agreement.

The proposed site plan was reviewed, noting that setbacks would be identified in the DA and a road reserve was included to allow for the design and connection of the Payzant Drive extension to King Street.

The lots were located at the end of Payzant Drive with neighbouring properties being the Avon View High School, Windsor Baptist Church, residential dwellings, and commercial uses.

Under the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM), the property was designated Residential and zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1).

Planner Dunphy reviewed the DA details which included permitting up to 280 apartment units and 18 townhouse units, setback requirements generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone, except the front and rear yards which have been reduced and deemed appropriate by the Development Officer, a maximum height of 5 storeys, a minimum ratio of 1 parking space to dwelling unit, a road reserve to allow a future Municipal connection from the Payzant Drive Extension to the King Street connection and completion of the Payzant Drive Extension by the earlier of 2030 or the completion of the King Street Connection.

Planner Dunphy reviewed the DA substantive details which included the maximum number of units permitted, the maximum height and storeys of the apartment buildings, the fire safety requirements, the landscaping requirements and the requirement for a stormwater management plan.

A Public Information meeting (PIM) was held on May 11, 2023 and broadcasted live on the municipal Facebook page. Fifteen (15) members of the public attended and deadline for comments was May 25th, 2023.

Comments included a nearby sewer line, concerns with traffic, blocked views, property values, introduction of additional traffic and waste, and concerns regarding access.

Planner Dunphy reviewed the Windsor Municipal Planning Strategy:

- Policy 5.4.6 of the WMPS allowed Council to consider entering into a development agreement to permit new multiple unit residential development. It was noted that in summary the criteria were met as the proposed development was generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone standards; the future Municipal road, constructed at the cost of the developer, will provide adequate access to the proposed development; adequate on-site parking, amenity space, and buffering will be required for the proposal as per the draft development agreement; and the Development Officer and the Municipal Traffic Authority have no concerns which have not been addressed in this report.
- Policy 5.5.1 allowed Council to consider permitting dwellings in excess of three storeys by development agreement. It was noted that in summary, the criteria were met since: the draft development agreement requires side yards to be at least one-half the height of the buildings above 3 storeys, the draft development agreement restricts the apartment buildings to 5 storeys in height and in no instance are they to exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height, and the proposal building is compatible with the surrounding area in terms of design, height and scale.

Planner Dunphy reviewed the Windsor MPS – DA Specific Criteria Policy (Policy 5.5.1) which allowed Council to consider permitting dwellings in excess of three storeys by DA. It was noted that in summary, the criteria were met since the draft DA required side yards to be at least one-half the height of the buildings above 3 storeys, the draft DA restricted the apartment buildings to 5 storeys in height and in no instance were they to exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height, and the proposal building was compatible with the surrounding area in terms of design, height and scale.

Planner Dunphy reviewed the Windsor MPS – DA General Criteria Policy (Policy 16.3.1), noting in summary the criteria were met since the proposal was not considered premature or inappropriate for the area, the costs relating directly to the development would not impact the Municipality and the Fire Chief, Development Officer, Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services, Public Works Engineering Division, and Municipal Traffic Authority had no concerns which were not addressed in the report

Planner Dunphy reviewed the process. A Public Information meeting was held May 11, 2023, followed by a review and recommendation report going to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee on February 8, 2024. First Reading occurred February 27, 2024, and Public Hearing was held March 26, 2024 resulting in Public Hearing being postponed until April 23, 2024 and then postponed again until May 28th, 2024; which resulted in the current Public Hearing and Second Reading (June 25, 2024). Planner Dunphy noted that all statutory requirements for the application have been met.

The applicants (Mr. Taiani and Mr. McCullough) provided a short presentation. Mr. Taiani noted that due to the time of year and delays to date, not a lot of intricate design was completed. Mr. Taiani reviewed the current preliminary site plan for the proposal (four buildings surrounding a central courtyard, it was noted that it was likely an application would be made to add an amenity building close to the courtyard. Parking was to be about 1.4 parking spaces to unit (it was preferred to either not build asphalt parking or to scale it back to something greener). The preference was to have more gardens and green spaces around the buildings with the majority of parking being accommodated underground.

The site plan was noted to be slightly larger than Miners Landing. Mr. Taiani provided an overview of the common area, amenity room and conceptual plan for apartments at Miners Landing. A rendering being considered for the townhouses was also provided, it included using a brick facade with a nod to Victorian/Georgian architecture. The proposed town houses would be two (2) storeys and everyone from singles, couples and families were accommodated. The apartments would be similar in style as the Miners Landing apartments. The same design team was being used for the Windsor location.

At 7:28 p.m. Deputy Mayor P. Morton opened the floor to questions from the public. No members of the public wished to speak on the matter. The floor was then opened for questions from Council.

Discussion Points:

- The developer noted there was a component of affordable housing in every project they developed. A challenge with affordable housing was defining affordability as it was different for everyone. Within the project affordability was identified as per CMHC guidelines or provincial guidelines. It was assumed financing would be through CMHC and include an element of affordability as a percentage of the units. The heterogeneous mixture of tenants was seen as more attractive to renters.
- Concern was raised with the parking lot area not being paved; it was a large surface area for stormwater. The developer advised parking would be dealt with by a civil engineering team during the design phase and also noted they were required to attenuate stormwater runoff (stormwater runoff would need to be stored and slowly released at the same rate as it would have pre-development). This was generally done

under the parking areas with large plastic dish tanks. The developer identified storm water on the site will be directed, collected and stored on the site, with a large portion being stored under the parking areas/underground. The other storage option would be above ground storage ponds. With either option, stormwater would be released outside of the property at the same rate it would have been released pre-development.

- Concern was voiced that outstanding questions related to the adjoining property and connectivity with Payzant Drive remained, there was a desire to postpone the Public Hearing and Second Reading until these questions were resolved. The connectivity concern was associated with how Irven Drive connects to Payzant (either a road from Irven Drive through the Parsons Green property or bordering the property, or a walking trail or another option). To date no option has been confirmed and the connection impacts the property/proposal. It was felt not enough information has been provided about this connection piece to make a decision.
- Planner Dunphy advised that it appeared a separate file was starting to be discussed. It was noted the property was nearby and there was an aspect of connectivity between the two properties; however, the requirements for this proposal have been met (the Payzant extension is required, and it was being built out to a connection for the municipal connection of Payzant to King Street). It was further summarized that the application as presented met the criteria.
- It was noted the development on the adjoining property could potentially impact the current proposal and until there was resolution, the current proposal could not be supported. It was suggested a postponement was in order until at least the next Council meeting to allow Public Works and the Planning staff have the connectivity issue resolved.
- Director Poirier advised there were two matters before Council for discussion at the meeting, although the matters were interrelated in terms of proximity of the properties; planning staff believed them to be two (2) separate matters. With respect to the Payzant Drive extension, staff were recommending Council approve the recommendation based on the criteria and the policies of Council. Based on review of the proposal and the submitted traffic impact study for the project, the DA was drafted with the requirements outlined for the developer to construct the Payzant Drive extension at their cost and to provide a portion of lands towards the Payzant Drive extension connection. Both requirements were met in the draft DA.
- It was noted the “other” developer’s proposal and requirements included a potential connection from Irven Drive to the new Payzant Drive connection. This is a requirement for the other developer/proposal and not a requirement of the current proposal being discussed/considered. The other developers’ requirements were based on the length of cul-de-sac proposed to the municipal specification manual, also based on information from traffic engineers engaged by the municipality the review the traffic study and in relation to the future streets map of the subdivision bylaw which shows a future connection from the Crossing development to King Street. The developer was expected to show Council how they propose to get the connection and there were two (2) other options for the developer to provide the

connection (emergency access instead of a full road build out as well as an opportunity for the developer to provide the full road on their lot, resulting in three (3) options that can be considered. There has been no discussion between the developers for the road connection to go through the Parsons Green property, nor was it a requirement for the Parsons Green application to provide that option as a connection for Irven Drive. The other developer was responsible to provide this connection.

- It was noted the development was supported but in the interest of residents in the area and the developer, the bigger picture needed to be looked at and until it was known that the other developer had a way to connect to Payzant and has a way to build the cul-de-sac.
- Director Poirier advised there were two (2) other options for the other developer to consider. The option being favoured by the other developer would go through the Parsons Green property and it was not a requirement for Parsons Green to provide that connection.
- The draft report of the other developer's application would likely go to the Planning and Heritage Advisory committee and be presented to Council (First Reading) in July. At this time, it was expected that the recommendation would not be favourable based on comments received from Public Works (length of cul-de-sac being proposed, the traffic impact study and the future streets map showing a connection). It was noted that when this item came before Council, staff did not expect it to change/impact the proposal currently being considered.
- There were statements of provincial interest in the MGA that outline items such as sewer and water, housing, etc. This area was not identified as a specific special water course in any of that legislation, but a specific setback of 50 ft was required from any water course to a development. This setback requirement would be in effect when issuing a development permit.
- Occupancy permits within the current draft development agreement were not tied to the road being constructed. Occupancy permits would fall under the normal requirements for any development through the DA process. It was suggested tying occupancy permits to the road construction by way of the DA may be of value in relation to safety for fire trucks turning or access to properties.
- The applicant has committed to building his portion of the road (extension) by 2030 or in compliance with the request made by Council to have language in the DA that states "whoever gets there first" as there was an interest in seeing the road completed as a whole. If the municipality committed to begin building the connector piece, the developer has committed to build his piece at the same time.
- Planner Dunphy noted that within the phasing section of the DA, the first apartment building was required to be completed within 72 months from commencement of the development and within 120 months from commencement of the development, all of the apartment buildings and all relevant infrastructure and landscaping was required to be completed. A full build out with 120 months of commencement.
- Planner Dunphy noted that prior to completion of the first phase (first apartment building) the water main running through the entirety of the Payzant Drive extension

must be replaced and completed. The DA identifies the road build out be completed by one of the proposed deadlines, either 2030 or the completion of the King Street to Payzant Drive connection (which ever is earlier), resulting in the Payzant Drive extension required to be completed at the same time.

- It was noted connectivity has been a long-standing concern, numerous discussions have occurred over the past two (2) decades regarding the one way in/one way out for Payzant Drive. Despite there being two (2) different projects from different developers there was a desire to ensure connectivity and the one way in/one way out issue was resolved. The developer noted the Payzant Drive extension was not the road reserve, the road reserve was in place in case the road extension required a wider angle to meet up with the connector piece. It was felt it was easier to have the reserve in place and written in the DA vs having to accommodate the ask afterwards.
- The developer identified 2030 as the timeline noted in the DA. He also advised they would have the road completed sooner as long as the connector piece was completed (they will be there at the same time the municipality was). As a building is completed, a specific amount of frontage was required resulting in the road being built out as required. It may make sense financially and schedule wise to build the entire road all at once but at any rate they were held to creating frontage (100ft) as they construct a building.
- There was uncertainty in not knowing what the connector piece looked like.
- The draft traffic impact study was expected to be completed by the end of next week. This study (traffic volume, turning and connectivity) was a broader scope and looked at a wider area, taking in more than just the Payzant area to ensure all information was captured to make a decision. The current information dated back to pre pandemic, there was desire to have update information to better reflect 2024 numbers for connectivity points, traffic routes, turning lanes required, etc.
- The additional information being sought was specifically how Irven Drive is going to connect to Payzant Drive.
- It was noted the project was support but there was support to see the road completed as a whole and connected to King Street to have an alternate access to the hospital, other developments and the high school.
- There was a desire to see the traffic study for connectivity first before a decision was made.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR SMITH AND B. MORTON THAT COUNCIL POSTPONE PUBLIC HEARING AND SECOND READING UNTIL THE JULY COUNCIL MEETING SO THAT COUNCIL CAN ASSESS THE INFORMATION AND HAVE MORE INFORMATION ON CONNECTIVITY IN THIS AREA. MOTION CARRIED. Nays: Jannasch, Sherman and P. Morton

At 7:08 p.m. the regular Council meeting resumed.

Deputy Mayor P. Morton, Chair

Deanna Snair, Executive Assistant/Clerk



WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT

Information <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation X	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---	--

To: Mayor Zebian and Members of West Hants Regional Municipality Council

Submitted by: _____
Alex Dunphy, Senior Planner

Date: June 25, 2024

Subject: Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04B

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Municipal Government Act Section 230

RECOMMENDATION

Should Council wish to approve the development agreement, the following motion would be in order:

...that Council gives Second Reading and approves entering into a development agreement to allow up to 280 units within grouped multi-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units on PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 on Payzant Drive in Windsor which is substantively the same as the draft set out in Appendix A of the report File #23-04B to Council dated June 25, 2024.

...that Council requires that the development agreement with Abraham Zebian on behalf of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED for PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 on Payzant Drive in Windsor be signed within 120 days from the date of final approval by Council or the date that any appeals have been disposed of; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

BACKGROUND

Property X	Public Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

An application was received from Noel Taiani of Parsons Green Developments with authorization from the property owner 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED on March 15, 2023. The application was to allow a proposed development including a total of 280 apartment units, across 4 multiple-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units grouped on the subject lots by development agreement. Abraham Zebian is the President of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED.

DISCUSSION

A Public Information Meeting was held on May 11, 2023.

On February 8, 2024, staff presented a recommendation report to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC) (Appendix A). The Committee discussed reduced yard requirements, proposed driveway access, the timeline for the road extension completion, the existing watercourse, and the Traffic Impact Study. During the February 8 meeting, PAC/HAC recommended in favour of the application.

On February 27, 2024, staff presented the PAC/HAC recommendation to Council for First Reading. Council discussed the road reserve within the development agreement, the status of the roundabout at Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road, the municipal services on the subject lots, connectivity between developments and the connections from Payzant Drive to both King Street and Irven Drive. Council recommended in favour of the application at that time.

On March 26, 2024, staff recommended to postpone the Public Hearing in order to fully answer Council's questions from the previous Committee of the Whole meeting. Council discussed how best to capture public comments during the public hearing, the wording regarding connection vs. extension, transportation connectivity, and the Payzant Drive to King Street connection design. Council postponed the Public Hearing to April 23, 2024, at that time.


On April 23, 2024, staff recommended to postpone the Public Hearing in order to complete a revised site plan for the draft development agreement following the update road reserve design from the Public Works Department. Council postponed the Public Hearing to May 28, 2024, at that time.

On May 28, 2024, staff recommended to postpone the Public Hearing in order to allow ongoing negotiations for the draft development agreement. Council postponed the Public Hearing to June 25, 2024, at that time.

Since the last Council meeting staff have corresponded with the applicant and the Municipal Solicitor regarding the timing of the Payzant Drive Extension construction. Ultimately, the applicant has agreed to a timeline for completion of construction for the Payzant Drive Extension based on the earlier of either the completion of the Payzant Drive to King Street Connection, or 2030. The updated draft development agreement (Appendix B) has been reviewed by the Municipal Solicitor and is the copy that staff recommend proceeding with.

NEXT STEPS

The process for this application is as follows:



FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A road extension of Payzant Drive would be required in order to service this proposed development. The developer will be required to construct the extension of Payzant Drive and all associated infrastructure to the extent of the frontage of the subject lots. Separately, during the June 27, 2023 Council meeting, Council directed staff to begin the process of designing the Payzant Drive to King Street connection. Any connection outside of what would be constructed by the developer to provide frontage and access to this development would be a cost to the Municipality.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A	Updated Draft Development Agreement
Appendix B	2024-02-27 Staff Report - Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04A

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER REVIEW

I support the recommendation.

Specifically, I encourage Council to review section 2.4 (a) (d) Road and Municipal Services. The underlined section details the timing of the road construction in relation to the extension (developer portion) and the connector (WHRM) portion.

Notwithstanding any other provision in this agreement, the Payzant Drive Extension shall be completed by the Owner to the satisfaction of the Development Officer and Municipal Engineer together, acting reasonably, with fulfilling any requirements under Section 39 of the Subdivision By-law by December 31, 2030, or in conjunction with the completion of the Payzant Drive Connection to King Street (to the south of the Payzant Drive Extension) to be completed by the Municipality, whichever occurs first. Prior to the occurrence of either of these events, the Owner is required only to complete that portion of the Payzant Drive Extension which is necessary for the issuance of permits for the construction of that portion of the Development from time to time.

I believe this is a positive outcome for both the developer and the WHRM after ongoing discussions regarding the road schedule.

Report Prepared by: _____
Alex Dunphy, Planner

Report Approved by: _____
Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development

Report Approved by:  _____
Mark Phillips, Chief Administrative Officer

**Appendix A –
Updated Draft Development Agreement**



DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT made this day of , 2024.

BETWEEN:

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY, a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, having its chief place of business at 76 Morison Drive, Wentworth Creek, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Municipality”)

OF THE FIRST PART

- and -

3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED a body corporate, with a head office at 31 Cochrane Lane, Sweets Corner, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Owner”)

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the Owner is the registered Owner of the parcels of land located on Payzant Drive (PIDs 45053030, 45343894, 45343878, and 45234382), hereinafter referred to as the “Properties”, which lands are more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto; and

WHEREAS PIDs 45053030, 45343894, 45343878, and 45234382 are designated Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map of the Municipal Planning Strategy and zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1) on the Zoning Map of the Land Use By-law; and

WHEREAS the Owner has requested that the Municipality enter into a development agreement to permit up to 280 apartment units and up to 18 townhouse units grouped on the Properties (the “Development”); and

WHEREAS Policy 5.4.6 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Section 6.1 (b) of the Land Use By-law enable Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow new multiple unit residential developments consisting of three or more units in a Residential designation, and Policy 5.5.1 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Section 6.1 (c) of the Land Use By-law enable Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow new dwellings in excess of three stories in a residential zone; and

WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, at a meeting held on **Month Day**, 2024, approved this request and adopted this Agreement by policy, subject to the execution of this development agreement by the parties hereto;

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

PART 1 AGREEMENT CONTEXT

1.1 Definitions

In this Agreement, all words or phrases used shall carry their customary meaning unless otherwise set out in the Land Use By-law, except those defined as follows:

- (a) “Active Construction” means that the Owner has active development and building permits for the construction of the apartment building and the associated parking podium, and that construction activity including but not limited to equipment, machinery, and employees, are on-site working towards the necessary building inspections leading to an occupancy permit;
- (b) “Ceased Operation” means the stopping of work on a particular building within the Development once active construction has commenced for an extended period of time, but shall not apply to the period of time between phases or stoppages of a seasonal nature or resulting from Force Majeure;
- (c) “Commencement” means the date the Owner begins Active Construction on the apartment buildings within this Agreement as permitted by an issued development and building permit;
- (d) “Front Lot Line” means the Property line abutting the future public street defined herein as the Payzant Drive Extension;

- (e) “Mechanical Penthouse” means an enclosed structure and/or area located on the roof surface of the building that may include mechanical equipment such as generators, cooling towers, chillers, electrical equipment, and elevator shafts;
- (f) “Minor Change” means an alteration which does not affect the intent of this Agreement or require an amendment to the text of this Agreement;
- (g) “Payzant Drive Extension” means a new municipal street and associated sidewalk, water, waste water and storm water infrastructure to be constructed by or at the Owner’s expense on the area shown as Payzant Drive Extension on Schedule B - Site Plan which is owned by the Municipality and, at the discretion of the Municipal Engineer, also upon some or all of the road reserve owned by the Owner described in section 2.14 and shown as such on Schedule B -Site Plan;
- (h) “Rear Lot Line” means the lot line furthest from or opposite to the front lot line;
- (i) “Side Lot Line” means a lot line other than a front or rear lot line;

1.2 Schedules

The following attached schedules shall form part of this Agreement:

Schedule A - Legal Description

Schedule B – Site Plan

1.3 Municipal Planning Strategy, Land Use By-law and Subdivision By-law

- (a) Municipal Planning Strategy means the Municipal Planning Strategy of the Town of Windsor, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (b) Land Use By-law means the Land Use By-law of the Town of Windsor, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (c) Subdivision By-law means the Subdivision By-law of the Town of Windsor, effective on March 21, 2012, as amended, or successor by-laws.

PART 2 DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Use

- (a) The Parties agree that uses on the Properties shall be limited to the following:
 - (i) those uses permitted by the underlying zoning in the Land Use By-law;
 - (ii) four, five (5) storey apartment buildings, each containing up to 70 dwelling units, up to an aggregate maximum of 280 apartment units on PIDs 45053030 and 45343894;
 - (iii) townhouse units including up to 18 dwelling units on PID 45343878;
 - (iii) amenity space contained within the apartment buildings; and

- (iv) underbuilding, underground and surface parking for the uses within the buildings.

Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the provisions of the Land Use By-law and the Subdivision By-law apply to any development undertaken pursuant to this Agreement.

2.2 Development Location and Design

- (a) The Municipality and the Owner acknowledge that the Development as shown on Schedule B is a phased Development. The Development location and design of the townhouse buildings located on PID 45343878 shall follow requirements as listed in Section 2.2 (b). The Development location and design of the apartment buildings located on PIDs 45053030 and 45343894 shall follow the requirements as listed in Section 2.2 (c).

- (b) The townhouse buildings shall be limited to a maximum of 18 dwelling units and shall be limited to 6 units per group. The townhouses may include underground and underbuilding parking and shall conform to the following requirements:

Minimum Front Yard	15 ft. (4.57 m.)
Minimum Rear Yard	35 ft. (10.67 m.)
Minimum Side Yard	10 ft. (3.05 m.)*
Maximum Building Height	35 ft. (10.67 m.)
Maximum Height of Accessory Building	15 ft. (4.57 m.)

*No side yard setback is required along the common lot boundary dividing townhouse units

- (c) The four (4) apartment buildings shall be limited to a maximum of 280 dwelling units in total. The buildings may include underground and underbuilding parking and shall conform to the following requirements:

Maximum Number of Units per Building	70
Minimum Front Yard	25 ft. (7.62 m.)*
Minimum Rear Yard	25 ft. (7.62 m.)
Minimum Side Yard	15 ft. (4.57 m.) or half the height of the main building
Maximum Storey of Main Buildings	5 storeys**
Maximum Height of Accessory Buildings	15 ft. (4.57 m.)

*The front yard for the apartment building closest to the road reserve may be reduced to 15 ft. (4.57 m.) to accommodate the building and required parking on the site.

**The building will in no instance exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height

- (d) Subject to the approval in writing of the Municipal Engineer, the lot for the apartment building located furthest away from the Payzant Drive Extension may be created on a right-of-way that is at least 19.69 ft. (6 m.) wide and shall not require any frontage. The lots for all other apartment buildings shall have a minimum lot frontage of 100 ft. (30.48 m.) on the Payzant Drive Extension.
- (e) In the event that the Owner chooses to build and occupy one apartment building at a time and/or one townhouse building at a time, the following infrastructure is required for each such building:
 - (i) the necessary services for the proper use and enjoyment of the building including but not limited to the Payzant Drive Extension for the full length of any frontage required for that building as well as for the connection to the existing part of Payzant Drive at the driveway to Avon View High School, a driveway and access, landscaping, pedestrian walkways, parking, lighting, and water and sewer services; and
 - (ii) the required usable recreation space as per Section 10.5, Recreational Space, of the Land Use By-law.
- (f) Accessory buildings are permitted in accordance with Section 5.1 of the Land Use By-law, *Accessory Buildings and Structures*.
- (g) Recreational space shall be regulated under Section 10.5 of the Land Use By-law, *Recreational Space*, and may include:
 - (i) individual balconies;
 - (ii) dedicated indoor amenity space; and
 - (iii) common use landscaped areas.
- (h) The Owner shall keep all undeveloped areas of the Properties landscaped which may include grass, shrubs, trees or other appropriate vegetative cover.

2.3 Access and Egress

- (a) The Owner shall develop, construct, and maintain the two shared driveways in the Development. One driveway shall be required for the first and second apartment building and the second driveway shall be required for the remaining apartment buildings. The distance between the driveways must be approved by the Municipal Engineer in accordance with the Municipal Specifications Manual.
- (b) The driveways shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface for vehicle traffic and be clearly demarcated and lined by the Owner. They may be

constructed using permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention. The vehicular entrance and exit shall be clearly demarcated.

- (c) The Owner agrees that it will seek and obtain approval in writing from the Municipality not to be unreasonably withheld before any driveway from the Development is connected to the Payzant Drive Extension or any other public road.

2.4 Road and Municipal Services

- (a) Roads and Municipal Services in the development shall conform to the following:
 - (i) the layout of the Payzant Drive Extension shall be as generally shown on Schedule B. The Development Officer, in consultation with the Municipal Engineer, may give consideration to minor incidental changes to its design, without such changes being deemed to be amendments to this development agreement;
 - (ii) the Payzant Drive Extension, municipal services, and stormwater management on PIDs 45213980 and 45234374 and within the Development shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Services Specifications Manual. Detailed design plans of the Payzant Drive Extension water and sewer servicing, and storm water systems shall be approved by the Municipal Engineer for each phase of the development prior to construction commencing for that phase;
- (b) Prior to the completion of the first phase of the Development, the water main running through PIDs 45213980 and 45234374 must be replaced at the expense of the Owner.
- (c) A 5 ft. (1.52 m.) wide pedestrian walkway shall be provided along the Payzant Drive Extension to the main entrances of the apartment buildings. The pedestrian walkways shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface and may use permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention.
- (d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this agreement, the Payzant Drive Extension shall be completed by the Owner to the satisfaction of the Development Officer and Municipal Engineer together, acting reasonably, with fulfilling any requirements under Section 39 of the Subdivision By-law by December 31, 2030, or in conjunction with the completion of the Payzant Drive Connection to King Street (to the south of the Payzant Drive Extension) to be completed by the Municipality, whichever occurs first. Prior to the occurrence of

either of these events, the Owner is required only to complete that portion of the Payzant Drive Extension which is necessary for the issuance of permits for the construction of that portion of the Development from time to time.

2.5 Parking

- (a) All required parking spaces for the apartment buildings shall be located on the same lot as that building.
- (b) All parking spaces for vehicles using the townhouses shall be located on the same lot as the townhouses.
- (c) A minimum of one (1) parking space per dwelling unit shall be provided for each apartment building and townhouse.
- (d) Parking may be provided either underbuilding, underground or outside at grade.
- (e) For the apartment buildings:
 - (i) outside parking aisles and spaces shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface for vehicle traffic and be clearly demarcated and lined by the Owner. They may be constructed using permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention; and
 - (ii) each required parking space shall be a minimum of 9 ft. by 20 ft. (2.7 m. by 6.1 m.) exclusive of driveways and manoeuvring aisles. Parking spaces provided in addition to the required parking spaces may be built without meeting the minimum size requirement for the use of a compact vehicle. Parking aisles shall be a minimum of 20 ft. (6.1 m.) wide.
- (f) The number of parking spaces may be varied in writing by the Development Officer in accordance with Section 2.13, *Variance*, of this Agreement.

2.6 Fire Safety

- (a) No development permit shall be issued until the location and connection design of any fire hydrant(s) connected to the municipal water supply has been approved by the water utility, in consultation with the local Fire Chief.
- (b) Specific curbs shall be designed to be mountable by emergency services vehicles as determined by the Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services in consultation with the local Fire Chief.
- (c) All access routes shall be kept clear of overhead obstructions and wires and be maintained by the Owner to allow unimpeded access to the Properties by

emergency services vehicles, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Fire Chief.

2.7 Buffering

Outdoor parking for the apartment buildings shall be screened from lots outside of the Development, through the use of:

- (a) a mix of local species of coniferous trees. At planting, each tree shall have a diameter of at least 2 in. measured at 4.5 ft. (1.37 m.) above the surrounding grade and a minimum height of 5 ft. (1.52 m.); or
- (b) a hedge of a variety of coniferous shrubs each of which will reach over 6 ft. (1.83 m.) in height at maturity; or
- (c) a wall or an opaque fence which is a minimum of 5 ft. (1.52 m.) in height and of sufficient height to provide a visual buffer to the abutting property; or

any combination of the above, all arranged to form a dense or opaque screen, and shall be maintained to that standard.

2.8 Site Drainage

- (a) No development permit shall be issued until the Owner provides to the Development Officer a stormwater management plan that satisfies the Municipal Engineer that historical flooding patterns and area drainage systems have been considered and that storm water discharge will balance pre- and post-construction flows to ensure there is no negative impact on downstream properties. If the stormwater management plan provided by the Owner does not in fact balance pre-and post-construction flows to ensure the absence of such impacts the Owner shall undertake such remediation as the Municipal Engineer may reasonably require.
- (b) The Owner shall undertake all construction activities in accordance with an erosion and sedimentation control plan prepared by a Professional Engineer, unless otherwise directed by Nova Scotia Environment, and also agrees to assume sole responsibility for compliance with all regulations of Nova Scotia Environment.

2.9 Servicing

(a) Waste Collection

- (i) No Municipal garbage collection will be provided to the apartment buildings. The Owner shall have sole responsibility for collecting, storing and disposing of garbage and other recycling or waste items from the apartment buildings.

- (ii) The Owner shall keep any outdoor storage of garbage in an enclosed structure or in some way adequately screened so as not to be visible from or cause a nuisance to nearby properties and abutting roads and it shall not be located closer than 10 ft. (3.05 m.) to an abutting property.

(b) Water and Sewer Services

- (i) The buildings shall be serviced with water and sewer services provided by West Hants Regional Municipality authorized by the Municipal Engineer. Detailed design plans of the water and sewer servicing connections and layout shall be in accordance with the Municipal Services Specifications Manual and shall be submitted to the Municipal Engineer for approval prior to construction.
- (ii) The Owner shall be responsible for constructing, installing and maintaining the water and sewer services on the Properties.

(c) Snow Plowing

The Owner shall have sole responsibility for snow plowing within the Development, excluding the Payzant Drive Extension.

2.10 Maintenance

- (a) The Owner shall keep the Properties and buildings and any portion thereof clean and in good repair. Any driveways, fences, lawns, trees, shrubs, walkways and other landscaping elements shall be regularly maintained and kept in a tidy state and free from unkempt materials or matter of any kind.
- (b) The Owner shall maintain the driveways to a level adequate to allow for access by emergency services vehicles.

2.11 Signs and Lighting

Signage and illumination shall be regulated under Sections 5.18 and 7.0 of the Land Use By-law, *Illumination* and *Signs*, which controls lighting, size, location, and number of signs. Exterior lighting for driveways, parking areas, signs or structures shall be shielded and directed downward to ensure there is no light spilling, glare or light cast over neighbouring properties or the street.

2.12 Subdivision

- (a) As noted in Section 2.2 (d) the lot for the apartment building located furthest from the Payzant Drive Extension shall be permitted to be subdivided on a right-of-way approved in writing by the Municipal Engineer.

- (b) At the time of subdivision application, the Owner must convey a driveway right-of-way to ensure continued access/egress from the Payzant Drive Extension and convey easements for any services including but not limited to water, sewer and stormwater, from the lot on which the driveway is constructed in favour of the subsequent lots to ensure continued access/egress and servicing to those lots regardless of future ownership. The Owner acknowledges that the shared driveways from the Payzant Drive Extension and the services which may cross the lot on which the driveway is constructed to service the subsequent lots are a joint and several responsibility of each owner of the lots benefiting from the infrastructure.
- (c) Subdivision of the properties shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable Subdivision By-law, with the exception of Section 2.12 (a) and except for the minimum lot size for the apartment buildings which shall be 55,000 sq. ft. per lot. No additional parkland or parkland fees shall be required for subdivision or consolidation of the properties subject to this agreement.
- (d) Subject to Section 2.2 (b) of this Agreement, any lot(s) subdivided from PID 45343878 after completion of the Payzant Drive Extension that will be developed as townhouses under this Agreement, shall no longer be subject to this Agreement.

2.13 Variance

In accordance with Section 5.40 of the Land Use By-law, *Variance*, the Development Officer may grant a variance for one or more of the following requirements subject to the requirements of the *Municipal Government Act*:

- (i) minimum required yard dimensions, excepting side yard setbacks, as required in Section 2.2 (c) of this Agreement;
- (ii) minimum required yard dimensions as required in Section 2.2 (d) of this Agreement; and
- (iii) number of parking spaces required.

2.14 Road Reserve

A road reserve on PID 45343894 as shown on Schedule B Site Plan is required to ensure that there is available land to construct the Payzant Drive Extension in the most effective way. In the event that the Municipal Engineer determines in their discretion that the road reserve is unnecessary for the construction of the Payzant Drive Extension, the Developer may construct on this portion of the lot with the written permission of the Municipal Engineer and the Development Officer, and changes to the Site Plan reflecting this will not be deemed an amendment to this Agreement.

2.15 Phasing

- (a) Construction of the first apartment building and all relevant infrastructure and landscaping as outlined in Sections 2.2 and 2.4 of this Agreement shall be completed within seventy-two (72) months of the commencement of Development outlined in Section 4.1 of this Agreement. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit or the time limit set forth in section 2.4(d) has not been met, Development as per this agreement shall no longer be permitted and this Agreement may be discharged in whole or in part at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the Municipal Government Act thirty (30) days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.
- (b) Construction of all apartment buildings and all relevant infrastructure and landscaping as outlined in Sections 2.2 and 2.4 of this Agreement shall be completed within one hundred and twenty (120) months of the actual commencement of the Development provided that such commencement is within the time limit prescribed in Section 4.1 of this Agreement. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, Development of unconstructed apartment buildings shall no longer be permitted and this Agreement may be discharged in whole or in part solely at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the Municipal Government Act thirty (30) days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

PART 3 CHANGES AND DISCHARGE

- 3.1** The Owner shall not increase the number of apartment buildings, or the number of units within any apartment buildings on the Properties from that provided for in Section 2.1 of this Agreement, *Use*, unless a new agreement is entered into with the Municipality or this Agreement is amended.
- 3.2** Any matters in this Agreement which are not specified in Subsection 3.3 below are not substantive matters and may be changed with the written consent of Council without a public hearing provided that Council determines that the changes do not significantly alter the intended effect of this Agreement.

3.3 The following matters are substantive matters:

- (a) the maximum number of units or buildings permitted within the Development and within each component thereof as listed in Section 2.1, *Use*;
- (b) the maximum height and storeys of the apartment buildings as listed in Section 2.2, *Development Location and Design*;
- (c) the fire safety requirements as listed in Section 2.6, *Fire Safety*;
- (d) the landscaping requirements as listed in Section 2.7, *Buffering*; and
- (e) the requirements for a stormwater management plan to be submitted prior to a development permit being issued as listed in Section 2.8, *Site Drainage*.

3.4 Upon conveyance of land by the Owner to either:

- (a) the Municipality for the purpose of creating or expanding a public street over the Properties, including for part of the Payzant Drive Extension; or
- (b) the Municipality for the purpose of creating or expanding any municipally owned facility or infrastructure over the Properties;

registration of the deed reflecting the conveyance shall be conclusive evidence that that this agreement shall be discharged as it relates to the public street or public facility, as the case may be, as of the date of registration with the Land Registry Office, but this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for all remaining portions of the Properties.

3.5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, discharge of this Agreement is not a substantive matter, and this Agreement may be discharged by Council without a public hearing.

3.6 Notice of Intent to Discharge this Agreement in whole or in part may be given by the Municipality to the Owner following a resolution of Council to give such Notice:

- (a) as provided for in this Agreement; or
- (b) at the discretion of the Municipality, with or without the concurrence of the Owner, where the Development has, in the reasonable opinion of Council on advice from the Development Officer, ceased operation for a period of at least twenty-four (24) months; or
- (c) at any time upon the written request of the Owner, provided the use of the Properties is in accordance with the Land Use By-law or a new Agreement has been entered into.

3.7 Council may discharge this Agreement in whole or in part 30 days after a Notice of Intent to Discharge has been given.

PART 4 IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Commencement of Development

- (a) The Owner may not commence any construction or use on the Properties until the Municipality has issued any development permit, building permit and/or occupancy permit that may be required. The date of commencement will be determined as the date the Owner begins Active Construction on the building within this Agreement as permitted by an issued development and building permit.
- (b) Active Construction shall commence not later than forty-eight (48) months from the date this Agreement is signed. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, this Agreement may be discharged at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act* 30 days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.
- (c) If the Owner is bona fide delayed from commencing the Development for reasons which are beyond the Owner's control, the determination of which shall be at the sole discretion of the Development Officer, then performance by the Owner is excused for the period of the delay and the time period for the Owner to perform their obligations shall be extended by the Development Officer in writing for an equivalent period, without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

4.2 Material to be Provided

- (a) The Owner shall provide record drawings to the Development Officer for any portion of the Development for which an engineered design is required, within ten (10) days of completion of any work which requires the engineered design.
- (b) The Owner shall, upon written request, provide the Municipality with copies of any documentation, permits or approvals required by Provincial or Federal governments or agencies.

PART 5 ADMINISTRATION and COMPLIANCE

5.1 Compliance with other By-laws and Regulations

- (a) Nothing in this Agreement shall exempt the Owner from complying with Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws, by-laws and regulations in force or from obtaining

any Federal, Provincial, or Municipal license, permission, permit, authority, or approval required thereunder.

- (b) Where the provisions of this Agreement conflict with those of any by-law of the Municipality applicable to the Properties (other than the Land Use By-law and Subdivision by-law to the extent expressly varied by this Agreement) or any statute or regulation, the higher or more stringent requirements shall prevail.

5.2 Severability of Provisions

The provisions of this Agreement are severable from one another and the invalidity or unenforceability of one provision shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision.

5.3 Interpretation

- (a) Where the context requires, the singular shall include the plural and the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neutral gender.
- (b) Where the written text of this Agreement conflicts with information provided in the Schedules attached to this Agreement, the written text of this Agreement shall prevail.
- (c) References to particular sections of statutes and bylaws shall be deemed to be references to any successor legislation and bylaws even if the content has been amended, unless the context otherwise requires.

5.4 Municipal Responsibility

- (a) The Municipality does not make any representations to the Owner about the suitability of the Properties for the Development proposed by this Agreement. The Owner assumes all risks and must ensure that any proposed Development complies with this Agreement and all other laws pertaining to the Development.
- (b) Any failure of the Municipality to insist upon a strict performance of any requirements or conditions contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any rights or remedies that the Municipality may have and shall not be deemed a waiver of any subsequent breach or default in the conditions or requirements contained in this Agreement.

5.5 Breach of Terms or Conditions

Upon breach of any term or condition of this Agreement, the Municipality may notify the Owner in writing. In the event that the Owner have not cured any such breach or entered into arrangements with the Municipality related to such breach to the Municipality's satisfaction, acting reasonably, within six (6) months of such notice, then

the Municipality may rely upon the remedies contained in Section 264 of the *Municipal Government Act* and may enter the land and perform any of the terms contained in the Development Agreement, or take such remedial action as is considered necessary to correct a breach of the Agreement, including the removal or destruction of anything that contravenes the terms of the Agreement and including decommissioning the site. It is agreed that all reasonable expenses, whether arising out of the entry on the land or from the performance of the terms, are a first lien on the land that is the subject of the Development Agreement.

5.6 Costs

The Owner shall pay all costs associated with registering this Agreement and all costs associated with any amendment thereof.

5.7 Development Agreement Bound to Land

This Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto and their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns, and shall run with the land which is the subject of this Agreement until such time as it is discharged by the Municipality in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

5.8 Assignment of Agreement

The Owner may, at any time and from time to time, transfer or assign this Agreement and its rights hereunder and may delegate its obligations hereunder to an assign, successor, heir, or purchaser of the land bound by this Agreement.

5.9 Written Notice

- (a) The Municipality may serve notice on the Owner personally or by ordinary mail which shall be deemed to have been received within three (3) business days of mailing, addressed to Abraham Zebian at 31 Cochrane Lane, Sweets Corner, NS, B0N 2T0, or at any other address provided in writing or email by the Owner.
- (b) The Owner may serve notice on the Municipality by registered mail addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer, West Hants Regional Municipality, 76 Morison Drive, P.O. Box 3000, Windsor, NS, B0N 2T0, or at any successor address provided in writing or email by the Municipality to the Owner.

5.10 Full Agreement

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and contract entered into by the Municipality and the Owner. No other agreement or representation, oral or written, shall be binding.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Agreement was properly executed by the respective parties hereto on the day and year first above written.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED

In the presence of:

) **WEST HANTS REGIONAL**

) **MUNICIPALITY**

)

)

)

Per: _____

Witness

) Mark Phillips, Chief Administrative Officer

)

)

)

) Per: _____

Witness

) Deanna Snair, Municipal Clerk

)

)

)

) **3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**

)

)

)

Per: _____

Witness

) Abraham Zebian, President

**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA
COUNTY OF HANTS**

ON THIS day of , A.D. 2024, before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that **WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**, one of the parties thereto, caused the same to be executed in its name and on its behalf and its corporate seal to be thereunto affixed in presence.

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA
COUNTY OF HANTS**

ON THIS day of , A.D. 2024, before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that, **Abraham Zebian**, one of the parties thereto, signed, sealed and delivered the same in presence.

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

AFFIDAVIT OF CLERK

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

I, Deanna Snair of _____, Hants County, Nova Scotia make oath and swear that:

1. I am the Clerk of the West Hants Regional Municipality (the “Municipality”) and I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. The Municipality is a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended.
3. I acknowledge that the Municipality executed the attached Instrument by its proper designates duly authorized in that regard under seal on the date of this Affidavit pursuant to subsection 13(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended. This acknowledgement is made pursuant to subsection 31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 and/or clause 79(1)(a) of the Land Registry Act, S.N.S. 2001, c.6, as amended, for the purpose of registering or recording the Instrument.
4. The Municipality is resident in Canada for the purposes of the Income Tax Act (Canada).

I certify that on this _____, 2024
the Municipal Clerk, Deanna Snair came before me, made oath,
and swore the foregoing affidavit at
_____, Nova Scotia.

A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Deanna Snair, Clerk

Canada
Province of Nova Scotia

AFFIDAVIT & PROOF OF EXECUTION (CORPORATE)

I, Abraham Zebian, Nova Scotia, make oath and say that:

1. I, Abraham Zebian, of **3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED** the “Corporation”. Except as otherwise stated I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. I acknowledge that I executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of the Corporation on the date of this affidavit; this acknowledgment is made for the purpose of registering such instrument pursuant to s.31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 or ss.79 and 83 of the Land Registration Act as the case may be.
3. I verify that I have the authority to execute the foregoing instrument on behalf of the corporation and thereby bind the Corporation.
4. The Corporation is a resident of Canada under the Income Tax Act (Canada).
5. The Ownership of a share or an interest in a share of the Corporation does not entitle the owner of such share or interest in such share to occupy a dwelling owned by the Corporation.

I certify that on this _____, 2024
the Deponents came before me, made oath,
and swore the foregoing affidavit at
_____, Nova Scotia.

A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Abraham Zebian, President

Schedule A
Legal Description

PID 45053030

ALL THAT lot of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the Town of Windsor, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia, being PID # 45053030 and bounded and described as follows:

BOUNDED AND LYING north and east of the road allowance owned by the Town of Windsor, shown as Lot A on an Expropriation Plan registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1971 as Plan # 126, and being PID # 45213980;

BOUNDED AND LYING south and west of those lands owned by HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN and shown on a plan of survey (Field Plot No. P-063/02) signed on the 14th day of June, 2002 by Greg Smith, Nova Scotia Land Surveyor, and filed in the Department of Natural Resources Office, Halifax, Province of Nova Scotia;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north of the lands more particularly described as follows and being PID # 45343894:

ALL that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being at Windsor in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a survey marker placed on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.857 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a survey marker on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE northwesterly following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, to a point being the southwest corner of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill;

THENCE following the southerly boundary of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill to a survey marker placed on a southwestern boundary of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen, in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of the said school land a distance of Eighty-three decimal Two Nine Five metres to the place of beginning.

The parcel is exempt from the requirement for subdivision approval under the Municipal Government Act because it is the remainder parcel after the subdivision of Adjoining lands.

PID 45343878

ALL THAT lot of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the Town of Windsor, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia, being PID # 45343878 and bounded and described as follows:

BOUNDED AND LYING south and west of the road allowance owned by the Town of Windsor, shown as Lot A on an Expropriation Plan registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1971 as Plan # 126, and being PID # 45213980;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING east of the railway lands being PID # 45343894 and shown on Retracement Plan 7004B registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1993;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING south of the lands conveyed by Annie May Burgess to the Nova Scotia Farm Loan Board by a deed dated the 30th day of September, 1981 and recorded in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants as Document number 500884241 and being PID # 45358314;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of the lands conveyed by Phillip Burgess and Patricia Burgess to Gary E. Dill by a deed recorded in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on April 14, 2005 as Document number 81731110 and being PID # 45234382;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of lands owned by the Town of Windsor and described as Part D on a Plan of Survey filed as P-284 in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants and being PID # 45234416;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of lands owned by Wilfred J Jodrey as shown on a Plan of Survey filed as P-284 in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants and being PID # 45053048;

The parcel is exempt from the requirement for subdivision approval under the Municipal Government Act because it is the remainder parcel after the subdivision of adjoining lands.

PID 45343894

ALL that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being at Windsor in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a survey marker placed on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.857 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a survey marker on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE northwesterly following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, to a point being the southwest corner of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill;

THENCE following the southerly boundary of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill to a survey marker placed on a southwestern boundary of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen, in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of the said school land a distance of Eighty-three decimal Two Nine Five metres to the place of beginning.

SUBJECT to an easement for access and drainage over the above described lands and known as Easement C and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point situated on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, said point also being the southwestern corner of Parcel B and situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degrees Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.856 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a point situated on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE North Zero Eight degrees Fifty-five minutes Twenty-four seconds West following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, a distance of Nineteen decimal Two Two Six metres to a point;

THENCE North Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds East a distance of One Hundred Thirty-four decimal Two Zero Nine metres to a point situated on a southwestern boundary of Parcel B, which said Parcel B forms a portion of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of Parcel B a distance of Twenty decimal Two One Five metres to the place of beginning.

The above described Easement C contains Zero decimal Two Seven Seven hectares.

PID 45234382

All that certain parcel of land situate at Currys Corner, Windsor, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia being a triangular piece of land lying to the west of Town of Windsor sewer line which said parcel is sketched as Harry Burgess and Ivan Burgess (Nova Scotia Farm Loan Board) on a Plan of Survey entitled Lands shown as Lots A, B, C, D, & E under Conveyance to the Town of Windsor for a Proposed Sewer Line Right-of-Way, said Lands being in or at

Currys Corner, in the Town of Windsor, NS made by E. Elliott, NSLS and recorded at the Office of the Registry of Deeds for the Registration District of Hants County on January 2, 1973 under Plan No. P-284, which said parcel may be more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at the point on the Westerly boundary of lands of the Town of Windsor shown as Lot A on said plan, intersects the northeasterly boundary of lands formerly of John Dill, now of Gary E. Dill;

Thence North 14 degrees 08 minutes East along lands of the Town of Windsor a distance of 102.0 feet to a point;

Thence North 7 degrees 45 minutes West continuing along lands of the Town of Windsor a distance of 9 feet, more or less, to a Southeasterly boundary of lands of Gary E. Dill;

Thence South 79 degrees 58 minutes West along lands of Gary E. Dill a distance of 59 feet, more or less to a point;

Thence South 19 degrees 20 minutes East along lands of Gary E. Dill to the place of beginning.

All bearings are magnetic for the year 1971.

Schedule B
Site Plan



**Appendix B – 2024-02-27 Staff Report - Development Agreement:
PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04A**



WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT

Information <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation X	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---	--

To: Mayor Zebian and Members of West Hants Regional Municipality Council

Submitted by: _____
Alex Dunphy, Planner

Date: February 27, 2024

Subject: Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04A

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Municipal Government Act Section 230

RECOMMENDATION

Should Council wish to proceed to Public Hearing, the following motions would be in order:

...that Council gives First Reading and will hold a Public Hearing to consider entering into a development agreement to allow up to 280 units within grouped multi-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units on PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 Payzant Drive in Windsor which is substantively the same as the draft set out in Attachment B of the report File #23-04 to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee dated February 8, 2024.

...that Council requires that the development agreement with Abraham Zebian on behalf of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED for PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 on Payzant Drive in Windsor be signed within 120 days from the date of final approval by Council or the date that any appeals have been disposed of; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

BACKGROUND

Property X	Public	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

	Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>				
--	----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

An application was received from Noel Taiani of Parsons Green Developments on behalf of the property owner 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED on March 15, 2023. The application was to allow a proposed development including a total of 280 apartment units, across 4 multiple-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units grouped on the subject lots by development agreement. Abraham Zebian is the President of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED.

DISCUSSION


A Public Information Meeting was held on May 11, 2023.

On February 8, 2024, staff presented a recommendation report to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC) (Appendix A). The Committee discussed reduced yard requirements, proposed driveway access, the timeline for the road extension completion, the existing watercourse, and the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Staff have included that TIS as Appendix B in this report. The Traffic Authority indicated that there were no concerns regarding the contents of the TIS.

During the February 8 meeting, PAC/HAC recommended in favour of the application.

NEXT STEPS

The process for this application is as follows:



FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A road extension of Payzant Drive would be required in order to service this proposed development. The developer will be required to construct the extension of Payzant Drive and all associated infrastructure to the extent of the frontage of the subject lots. Separately, during the June 27, 2023 Council meeting, Council directed staff to begin the process of designing the Payzant Drive to King Street connection. Any connection outside of what would be constructed by the developer to provide frontage and access to this development would be a cost to the Municipality.

ALTERNATIVES

In response to this application, Council may decide to:

- hold First Reading and authorize a Public Hearing to approve the development agreement as drafted or as specifically revised by direction of Council; or
- provide alternative direction such as requesting further information on a specific topic.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A	2024-02-08 Staff Report - Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04
Appendix B	2023-07-26 Traffic Impact Study – Payzant Drive Development

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER REVIEW

CAO comments to follow.

Report Prepared by: _____
Alex Dunphy, Planner

Report Approved by: _____
Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development

**Appendix A –
2024-02-08 Staff Report - Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and
45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04**



WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT

Information <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation X	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---	--

To: Members of Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC)

Submitted by: _____
Alex Dunphy, Planner

Date: February 8, 2024

Subject: Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive; File # 23-04

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Municipal Government Act Section 230

RECOMMENDATION

To allow the requested development, staff recommends that the PAC/HAC forward a positive recommendation by passing the following motion:

...that PAC/HAC recommends that Council give First Reading and hold a Public Hearing to consider entering into a development agreement to allow up to 280 units within grouped multi-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units on PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 Payzant Drive in Windsor which is substantively the same as the draft set out in Attachment B of the report File #23-04 to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee dated February 8, 2024.

...that PAC/HAC recommends that Council require that the development agreement with Abraham Zebian on behalf of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED for PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 on Payzant Drive in Windsor be signed within 120 days from the date of final approval by Council or the date that any appeals have been disposed of; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

BACKGROUND

Property X	Public Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

An application was received from Noel Taiani of Parsons Green Developments on behalf of the property owner 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED on March 15, 2023. The application was to allow a proposed development including a total of 280 apartment units, across 4 multiple-unit apartment buildings and 18 townhouse units grouped on the subject lots by development agreement. Abraham Zebian is the President of 3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED.

DISCUSSION

The subject lots are designated Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) of the Windsor Municipal Planning Strategy (WMPS) (Figure 1). The subject lots are zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1) on Schedule A of the Windsor Land Use By-law (WLUB) (Figure 2).

Surrounding Context

Properties surrounding the subject lots are primarily designated Residential and Community Use. The properties designated Residential range in zoning from Single Unit Residential (R-1) to High Density Residential (R-4) and Agriculture (AG). Properties designated Community Use are zoned either Institutional (I) or Open Space (OS). The Avon View High School is located east of the subject lots. The Windsor Baptist Church and two-unit residential dwellings are located north of the subject lots. King Street is located south and west of the subject lots.

Payzant Drive Extension

Staff have been in discussions with the Public Works Engineering Division regarding the required road extension to Payzant Drive in order to service this proposed development. The developer will be required to construct the extension of Payzant Drive to the extent of the frontage of the subject lots. This process has overlapped with the consideration for a connection from Payzant Drive to King Street to provide improved access to the uses currently on Payzant Drive. Work has begun on the design of the connection to King Street and may require a small portion of the land on which the proposed development is sited. This portion of land has been captured in the draft development agreement through a road reserve, which if deemed unnecessary for the connection to King Street, will allow the developer to develop on the road reserve as normal.

Municipal Planning Strategy Document Review

Policy 5.4.6 is one of the two enabling policies to be considered for this application. This policy provides Council with the ability to consider new multiple-unit grouped dwellings by development agreement in the Residential designation. The full list of criteria is included with this report in Attachment A. In summary, the proposal meets the criteria since:

- the proposed development is generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone standards;

- the future Municipal road, constructed at the cost of the developer, will provide adequate access to the proposed development;
- adequate on-site parking, amenity space, and buffering will be required for the proposal as per the draft development agreement; and
- the Development Officer and the Municipal Traffic Authority have no concerns which have not been addressed in this report.

Policy 5.5.1 is the second enabling policy to be considered for this application. This policy provides Council with the ability to consider permitting dwellings in excess of three storeys by development agreement, in any residential zone. The full list of criteria is included with this report in Attachment A. In summary, the proposal meets the criteria since:

- the draft development agreement requires side yards to be at least one-half the height of the buildings above 3 storeys;
- the draft development agreement restricts the apartment buildings to 5 storeys in height and in no instance are they to exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height; and
- the proposal building is compatible with the surrounding area in terms of design, height and scale.

Policy 16.3.1 establishes the general criteria that all development agreements must meet. The full list of criteria is included with this report in Attachment A. In summary, the proposal meets the criteria as:

- the proposal is not considered premature or inappropriate for the area;
- the costs relating directly to the development will not impact the Municipality.; and
- the Fire Chief, Development Officer, Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services, Public Works Engineering Division, and Municipal Traffic Authority have no concerns which have not been addressed in this report.

MUNICIPAL CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN


The Municipal Climate Change Action Plan (MCCAP) for Windsor (2014) highlights two simulated flooding scenarios. The first scenario is based on a storm surge that occurred in 1997, which shows the expected damage is to occur along the coastline. The second scenario shows the simulated flooding extent for probable maximum flood due to climate change. Under this scenario most of the community of Windsor will experience extensive flooding, including the western subject lots.

In accordance with the Municipal Services Specifications Manual, the Public Works Engineering Division will require the developer to provide a stormwater management plan showing that the pre- and post-development flows are neutral or better than before the development. Property owners are responsible for ensuring that their lot is suitable for the proposed uses.

NEXT STEPS

As noted above, the draft development agreement has been considered within the context of both the specific and general policies of the WMPS, and is consistent with the intent,

objectives, policies and criteria of the WMPs. As a result, it is reasonable to consider permitting a multiple-unit residential development, consisting of 280 apartment units and 18 townhouse units on PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382 in Windsor by development agreement.



FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A road extension of Payzant Drive would be required in order to service this proposed development. The developer will be required to construct the extension of Payzant Drive and all associated infrastructure to the extent of the frontage of the subject lots. Separately, during the June 27, 2023 Council meeting, Council directed staff to begin the process of designing the Payzant Drive to King Street Connection. Any connection outside of what would be constructed by the developer to provide frontage and access to this development would be a cost to the Municipality.

ALTERNATIVES

The Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC) may:

- hold First Reading and authorize a Public Hearing to approve the development agreement as drafted or as specifically revised by direction of PAC/HAC; or
- provide alternative direction such as requesting further information on a specific topic.

ATTACHMENTS

Figure 1

Windsor GFLUM Extract

Figure 2	Windsor Zoning Map Extract
Attachment A	Policy Summary for Development Agreement
Attachment B	Draft Development Agreement
Attachment C	Public Information Meeting Notes

Report Prepared by: _____

Alex Dunphy, Planner


Report Approved by: _____

Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development

Figure 1 – Windsor GFLUM Extract



Figure 2 – Windsor Zoning Map Extract



Attachment A – Policy Summary for Development Agreement

<p>Policy 5.4.6 <i>It shall be the policy of Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow, in the Residential designation, new multiple unit residential development consisting of three or more units, grouped dwellings, boarding houses and residential care facilities, as well as the conversion of existing buildings to three or more units, subject to the following:</i></p>	
<p><i>(a) the proposed use meets one of the following:</i></p>	
<p><i>(i) in the case of a new building or the conversion of an existing non-residential building, that the development is generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone standards; or</i></p>	<p>The development will be generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone standards. The front and rear yard setbacks, as well as the minimum lot size have been reduced to allow the proposed density requested. The Development Officer commented that the reduced lot requirements were deemed acceptable.</p>
<p><i>(ii) in the case of a conversion of an existing residential building, that any addition or enlargement to the building meets the setback requirements of the zone in which it is located, or that any undersized setbacks are not further reduced by the addition or enlargement;</i></p>	<p>Not applicable as the proposal is for a new construction.</p>
<p><i>(b) the height, bulk, lot coverage and appearance of any building is compatible with adjacent land uses;</i></p>	<p>The individual apartment buildings within the proposal are of a similar size or smaller in scale than another multi-unit residential development that have been previously approved by Council on Payzant Drive. In addition, nearby larger buildings include the Avon View High School and the Hants Community Hospital. The height, bulk, lot coverage, and appearance of the buildings within the development are considered to be compatible with the land uses in the area.</p>
<p><i>(c) the development is considered compatible with the residential character of the area with</i></p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was provided for the proposed development and the study indicated that no improvements</p>

<p><i>respect to traffic generation and population density;</i></p>	<p>to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development were recommended. The Municipal Traffic Authority commented that they have no concerns regarding traffic generation or density for the proposed development as the proposed extension to Payzant Drive will be required to be built to the standard of the Municipal Services Specifications Manual.</p>
<p><i>(d) consideration is given to the provision of fences and/or landscaping as part of the residential development to minimize effects on adjacent land uses;</i></p>	<p>The draft development agreement outlines the buffering and landscaping requirements for all parking areas of the development.</p>
<p><i>(e) adequate on-site parking is provided and parking areas are well designed;</i></p>	<p>The proposal provides more parking spaces than what is required based on the draft development agreement. The Development Officer commented that they have no concerns regarding the parking proposed to be provided.</p>
<p><i>(f) there is adequate on-site recreational open space suitable in extent and design to the nature of the development; for conversion of existing buildings, nearby public parks may be deemed sufficient;</i></p>	<p>The draft development agreement requires that amenity space is provided in accordance with Section 10.5 of the WLUB.</p>
<p><i>(g) the development abuts an arterial or collector street as shown on the Transportation Map (Map 2), if the development consists of 12 or more units;</i></p>	<p>As stated in Policy 5.4.6 (c), the proposed extension to Payzant Drive will be required to be built to the standard of the Municipal Services Specifications Manual. That road extension will provide direct access to the proposed development.</p>
<p><i>(h) the architectural design of the development is reasonably consistent with the provisions of the Architectural Design Manual if the proposed development is located in an Architectural Control District;</i></p>	<p>Not applicable as the subject lots are not within an Architectural Control District.</p>

<i>(i) in the case of the conversion of an existing structure, renovations can be made to ensure the safety of residents in case of fire;</i>	Not applicable as the proposal is for a new build, not the conversion of an existing building.
<i>(j) any other matter which may be addressed in a development agreement; and</i>	All relevant matters have been addressed in this report.
<i>(k) the provisions of Policy 16.3.1 of the Municipal Planning Strategy.</i>	See below.
Policy 5.5.1	
<i>In any residential zone, Council may consider permitting dwellings in excess of three storeys by development agreement, subject to the following conditions:</i>	
<i>(a) the side yards are at least one-half the height of the building;</i>	The draft development agreement requires that the side yards for the proposed apartment buildings to be at least one-half the height of the building.
<i>(b) the building will in no instance exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height;</i>	The draft development agreement limits the proposal to 5 stories in height. The maximum building height will not exceed 80 ft.
<i>(c) the building design, height and scale is compatible with the surrounding area;</i>	As stated in Policy 5.4.6 (b), larger multi-unit residential development was approved by Council on Payzant Drive and Community Way. As well as other nearby larger uses including the Avon View High School and the Hants Community Hospital. The Development Officer commented that the height, design, and scale of the buildings within the development are considered to be compatible with the surrounding area.
<i>(d) any other matter which may be addressed in a development agreement; and</i>	All relevant matters have been addressed in this report.
<i>(e) the provisions of Policy 16.3.1 of the Municipal Planning Strategy.</i>	See below.

Policy 5.4.5	See Policy 5.4.6 (f).
---------------------	-----------------------

It shall be the policy of Council to require adequate recreational space for multiple unit residential development.

Policy 16.3.1

In considering development agreements and amendments to the Town of Windsor Land Use By-law, in addition to the criteria set out in various policies of this Strategy, Council shall consider:

(a) whether the proposal is considered premature or inappropriate in terms of:

(i) the adequacy of sewer and water services;

The Public Works Engineering Division commented that the current water and sewer services are adequate for the proposal, however if all potential projects in Windsor were to be constructed all at once, the current infrastructure installed and in service today would be close to an 'uncomfortable state'. In a meeting with the Public Works Engineering Division, staff confirmed that provided the Municipal infrastructure upgrades outlined in the 5-year capital plans stay on track, there should be no water or sewer capacity issues for Windsor.

(ii) the adequacy of school facilities;

The Regional Executive Director for the Annapolis Valley Regional Centre for Education has stated that their facilities will accommodate any new development.

(iii) the adequacy of fire protection;

The Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services commented that they had no issues, but the apartment buildings would need to have sprinkler systems installed and that comments from the Fire Chief would be required to confirm that they are equipped to handle a 5-storey building. The Public Works Engineering Division confirmed that a fire flow test would be

	<p>required to be conducted. This would likely have to occur after the developer has replaced the water main servicing the development.</p> <p>The local Fire Chief has commented that the proposal has 360 access to the apartment buildings and that beyond the normal mountable curbs and overhead obstruction prevention which are included in the draft development agreement, there were no further concerns regarding firefighting capacity.</p>
<p><i>(iv) the adequacy of road networks adjacent to, or leading to the development; and</i></p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was requested for the proposed development. The Traffic Impact Study indicated that no improvements to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development were recommended.</p> <p>In a meeting with the Traffic Authority and the applicant, it was determined that a road reserve was required in order for the Municipality to connect the Payzant Drive road extension to King Street. The Traffic Authority commented that they had no further concerns regarding the road networks adjacent or leading to the development.</p>
<p><i>(v) the financial capacity of the Town to absorb any costs relating to the development.</i></p>	<p>A road extension of Payzant Drive would be required in order to service this proposed development. The developer will be required to construct the extension of Payzant Drive and all associated infrastructure to the extent of the frontage of the subject lots. Any connection outside of what would be constructed by the developer to provide frontage and access to this development would be a cost to the Municipality. The costs relating directly</p>

	to the development will not impact the Municipality.
<i>(b) the suitability with any aspect relative to the movement of auto, rail and pedestrian traffic</i>	The Traffic Authority commented that they had no concerns regarding movement suitability for the proposed development. Sidewalks are required on the future Municipal road which will service the proposed development and will connect to the existing sidewalk on Payzant Drive. Pedestrian walkways are required to all building entrances in the draft development agreement. There is no active rail line in the vicinity.
<i>(c) the adequacy of the dimensions and shape of the lot for the intended use</i>	The Development Officer commented that the subject lots are suitable in terms of dimension and shape for this proposal.
<i>(d) the pattern of development which the proposal might create;</i>	The proposal is within the Residential designation, one which Council intends for the ability to consider multi-unit residential developments. The Development Officer commented that they had no concerns regarding the pattern of development.
<i>(e) the suitability of the area in terms of steepness of grade, soil and geological conditions, location of water courses, marshes or bogs and susceptibility of flooding;</i>	The subject lots are relatively flat and cleared. The subject lots have not been identified to be within either the Dykelands or Environmental Constraints overlays on the Zoning Map for the Windsor Land Use By-law. A small watercourse has been identified on the western portion of the subject lots. The usual watercourse setback for any development will be required.
<i>(f) whether the proposal meets the requirements of the appropriate provincial or federal agencies as well as whether it conforms to all</i>	All Municipal, Provincial, and Federal regulations will have to be met.

<i>other relevant municipal by-laws and regulations; and</i>	
<i>(g) any other matter required by relevant policies of this Strategy.</i>	All relevant matters have been addressed in this report.

Attachment B – Draft Development Agreement



DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT made this day of , 2023.

BETWEEN:

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY, a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, having its chief place of business at 76 Morison Drive, Wentworth Creek, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Municipality”)

OF THE FIRST PART

- and -

3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED a body corporate, with a head office at 31 Cochrane Lane, Sweets Corner, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Owner”)

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the Owner is the registered Owner of the parcels of land located on Payzant Drive (PIDs 45053030, 45343894, 45343878, and 45234382), hereinafter referred to as the “Properties”, which lands are more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto; and

WHEREAS PIDs 45053030, 45343894, 45343878, and 45234382 are designated Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map of the Municipal Planning Strategy and zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1) on the Zoning Map of the Land Use By-law; and

WHEREAS the Owner has requested that the Municipality enter into a development agreement to permit up to 280 apartment units and up to 18 townhouse units grouped on the Properties (the “Development”); and

WHEREAS Policy 5.4.6 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Section 6.1 (b) of the Land Use By-law enable Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow new multiple unit residential developments consisting of three or more units in a Residential designation, and Policy 5.5.1 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Section 6.1 (c) of the Land Use By-law enable Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow new dwellings in excess of three stories in a residential zone; and

WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, at a meeting held on **Month Day**, 2024, approved this request and adopted this Agreement by policy, subject to the execution of this development agreement by the parties hereto;

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

PART 1 AGREEMENT CONTEXT

1.1 Definitions

In this Agreement, all words or phrases used shall carry their customary meaning unless otherwise set out in the Land Use By-law, except those defined as follows:

- (a) “Active Construction” means that the Owner has active development and building permits for the construction of the apartment building and the associated parking podium, and that construction activity including but not limited to equipment, machinery, and employees, are on-site working towards the necessary building inspections leading to an occupancy permit;
- (b) “Ceased Operation” means the stopping of work on a particular building within the Development once active construction has commenced for an extended period of time, but shall not apply to the period of time between phases or stoppages of a seasonal nature or resulting from Force Majeure;
- (c) “Commencement” means the date the Owner begins Active Construction on the apartment buildings within this Agreement as permitted by an issued development and building permit;
- (d) “Front Lot Line” means the Property line abutting the future public street on PIDs 45213980 and 45234374;

- (e) “Mechanical Penthouse” means an enclosed structure and/or area located on the roof surface of the building that may include mechanical equipment such as generators, cooling towers, chillers, electrical equipment, and elevator shafts;
- (f) “Minor Change” means an alteration which does not affect the intent of this Agreement or require an amendment to the text of this Agreement;
- (g) “Rear Lot Line” means the lot line furthest from or opposite to the front lot line;
- (h) “Side Lot Line” means a lot line other than a front or rear lot line;

1.2 Schedules

The following attached schedules shall form part of this Agreement:

Schedule A - Legal Description

Schedule B – Site Plan

1.3 Municipal Planning Strategy, Land Use By-law and Subdivision By-law

- (a) Municipal Planning Strategy means the Municipal Planning Strategy of the Town of Windsor, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (b) Land Use By-law means the Land Use By-law of the Town of Windsor, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (c) Subdivision By-law means the Subdivision By-law of the Town of Windsor, effective on March 21, 2012, as amended, or successor by-laws.

PART 2 DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Use

- (a) The Parties agree that uses on the Property shall be limited to the following:
 - (i) those uses permitted by the underlying zoning in the Land Use By-law;
 - (ii) four, five (5) storey apartment buildings, each containing up to 70 dwelling units, up to an aggregate maximum of 280 apartment units on PIDs 45053030 and 45343894;
 - (iii) townhouse units including up to 18 dwelling units on PID 45343878;
 - (iii) amenity space contained within the apartment buildings; and
 - (iv) underbuilding, underground and surface parking for the uses within the buildings.

Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the provisions of the Land Use By-law and the Subdivision By-law apply to any development undertaken pursuant to this Agreement.

2.2 Development Location and Design

(a) The Municipality and the Owner acknowledge that the Development as shown on Schedule B is a phased Development. The Development location and design of the townhouse buildings located on PID 45343878 shall follow requirements as listed in Section 2.2 (b). The Development location and design of the apartment buildings located on PIDs 45053030 and 45343894 shall follow the requirements as listed in Section 2.2 (c).

(b) The townhouse buildings shall be limited to a maximum of 18 dwelling units and shall be limited to 6 units per group. The townhouses may include underground and underbuilding parking and shall conform to the following requirements:

Minimum Front Yard	15 ft. (4.57 m.)
Minimum Rear Yard	35 ft. (10.67 m.)
Minimum Side Yard	10 ft. (3.05 m.)*
Maximum Building Height	35 ft. (10.67 m.)
Maximum Height of Accessory Building	15 ft. (4.57 m.)

*No side yard setback is required along the common lot boundary dividing townhouse units

(c) The four (4) apartment buildings shall be limited to a maximum of 280 dwelling units in total. The buildings may include underground and underbuilding parking and shall conform to the following requirements:

Maximum Number of Units per Building	70
Minimum Front Yard	25 ft. (7.62 m.)
Minimum Rear Yard	25 ft. (7.62 m.)
Minimum Side Yard	15 ft. (4.57 m.) or half the height of the main building
Maximum Storey of Main Buildings	5 storeys*
Maximum Height of Accessory Buildings	15 ft. (4.57 m.)

*The building will in no instance exceed 80 ft (24.38 m) in height

(d) Subject to the approval in writing of the Municipal Engineer, the lot for the apartment building located furthest away from the future municipal road may be created on a right-of-way that is at least 19.69 ft. (6 m.) wide and shall not require any frontage. The lots for all other apartment buildings shall have a minimum lot frontage of 100 ft. (30.48 m.) on the future municipal road.

(e) In the event that the Owner chooses to build and occupy one apartment building at a time, the following infrastructure is required for that building:

- (i) the necessary services for the proper use and enjoyment of the building including but not limited to a driveway and access, landscaping, pedestrian walkways, parking, lighting, and water and sewer services; and
 - (ii) the required usable recreation space as per Section 10.5, Recreational Space, of the Land Use By-law.
- (f) Accessory buildings are permitted in accordance with Section 5.1 of the Land Use By-law, *Accessory Buildings and Structures*.
- (g) Recreational space shall be regulated under Section 10.5 of the Land Use By-law, *Recreational Space*, and may include:
- (i) individual balconies;
 - (ii) dedicated indoor amenity space; and
 - (iii) common use landscaped areas.
- (h) The Owner shall keep all undeveloped areas of the Properties landscaped which may include grass, shrubs, trees or other appropriate vegetative cover.

2.3 Access and Egress

- (a) The Owner shall develop, construct, and maintain the two shared driveways in the Development. One driveway shall be required for the first and second apartment building and the second driveway shall be required for the remaining apartment buildings. The distance between the driveways must be approved by the Municipal Engineer in accordance with the Municipal Specifications Manual.
- (b) The driveways shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface for vehicle traffic and be clearly demarcated and lined by the Owner. They may be constructed using permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention. The vehicular entrance and exit shall be clearly demarcated.
- (c) The Owner agrees that it will seek and obtain approval in writing from the Municipality before any driveway from the Development is connected to Payzant Drive or any other public road.

2.4 Road and Municipal Services

- (a) Roads and Municipal Services in the development shall conform to the following:
- (i) the layout of the street extension within the development shall be as generally shown on Schedule B. The Development Officer, in consultation with the Municipal Engineer, may give consideration to minor incidental

changes to the design of the street extension, without such changes being deemed to be amendments to this development agreement;

- (ii) the street extension, municipal services, and stormwater management within the Development shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Services Specifications Manual. Detailed design plans of the street networks, water and sewer servicing, and storm water systems shall be approved by the Municipal Engineer for each phase of the development prior to construction commencing for that phase;
- (c) Prior to the completion of the first phase of the Development, the water main running through PIDs 45213980 and 45234374 must be replaced at the expense of the Owner; and
- (d) A 5 ft. (1.52 m.) wide pedestrian walkway shall be provided along the street extension to the main entrances of the apartment buildings. The pedestrian walkways shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface and may use permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention.
- (e) Construction of the road extension through the entirety of PIDs 45213980 and 45234374 and all relevant infrastructure shall be completed by 2030, to allow the connection of the extension of Payzant Drive to King Street. If by mutual agreement between the Municipality and the Owner, the road extension completion date may be changed.

2.5 Parking

- (a) All required parking spaces for the apartment buildings shall be located on the same lot as that building.
- (b) All parking spaces for vehicles using the townhouses shall be located on the same lot as the townhouses.
- (c) A minimum of one (1) parking space per dwelling unit shall be provided for each apartment building.
- (d) Parking may be provided either underbuilding, underground or outside at grade.
- (e) Outside parking aisles and spaces shall be constructed so as to create a stable surface for vehicle traffic and be clearly demarcated and lined by the Owner. They may be constructed using permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention.

- (f) Each required parking space shall be a minimum of 9 ft. by 20 ft. (2.7 m. by 6.1 m.) exclusive of driveways and manoeuvring aisles. Parking spaces provided in addition to the required parking spaces may be built without meeting the minimum size requirement for the use of a compact vehicle. Parking aisles shall be a minimum of 20 ft. (6.1 m.) wide.
- (g) The number of parking spaces may be varied in writing by the Development Officer in accordance with Section 2.13, *Variance*, of this Agreement.

2.6 Fire Safety

- (a) No development permit shall be issued until the location and connection design of any fire hydrant(s) connected to the municipal water supply has been approved by the water utility, in consultation with the district Fire Chief.
- (b) Specific curbs shall be designed to be mountable by emergency services vehicles as determined by the Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services in consultation with the local Fire Chief.
- (c) All access routes shall be kept clear of overhead obstructions and wires and be maintained by the Owner to allow unimpeded access to the Properties by emergency services vehicles, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Fire Chief.

2.7 Buffering

Outdoor parking for the apartment buildings and townhouses shall be screened from lots outside of the Development, through the use of:

- (a) a mix of local species of coniferous trees. At planting, each tree shall have a diameter of at least 2 in. measured at 4.5 ft. (1.37 m.) above the surrounding grade and a minimum height of 5 ft. (1.52 m.); or
- (b) a hedge of a variety of coniferous shrubs each of which will reach over 6 ft. (1.83 m.) in height at maturity; or
- (c) a wall or an opaque fence which is a minimum of 5 ft. (1.52 m.) in height and of sufficient height to provide a visual buffer to the abutting property; or

any combination of the above, all arranged to form a dense or opaque screen, and shall be maintained to that standard.

2.8 Site Drainage

- (a) No development permit shall be issued until the Owner provides to the Development Officer a stormwater management plan that satisfies the Municipal Engineer that historical flooding patterns and area drainage systems have been

considered and that storm water discharge will balance pre- and post-construction flows to ensure there is no negative impact on downstream properties. If the stormwater management plan provided by the Owner does not in fact balance pre-and post-construction flows to ensure the absence of such impacts the Owner shall undertake such remediation as the Municipal Engineer may reasonably require.

- (b) The Owner shall undertake all construction activities in accordance with an erosion and sedimentation control plan prepared by a Professional Engineer, unless otherwise directed by Nova Scotia Environment, and also agrees to assume sole responsibility for compliance with all regulations of Nova Scotia Environment.

2.9 Servicing

(a) Waste Collection

- (i) No Municipal garbage collection will be provided to the apartment buildings. The Owner shall have sole responsibility for collecting, storing and disposing of garbage and other recycling or waste items from the apartment buildings.
- (ii) The Owner shall keep any outdoor storage of garbage in an enclosed structure or in some way adequately screened so as not to be visible from or cause a nuisance to nearby properties and abutting roads and it shall not be located closer than 10 ft. (3.05 m.) to an abutting property.

(b) Water and Sewer Services

- (i) The buildings shall be serviced with water and sewer services provided by West Hants Regional Municipality authorized by the Municipal Engineer. Detailed design plans of the water and sewer servicing connections and layout shall be in accordance with the Municipal Services Specifications Manual and shall be submitted to the Municipal Engineer for approval prior to construction.
- (ii) The Owner shall be responsible for constructing, installing and maintaining the water and sewer services on the Properties.

(c) Snow Plowing

The Owner shall have sole responsibility for snow plowing within the Development, excluding the street extension to Payzant Drive upon conveyance to the Municipality.

2.10 Maintenance

- (a) The Owner shall keep the Properties and buildings and any portion thereof clean and in good repair. Any driveways, fences, lawns, trees, shrubs, walkways and other landscaping elements shall be regularly maintained and kept in a tidy state and free from unkempt materials or matter of any kind.
- (b) The Owner shall maintain the driveways to a level adequate to allow for access by emergency services vehicles.

2.11 Signs and Lighting

Signage and illumination shall be regulated under Sections 5.18 and 7.0 of the Land Use By-law, *Illumination* and *Signs*, which controls lighting, size, location, and number of signs. Exterior lighting for driveways, parking areas, signs or structures shall be shielded and directed downward to ensure there is no light spilling, glare or light cast over neighbouring properties or the street.

2.12 Subdivision

- (a) As noted in Section 2.2 (e) the lot for the apartment building located furthest from the front lot line shall be permitted to be subdivided on a right-of-way approved in writing by the Municipal Engineer.
- (b) At the time of subdivision application, the Owner must convey a right-of-way to ensure continued access/egress from the future municipal road and convey easements for any services including but not limited to water, sewer and stormwater, from the lot on which the driveway is constructed in favour of the subsequent lots to ensure continued access/egress and servicing to those lots regardless of future ownership. The Owner acknowledges that the shared driveways from the future Municipal road and the services which may cross the lot on which the driveway is constructed to service the subsequent lots are a joint and several responsibility of each owner of the lots benefiting from the infrastructure.
- (c) Subdivision of the properties shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable Subdivision By-law, with the exception of Section 2.12 (a) and the minimum lot size, which shall be 55,000 sq. ft. per lot. No additional parkland or parkland fees shall be required for subdivision or consolidation of the properties subject to this agreement.
- (d) Subject to Section 2.2 (b) of this Agreement, any lot(s) subdivided from PID 45343878 that will be developed as townhouses under this Agreement, shall no longer be subject to this Agreement.

2.13 Variance

In accordance with Section 5.40 of the Land Use By-law, *Variance*, the Development Officer may grant a variance for one or more of the following requirements subject to the requirements of the *Municipal Government Act*:

- (i) minimum required yard dimensions, excepting side yard setbacks, as required in Section 2.2 (c) of this Agreement;
- (ii) minimum required yard dimensions as required in Section 2.2 (d) of this Agreement; and
- (iii) number of parking spaces required.

2.14 Road Reserve

In accordance with the Payzant Drive Extension Plan, a road reserve on PID 45343894 will be required to ensure that there is available land to construct the Payzant Drive extension, as shown on Schedule B. In the event that the Municipal Engineer determines in their discretion that the road reserve is unnecessary for the construction of the Payzant Drive extension, the Developer may construct on this portion of the lot with the permission in writing of the Municipal Engineer and the Development Officer, and changes to the Site Plan reflecting this will be deemed not to be an amendment to this agreement.

2.15 Phasing

- (a) Construction of the first apartment building and all relevant infrastructure and landscaping as outlined in Section 2.2 (h) of this Agreement shall be completed within seventy-two (72) months of the commencement of Development outlined in Section 4.1 of this Agreement. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, Development as per this agreement shall no longer be permitted and this Agreement may be discharged in part at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the Municipal Government Act thirty (30) days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.
- (b) Construction of all apartment buildings and all relevant infrastructure and landscaping as outlined in Section 2.2 (h) of this Agreement shall be completed within one hundred and twenty (120) months of the actual commencement of the Development provided that such commencement is within the time limit prescribed in Section 4.1 of this Agreement. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, Development of the

apartment buildings shall no longer be permitted and this Agreement may be discharged in part solely at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the Municipal Government Act thirty (30) days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

PART 3 CHANGES AND DISCHARGE

3.1 The Owner shall not increase the number of apartment buildings, or the number of units within any apartment buildings on the Properties from that provided for in Section 2.1 of this Agreement, *Use*, unless a new agreement is entered into with the Municipality or this Agreement is amended.

3.2 Any matters in this Agreement which are not specified in Subsection 3.3 below are not substantive matters and may be changed with the written consent of Council without a public hearing provided that Council determines that the changes do not significantly alter the intended effect of this Agreement.

3.3 The following matters are substantive matters:

- (a) the maximum number of units permitted within the Development and within each component thereof as listed in Section 2.1, *Use*;
- (b) the maximum height and storeys of the apartment buildings as listed in Section 2.2, *Development Location and Design*;
- (c) the fire safety requirements listed in Section 2.6, *Fire Safety*;
- (d) the landscaping requirements in Section 2.7, *Buffering*; and
- (e) the requirements for a stormwater management plan to be submitted prior to a development permit being issued as listed in Section 2.8, *Site Drainage*.

3.4 Upon conveyance of land by the Owner to either:

- (a) the Municipality for the purpose of creating or expanding a public street over the Property; or
- (b) the Municipality for the purpose of creating or expanding any municipally owned facility or infrastructure over the Property;

registration of the deed reflecting the conveyance shall be conclusive evidence that that this agreement shall be discharged as it relates to the public street or public facility, as the case may be, as of the date of registration with the Land Registry Office, but this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for all remaining portions of the Property.

- 3.5** Notwithstanding the foregoing, discharge of this Agreement is not a substantive matter, and this Agreement may be discharged by Council without a public hearing.
- 3.6** Notice of Intent to Discharge this Agreement in whole or in part may be given by the Municipality to the Owner following a resolution of Council to give such Notice:
- (a) as provided for in this Agreement; or
 - (b) at the discretion of the Municipality, with or without the concurrence of the Owner, where the Development has, in the reasonable opinion of Council on advice from the Development Officer, ceased operation for a period of at least twenty-four (24) months; or
 - (c) at any time upon the written request of the Owner, provided the use of the Properties is in accordance with the Land Use By-law or a new Agreement has been entered into.
- 3.7** Council may discharge this Agreement in whole or in part 30 days after a Notice of Intent to Discharge has been given.

PART 4 IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Commencement of Development

- (a) The Owner may not commence any construction or use on the Property until the Municipality has issued any development permit, building permit and/or occupancy permit that may be required. The date of commencement will be determined as the date the Owner begins Active Construction on the building within this Agreement as permitted by an issued development and building permit.
- (b) Active Construction shall commence not later than forty-eight (48) months from the date this Agreement is signed. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, this Agreement may be discharged at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act* 30 days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.
- (c) If the Owner is bona fide delayed from commencing the Development for reasons which are beyond the Owner's control, the determination of which shall be at the sole discretion of the Development Officer, then performance by the Owner is excused for the period of the delay and the time period for the Owner

to perform their obligations shall be extended by the Development Officer in writing for an equivalent period, without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

4.2 Material to be Provided

- (a) The Owner shall provide record drawings to the Development Officer for any portion of the Development for which an engineered design is required, within ten (10) days of completion of any work which requires the engineered design.
- (b) The Owner shall, upon written request, provide the Municipality with copies of any documentation, permits or approvals required by Provincial or Federal governments or agencies.

PART 5 ADMINISTRATION and COMPLIANCE

5.1 Compliance with other By-laws and Regulations

- (a) Nothing in this Agreement shall exempt the Owner from complying with Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws, by-laws and regulations in force or from obtaining any Federal, Provincial, or Municipal license, permission, permit, authority, or approval required thereunder.
- (b) Where the provisions of this Agreement conflict with those of any by-law of the Municipality applicable to the Properties (other than the Land Use By-law and Subdivision by-law to the extent expressly varied by this Agreement) or any statute or regulation, the higher or more stringent requirements shall prevail.

5.2 Severability of Provisions

The provisions of this Agreement are severable from one another and the invalidity or unenforceability of one provision shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision.

5.3 Interpretation

- (a) Where the context requires, the singular shall include the plural and the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neutral gender.
- (b) Where the written text of this Agreement conflicts with information provided in the Schedules attached to this Agreement, the written text of this Agreement shall prevail.
- (c) References to particular sections of statutes and bylaws shall be deemed to be references to any successor legislation and bylaws even if the content has been amended, unless the context otherwise requires.

5.4 Municipal Responsibility

- (a) The Municipality does not make any representations to the Owner about the suitability of the Properties for the Development proposed by this Agreement. The Owner assumes all risks and must ensure that any proposed Development complies with this Agreement and all other laws pertaining to the Development.
- (b) Any failure of the Municipality to insist upon a strict performance of any requirements or conditions contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any rights or remedies that the Municipality may have and shall not be deemed a waiver of any subsequent breach or default in the conditions or requirements contained in this Agreement.

5.5 Breach of Terms or Conditions

Upon breach of any term or condition of this Agreement, the Municipality may notify the Owner in writing. In the event that the Owner have not cured any such breach or entered into arrangements with the Municipality related to such breach to the Municipality's satisfaction, acting reasonably, within six (6) months of such notice, then the Municipality may rely upon the remedies contained in Section 264 of the *Municipal Government Act* and may enter the land and perform any of the terms contained in the Development Agreement, or take such remedial action as is considered necessary to correct a breach of the Agreement, including the removal or destruction of anything that contravenes the terms of the Agreement and including decommissioning the site. It is agreed that all reasonable expenses, whether arising out of the entry on the land or from the performance of the terms, are a first lien on the land that is the subject of the Development Agreement.

5.6 Costs

The Owner shall pay all costs associated with registering this Agreement and all costs associated with any amendment thereof.

5.7 Development Agreement Bound to Land

This Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto and their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns, and shall run with the land which is the subject of this Agreement until such time as it is discharged by the Municipality in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

5.8 Assignment of Agreement

The Owner may, at any time and from time to time, transfer or assign this Agreement and its rights hereunder and may delegate its obligations hereunder to an assign, successor, heir, or purchaser of the land bound by this Agreement.

5.9 Written Notice

- (a) The Municipality may serve notice on the Owner personally or by ordinary mail which shall be deemed to have been received within three (3) business days of mailing, addressed to Abraham Zebian at 31 Cochrane Lane, Sweets Corner, NS, B0N 2T0, or at any other address provided in writing or email by the Owner.
- (b) The Owner may serve notice on the Municipality by registered mail addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer, West Hants Regional Municipality, 76 Morison Drive, P.O. Box 3000, Windsor, NS, B0N 2T0, or at any successor address provided in writing or email by the Municipality to the Owner.

5.10 Full Agreement

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and contract entered into by the Municipality and the Owner. No other agreement or representation, oral or written, shall be binding.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Agreement was properly executed by the respective parties hereto on the day and year first above written.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED

In the presence of:

) **WEST HANTS REGIONAL**

) **MUNICIPALITY**

)

)

)

Per: _____

Witness

) Mark Phillips, Chief Administrative Officer

)

)

)

) Per: _____

Witness

) Deanna Snair, Municipal Clerk

)

)

)

) **3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**

)

)

Witness

)
Per: _____
) Abraham Zebian, President

**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA
COUNTY OF HANTS**

ON THIS day of , A.D. 2024, before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that **WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**, one of the parties thereto, caused the same to be executed in its name and on its behalf and its corporate seal to be thereunto affixed in presence.

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA
COUNTY OF HANTS**

ON THIS day of , A.D. 2024, before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that, **Abraham Zebian**, one of the parties thereto, signed, sealed and delivered the same in presence.

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

AFFIDAVIT OF CLERK

WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

I, Deanna Snair of _____, Hants County, Nova Scotia make oath and swear that:

1. I am the Clerk of the West Hants Regional Municipality (the “Municipality”) and I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. The Municipality is a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended.
3. I acknowledge that the Municipality executed the attached Instrument by its proper designates duly authorized in that regard under seal on the date of this Affidavit pursuant to subsection 13(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended. This acknowledgement is made pursuant to subsection 31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 and/or clause 79(1)(a) of the Land Registry Act, S.N.S. 2001, c.6, as amended, for the purpose of registering or recording the Instrument.
4. The Municipality is resident in Canada for the purposes of the Income Tax Act (Canada).

I certify that on this _____, 2024
the Municipal Clerk, Deanna Snair came before me, made oath,
and swore the foregoing affidavit at
_____, Nova Scotia.

A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Deanna Snair, Clerk

Canada
Province of Nova Scotia

AFFIDAVIT & PROOF OF EXECUTION (CORPORATE)

I, Abraham Zebian, Nova Scotia, make oath and say that:

1. I, Abraham Zebian, of **3324482 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED** the “Corporation”. Except as otherwise stated I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. I acknowledge that I executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of the Corporation on the date of this affidavit; this acknowledgment is made for the purpose of registering such instrument pursuant to s.31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 or ss.79 and 83 of the Land Registration Act as the case may be.
3. I verify that I have the authority to execute the foregoing instrument on behalf of the corporation and thereby bind the Corporation.
4. The Corporation is a resident of Canada under the Income Tax Act (Canada).
5. The Ownership of a share or an interest in a share of the Corporation does not entitle the owner of such share or interest in such share to occupy a dwelling owned by the Corporation.

I certify that on this _____, 2024
the Deponents came before me, made oath,
and swore the foregoing affidavit at
_____, Nova Scotia.

A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Abraham Zebian, President

Schedule A
Legal Description

PID 45053030

ALL THAT lot of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the Town of Windsor, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia, being PID # 45053030 and bounded and described as follows:

BOUNDED AND LYING north and east of the road allowance owned by the Town of Windsor, shown as Lot A on an Expropriation Plan registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1971 as Plan # 126, and being PID # 45213980;

BOUNDED AND LYING south and west of those lands owned by HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN and shown on a plan of survey (Field Plot No. P-063/02) signed on the 14th day of June, 2002 by Greg Smith, Nova Scotia Land Surveyor, and filed in the Department of Natural Resources Office, Halifax, Province of Nova Scotia;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north of the lands more particularly described as follows and being PID # 45343894:

ALL that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being at Windsor in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a survey marker placed on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.857 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a survey marker on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE northwesterly following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, to a point being the southwest corner of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill;

THENCE following the southerly boundary of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill to a survey marker placed on a southwestern boundary of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen, in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of the said school land a distance of Eighty-three decimal Two Nine Five metres to the place of beginning.

The parcel is exempt from the requirement for subdivision approval under the Municipal Government Act because it is the remainder parcel after the subdivision of Adjoining lands.

PID 45343878

ALL THAT lot of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the Town of Windsor, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia, being PID # 45343878 and bounded and described as follows:

BOUNDED AND LYING south and west of the road allowance owned by the Town of Windsor, shown as Lot A on an Expropriation Plan registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1971 as Plan # 126, and being PID # 45213980;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING east of the railway lands being PID # 45343894 and shown on Retracement Plan 7004B registered in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on January 01, 1993;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING south of the lands conveyed by Annie May Burgess to the Nova Scotia Farm Loan Board by a deed dated the 30th day of September, 1981 and recorded in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants as Document number 500884241 and being PID # 45358314;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of the lands conveyed by Phillip Burgess and Patricia Burgess to Gary E. Dill by a deed recorded in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants on April 14, 2005 as Document number 81731110 and being PID # 45234382;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of lands owned by the Town of Windsor and described as Part D on a Plan of Survey filed as P-284 in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants and being PID # 45234416;

AND BOUNDED AND LYING north and west of lands owned by Wilfred J Jodrey as shown on a Plan of Survey filed as P-284 in the Land Registry Office for the County of Hants and being PID # 45053048;

The parcel is exempt from the requirement for subdivision approval under the Municipal Government Act because it is the remainder parcel after the subdivision of adjoining lands.

PID 45343894

ALL that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being at Windsor in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a survey marker placed on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.857 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a survey marker on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE northwesterly following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, to a point being the southwest corner of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill;

THENCE following the southerly boundary of lands now or formerly of Gary Edward Dill to a survey marker placed on a southwestern boundary of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen, in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of the said school land a distance of Eighty-three decimal Two Nine Five metres to the place of beginning.

SUBJECT to an easement for access and drainage over the above described lands and known as Easement C and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point situated on a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks, said point also being the southwestern corner of Parcel B and situate (by grid bearings referenced to the Nova Scotia Three degrees Modified Transverse Mercator Projection, Zone 5, central meridian Sixty-four degrees Thirty minutes West longitude) North Sixty-four degrees Seventeen minutes Zero One seconds East a distance of Two Hundred Twenty-six decimal Nine Six Three metres from Nova Scotia Coordinate Monument No. 8629 having coordinate values (Northing 4,982,024.877 metres, Easting 5,529,748.856 metres);

THENCE (from the place of beginning) South Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds West following a northern boundary of Lot AB-1, land now or formerly of Dwight Banks a distance of One Hundred Thirty-six decimal Six Nine Seven metres to a point situated on a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road;

THENCE South Eighty-six degrees Twenty-one minutes Twenty-three seconds West following a northern boundary of Parcel OHR-2, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, formerly the Old Halifax Road, a distance of Four decimal Four Two Eight metres to a southeastern corner of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor;

THENCE North Zero Eight degrees Fifty-five minutes Twenty-four seconds West following an eastern boundary of Lot D, land now or formerly of the Town of Windsor, a distance of Nineteen decimal Two Two Six metres to a point;

THENCE North Sixty-seven degrees Zero Zero minutes Zero Zero seconds East a distance of One Hundred Thirty-four decimal Two Zero Nine metres to a point situated on a southwestern boundary of Parcel B, which said Parcel B forms a portion of lands now or formerly of Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Nova Scotia, being the Avon View High School lands;

THENCE South Twenty-eight degrees Thirty-eight minutes Fifty-one seconds East following a southwestern boundary of Parcel B a distance of Twenty decimal Two One Five metres to the place of beginning.

The above described Easement C contains Zero decimal Two Seven Seven hectares.

PID 45234382

All that certain parcel of land situate at Currys Corner, Windsor, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia being a triangular piece of land lying to the west of Town of Windsor sewer line which said parcel is sketched as Harry Burgess and Ivan Burgess (Nova Scotia Farm Loan Board) on a Plan of Survey entitled Lands shown as Lots A, B, C, D, & E under Conveyance to the Town of Windsor for a Proposed Sewer Line Right-of-Way, said Lands being in or at

Currys Corner, in the Town of Windsor, NS made by E. Elliott, NSLS and recorded at the Office of the Registry of Deeds for the Registration District of Hants County on January 2, 1973 under Plan No. P-284, which said parcel may be more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at the point on the Westerly boundary of lands of the Town of Windsor shown as Lot A on said plan, intersects the northeasterly boundary of lands formerly of John Dill, now of Gary E. Dill;

Thence North 14 degrees 08 minutes East along lands of the Town of Windsor a distance of 102.0 feet to a point;


Thence North 7 degrees 45 minutes West continuing along lands of the Town of Windsor a distance of 9 feet, more or less, to a Southeasterly boundary of lands of Gary E. Dill;

Thence South 79 degrees 58 minutes West along lands of Gary E. Dill a distance of 59 feet, more or less to a point;

Thence South 19 degrees 20 minutes East along lands of Gary E. Dill to the place of beginning.

All bearings are magnetic for the year 1971.

Schedule B
Site Plan



CONSULTANT	CLIENT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	SHEET DESCRIPTION	Engineer	Drawn
DESIGNPOINT engineering • surveying • solutions 902.832.5597 designpoint.ca	PG DEVELOPMENTS	PAYZANT DRIVE EXTENSION WINDSOR, NOVA SCOTIA	SITE PLAN	N. FOUGERE	S. LOPES
				Scale 1:1000	Date Jan. 29, 2024
				Project No. 22-269	Drawing No. 01
				Filename 22-269_Phases.dwg	1 OF 01

P:\2022\22-269 Parsons Green - Payzant Drive\01 - Drawings\Eng Design\Sheets\22-269_Phases.dwg, Plot Date: 2024-Jan-29, Plot Size: ANSI FULL BLEED B (11.00 X 17.00 INCHES)

Attachment C – Public Information Meeting Notes

May 11 - May 25, 2023

Development Agreement: PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Drive ; File # 23-04

<p>Meeting date and time</p>	<p>A Public Information Meeting was held on May 11, 2023 beginning at 6:22 p.m. The meeting was broadcast live on the Municipal Facebook page.</p>
<p>Attending</p>	<p>In attendance for the first meeting: One (1) Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Nicholls (Chair) <p>Four (4) members of staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director Poirier • Planner Dunphy • Planner Fredericks • Planning Assistant Lake <p>PAC/HAC Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Ivey • Councillor Murley • Jane Davis • Stefan Palios • Tasha Rogers • Lisa Bland <p>Approximately 15 members of the public.</p>
<p>Applicant Noel Taiani on behalf of Abraham Zebian Property Payzant Drive, Windsor Multiple Use Residential (PIDs 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382)</p>	<p>Planner Dunphy outlined the application to allow up to 280 apartment units and 18 townhouse units grouped on the subject lots by development agreement.</p> <p>The applicant did not give a presentation.</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Comments from the public could be submitted to Alex Dunphy by mail, e-mail and telephone between May 11 – May 25, 2023.</p> <p>Staff received 2 pieces of written submissions during the comment period, included at the bottom of this chart. 5 members of the public spoke during the Public Information Meeting. The following are the comments from the public.</p>

	<p>Staff, Chair and applicant responses are included in purple text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant Burgess commented that they live nearby and indicated that they were concerned with the sewer line that runs nearby the brook. • Rick Percal indicated that the sewer line runs through the proposal land. Rick also asked if the road would be extended from Payzant and if the road would connect to King Street and had concerns with traffic. Jennifer Nichols responded that concerns would be brought to the appropriate authorities to address issues such as traffic. • Grant Burgess indicated that the trail between the development was not a right-of-way but was being used as such by the public. Grant was concerned with the traffic on this piece of land. • David Pemberton had concerns regarding the traffic and how it would be addressed. Alex Dunphy replied that part of the application process is to address issues such as traffic through consultation with the Public Works Department and the Municipal Traffic Authority. • Kathy Pemberton was concerned with the view from their property being blocked and the value of their property. • Rick Percal asked what would be developed on the smallest property (PID 45234382). Alex Dunphy replied that nothing was indicated to be located on that property in the proposal and that sometimes the project area includes pieces of land that are not developed on. • Kathy Pemberton asked who the developer was and where they were located. Alex Dunphy replied that the developer was Parsons Green Developments and were present at the meeting. • David Cameron asked where the developer was from and how they acquired the property. David also commented that apartment buildings would introduce more cars and garbage to the area.
Adjournment	The presentation portion of the PIM ended at approximately 6:38 p.m.

Public Email Responses Submitted for the Application

May 12, 2023

From Tamara Stevens

To Alex Dunphy

Good day,

I wanted to comment on the proposed rezoning for the area on Payzant Dr. The pictures indicate that the area has been cleared and I am guessing it was probably farmland. I am quite concerned with the amount of farmland that is being rezoned both province-wide and locally. The population is increasing, and we are going to continue to need more food not less. I do not believe farmland should be rezoned at all regardless of how long it has been unused. We should be encouraging groups or individuals to develop any unused farmland for growing food not vineyards, actual food. As well, I would be interested in what level of rent will be demanded of tenants. If these apartments are going to be anything but low income, I don't believe that this is good development as I believe it would encourage people from outside the area rather than address the lack of living space for current residents. We have many struggling to find affordable housing, but the developers are only interested in what they can make a profit on. I think it important for government to determine this information prior to approval.

L.Tamara Stevens

May 25, 2023

From John Edgecombe

To Alex Dunphy

Dear Mr Dunphy, my name is John Edgecombe and live at *ADDRESS REMOVED* as well own the commercial property at *ADDRESS REMOVED*.

I sat through the public meeting on the 11th and after hearing what is proposed I wanted to send you a note.

The property in mention is zoned single family homes and I feel it should remain that way. As we build our community with families and seniors we need to keep our "town" feeling. If I wanted to be in the city I would have lived there. Having four (4) 70 unit apartments in front of high school with one access road seems absurd. Along with de-valuing our properties. I know West Hants wants to grow and we have lots of space to do that, but let's keep it the way it is as a community. We do not need to become a Bayers Lake with apartments everywhere and nobody knowing their neighbors. Plus, we do not have the infrastructure in place for that many more cars, sewer systems or even people.

As well, I have no idea what it will do to the brook that runs through the property environmentally wise either.


Anyway my two cents worth, I agree to the single family homes but NOT to the apartment buildings.

Sincerely,

John Edgecombe

Appendix B – 2023-07-26 Traffic Impact Study – Payzant Drive Development

DRAFT Traffic Impact Study



July 26, 2023

Payzant Drive Development

Windsor, NS



SUBMITTED BY:

DesignPoint Engineering & Surveying Ltd.

90 Western Parkway, Suite 500
Bedford, NS B4B 2J3

SUBMITTED TO:

4489461 NS Ltd

C/O Parsons Green Developments
PO Box 36116, RPO Spring Garden
Halifax, NS B3J 3S9
Hazelview Investments



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Project Overview	1
1.2	Study Area	1
2.0	Existing conditions.....	4
2.1	Existing Traffic Volumes	4
2.2	Existing Traffic Operations	5
3.0	Site Generated Traffic	6
3.1	Access Review	6
3.2	Site Generated Traffic	6
3.3	Trip Distribution	7
4.0	Future Conditions.....	9
4.1	2033 Background Traffic Volumes	9
4.2	2033 Total Traffic Volumes	11
4.3	Future Connection to King Street.....	13
	4.3.1 2033 Background Volumes.....	13
	4.3.2 Trip Distribution.....	15
	4.3.3 2033 Total Traffic Volumes.....	17
	4.3.4 Auxiliary Turn Lane Warrant Analysis.....	18
5.0	Conclusions.....	19
6.0	Recommendations	19

Appendix A – Vistro Reports

Appendix B – Auxiliary Turn Lane Warrants

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

DesignPoint Engineering & Surveying Ltd. has been engaged to complete a traffic impact study for a proposed development on Payzant Drive in Windsor, NS. The development proposes adding 298 residential units through the addition of townhouses and multi-unit buildings. The site will be accessed through an extension of Payzant Drive.

1.2 STUDY AREA

The site is located at the end of Payzant Drive, adjacent to Avon View High School, as shown in Figure 2. Payzant Drive at Wentworth Road is considered the critical intersection for this analysis, as all other existing intersections are low density residential intersections.




Figure 1 - Proposed Development



Figure 2 – Proposed development location on Payzant Drive

Payzant Drive

Payzant Drive is two lanes with a posted speed limit of 50km/h. It serves as a primary connection for two destinations: Avon View High School and Hants Community Hospital. Additionally, there are several residential properties on or connecting to Payzant Drive. A sidewalk on the northeast side of the road extends the length of the road. Payzant Drive currently ends at Avon View High School, though the potential for a future connection with King Street has been identified. Payzant Drive is owned by West Hants Regional Municipality.



Figure 3 - Payzant Drive towards Wentworth Road

Wentworth Road

Wentworth Road is a two-lane road with a posted speed limit of 50km/h. It serves as a direct connection to Highway 101. Sidewalk on both sides of the road extends from Industrial Drive to O'Brien Street, where sidewalk further extends to King Street on the northwest Side.



Figure 4 - Wentworth Road towards Payzant Drive

Properties on Wentworth Road are primarily commercial, though there is an increase in residential properties towards King Street. Both the West Hants Sports Complex and Hants Exhibition Arena are located on Wentworth Road.

Wentworth Road is owned by West Hants Regional Municipality.

Payzant Drive at Wentworth Road

The intersection of Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road is a four-legged, two-way stop-controlled intersection. The commercial driveway on the north side of the intersection acts as the fourth leg. The intersection is stop controlled on Payzant Drive and at the driveway. Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road have left turn lanes with varying storage lengths. The eastbound left turn lane on Wentworth Road has a storage length of 25m, while the westbound left turn lane has a storage length of 80m. The northbound left turn lane on Payzant Drive has a storage length of 60m. Through and right turn movements on Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road share a lane. Through, right, and left turn movements share a lane at the driveway.



Figure 5 - Existing intersection layout of Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road

The Municipality of West Hants is undertaking a detailed design to convert this intersection into a roundabout.

Future Connections

A note that ongoing work is happening to the west of this development as part of the “The Crossing” project by Brison Developments. This development is in varying stages of completion, construction, and design but ultimately will include several new connections from Payzant Drive. Community Way will connect Payzant Drive to Irven Drive, and Underwood Drive will eventually connect with links to Irven Drive and Cole Drive. From these connections, a road user can navigate through the development to both Wentworth Road and King Street.

For the purposes of this study, we have not included traffic redistribution from either of these connections. This is based largely on two main considerations: the first is that these connections are non-direct circuitous routes through residential areas which makes them less attractive as through routes for drivers, and the second is that by directing all of the site development traffic away from these connections, we are representing a conservative traffic scenario (that is, likely a worst case scenario).

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

2.1 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Existing traffic volumes for Payzant Drive at Wentworth Road were obtained from the “Windsor Intersection Infrastructure Needs Assessment” prepared by WSP for the West Hants Regional Municipality. Traffic volumes were collected by WSP on Tuesday, January 19, 2021. Data were collected from 7 AM to 9 AM, 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM, and 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM. A seasonal factor of 1.17 and a COVID-19 factor of 1.05 were applied to the raw count data to account for volume fluctuations on the collection day. Anticipated trips generated by the West Hants Sports Complex and Hants County Exhibition were also added by WSP to the data to finalize the existing intersection volumes for 2021. As part of this traffic study, these volumes were compared with data collected for other private developments in the area and found to be appropriately representative of typical traffic patterns.

To represent 2023 existing volumes, an annual growth of 1.5% was applied to the final existing intersection volumes from the 2021 report. This annual growth was identified in the 2021 WSP assessment as the area’s growth based on historical traffic data from Highway 101 Section 60 and accounts for growth from unknown developments.




Figure 6 - 2023 existing traffic volumes for the AM & PM peak hours (based on data from Windsor Intersection Infrastructure Needs Assessment, WSP 2021)

2.2 EXISTING TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

A level of service (LOS) analysis is a method to determine how well a transportation facility, typically an intersection, performs from a driver’s perspective during a specific period (usually peak hours). The LOS is measured by the average delay of each vehicle travelling through an intersection with grades ranging from A to F, where A is associated with minimal delay, and F is associated with heavily congested conditions. The desired or acceptable level of service can range depending on the location and context of individual streets. Streets within dense urban corridors are expected to experience some level of congestion during peak hours, and a lower level of service (D or E) is usually acceptable. The acceptable level of service of streets within more rural areas would typically be higher (A to C), where congestion and longer delays are unexpected.

The adjacent table provides the level of service criteria as defined in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010) for unsignalized intersections.

Table 1 - Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections



Level of Service	Average Control Delay (seconds per vehicle)
A	≤10
B	>10 – 15
C	>15 – 25
D	>25 – 35
E	>35 – 50
F ¹	>50

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2010, *Transportation Research Board, 2010*

1. If the volume-to-capacity ratio for a lane group exceeds 1.0 LOS F is assigned to the individual lane group for all unsignalized intersections, or minor street approach at two-way stop-controlled intersections. Overall intersection LOS is determined solely by the control delay.

A level of service analysis has been completed for the intersection using PTV Vistro traffic modelling software. A summary of the AM and PM peak hour level of service measures for the intersection of Payzant Drive at Wentworth Road has been provided in Table 2. The northbound left turn movement is overcapacity in the AM Peak hour with a level of service of F. All other movements operate below capacity.

Table 2 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2023 existing traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2023 Existing Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		1	407	237	304	433	5	67	1	175	1	1	1	14.77	
v/c		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00	1.12	0.01	0.32	0.03	0.02	0.00		
Delay (s)		8.2	0.0	0.0	10.6	0.0	0.0	269.2	56.7	14.8	108.8	64.6	13.4		
LOS		A	A	A	B	A	A	F	F	B	F	F	B		B
95th% Queue (m)		0.02	0.0	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	41.8	10.9	10.9	1.1	1.1	1.1		
PM Peak Hour - 2023 Existing Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		5	510	57	82	505	5	113	5	170	5	1	5	9.77	
v/c		0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	0.03	0.31	0.06	0.01	0.01		
Delay (s)		8.43	0	0	8.9	0	0	92.26	30.61	15.29	50.2	29.7	13.36		
LOS		A	A	A	A	A	A	F	D	C	F	D	B		A
95th% Queue (m)		0.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	38.2	11.6	11.6	1.8	1.8	1.8		

3.0 SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC

3.1 ACCESS REVIEW

The site plan for the proposed development includes 18 townhouses and four multi-unit mid-rise residential buildings (70 units each), resulting in 298 new residential units. The proposed townhouse driveways will front Payzant Drive, while the multi-unit buildings will be accessed by two driveways at opposite ends of the development. Stopping sight distance at the access driveways has not been reviewed as part of this study since the roadway has not yet been constructed.

The design of the future road extension should consider adequate sight lines at these driveways.




Figure 7 – Proposed access locations to multi-unit site

3.2 SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC

Site generated traffic has been calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, 11th Edition. Townhouse trips have been represented by the Single-Family Detached Housing land use to better reflect rural travel patterns. The development is estimated to generate 112 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 126 two-way vehicle trips in the PM peak hour.

Table 3 - Site generated trip calculations

Land Use	Code	Units	Variable	Trip Generation Rates ¹						Trips Generated			
				AM Peak			PM Peak			AM Peak		PM Peak	
				Rate	In	Out	Rate	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
Single-Family Detached Housing	210	18	Dwelling Units	0.75	0.26	0.74	0.94	0.63	0.37	4	10	11	6
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	221	280	Dwelling Units	0.35	0.26	0.74	0.39	0.6	0.4	25	73	66	44
Estimated Site Generated Trips										29	83	76	50
Notes:	Trip generation rates from ITE <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> , 11th Edition.												

3.3 TRIP DISTRIBUTION

Trip distribution of site generated trips through the study area has been estimated using the distribution of existing traffic volumes. Existing volumes indicate approximately 70% of trips originating from Payzant Drive in the AM peak hour and 60% of trips in the PM peak hour travel towards Highway 101. Due to the proximity and connectivity of Highway 101, it is anticipated site generated trips will also follow this distribution. The estimated distribution is provided in Figure 8, and the distribution of site generated trips at the Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road intersection is shown in Figure 9.




Figure 8 - Estimated distribution of site generated traffic



Figure 9 - AM and PM distribution of site generated traffic at the Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road intersection

4.0 FUTURE CONDITIONS

4.1 2033 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Background traffic is the traffic added by general annual traffic growth. A 1.5% annual growth rate has been used to calculate background traffic volumes. This annual growth was identified in the 2021 Infrastructure Needs Assessment based on historical traffic trends of Highway 101 Section 60 and to account for growth from unknown developments. All trips from unknown developments are assumed to be captured by this annual growth. This study analyzes a horizon year of 2033 (5 years past an estimated 5-year build out).

As part of the 2021 WSP assessment, the existing intersection was recommended to be upgraded to a roundabout. It is understood that the municipality plans to proceed with this recommendation. Two 2033 background scenarios have been evaluated for this recommendation: the existing two-way stop-controlled intersection and the proposed roundabout. The 2033 Background Traffic Volumes for the two-way stop-controlled scenario are shown in Figure 10, and the 2033 Background Traffic Volumes for the roundabout scenario are shown in Figure 11.




Figure 10 – 2033 background traffic volumes for the AM & PM peak hours two-way stop-controlled scenario






Figure 11 – 2033 background traffic volumes for the AM & PM peak hours roundabout scenario

A level of service summary has been completed for the 2033 background traffic volumes to determine how the Payzant Drive at Wentworth Road intersection operates without site generated traffic. A summary of the two-way stop-controlled intersection is provided in Table 4, and a summary of the roundabout is provided in Table 5. In the two-way stop-controlled scenario, northbound left turn movements operate above capacity in the AM and PM peak hours with a level of service of F. With the roundabout, all movements operate below capacity.

Table 4 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2033 two-way stop-controlled background traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		1	472	275	353	502	6	78	1	203	1	1	1	38.97	
v/c		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	2.26	0.02	0.41	0.06	0.03	0.00		
Delay (s)		8.4	0.0	0.0	12.1	0.0	0.0	826.0	90.0	18.0	222.4	110.8	20.9		
LOS		A	A	A	B	A	A	F	F	C	F	F	C		E
95th% Queue (m)		0.02	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	66.9	16.4	16.4	2.0	2.0	2.0		
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		6	592	66	95	586	6	131	6	197	6	1	6	24.32	
v/c		0.01	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.31	0.05	0.41	0.12	0.01	0.01		
Delay (s)		8.7	0.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0	272.6	41.1	19.0	84.2	42.2	18.5		
LOS		A	A	A	A	A	A	F	E	C	F	E	C		C
95th% Queue (m)		0.1	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	70.2	17.8	17.8	3.6	3.6	3.6		

Table 5 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2033 background roundabout background traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		1	472	275	353	502	6	78	1	203	1	1	1	13.6	
v/c		0.47	0.47	0.27	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.01	0.01	0.01		
Delay (s)		9.1	9.1	6.3	12.6	12.6	12.6	21.5	21.5	21.5	7.1	7.1	7.1		
LOS		A	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	A	A	A		B
95th% Queue (m)		19.69	19.7	8.6	45.6	45.6	45.6	59.0	59.0	59.0	0.1	0.1	0.1		
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		6	592	66	95	586	6	131	6	197	6	1	6	9.35	
v/c		0.47	0.47	0.05	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.02	0.02	0.02		
Delay (s)		7.7	7.7	3.3	10.4	10.4	10.4	11.5	11.5	11.5	6.5	6.5	6.5		
LOS		A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A		A
95th% Queue (m)		19.8	19.8	1.3	30.7	30.7	30.7	18.7	18.7	18.7	0.5	0.5	0.5		

4.2 2033 TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The 2033 Total Traffic Volumes result from 2033 Background volumes plus site-generated traffic added by the development. Total Traffic Volumes for the stop-controlled scenario are shown in Figure 12, and the Total Traffic Volumes for the roundabout scenario are shown in Figure 13.



Figure 12 - 2033 future volumes for the AM and PM peak hours two-way stop controlled scenario





Figure 13 - 2033 future volumes for the AM and PM peak hours roundabout scenario

A level of service analysis has been completed for AM and PM peak hours using total traffic volumes to evaluate the impact of traffic added by the development. The analysis has been completed for the existing two-way stop-controlled intersection and the proposed roundabout. The two-way stop-controlled scenario is shown in Table 6, and the roundabout scenario is shown in Table 7. In the AM and PM stop-controlled scenario, northbound left turn movements operate above capacity at a level of service of F. The overall intersection operates at a level of service of F. In the AM and PM roundabout scenario, all movements operate below capacity at a high level of service.

Table 6 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2033 two-way stop-controlled total traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Total Traffic														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Vehicle Count	STOP	1	472	291	366	502	6	103	1	261	1	1	1	
v/c		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	3.28	0.02	0.53	0.08	0.03	0.00	
Delay (s)		8.4	0.0	0.0	12.4	0.0	0.0	1289.0	100.6	21.6	324.1	128.3	28.6	71.55
LOS		A	A	A	B	A	A	F	F	C	F	F	D	F
95th% Queue (m)		0.02	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	92.4	25.5	25.5	2.7	2.7	2.7	
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Total Traffic														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Vehicle Count	STOP	6	592	96	141	586	6	151	6	227	6	1	6	
v/c		0.01	0	0	0.16	0	0	1.91	0.06	0.48	0.18	0.01	0.01	
Delay (s)		8.7	0.0	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	539.9	50.8	21.9	126.7	57.6	25.8	48.90
LOS		A	A	A	A	A	A	F	F	C	F	F	D	E
95th% Queue (m)		0.1	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	101.1	23.7	23.7	5.2	5.2	5.2	

Table 7 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2033 roundabout total traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Total Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		1	472	291	366	502	6	103	1	261	1	1	1	11.00	
v/c		0.48	0.48	0.29	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.01		
Delay (s)		9.3	9.3	6.6	13.8	13.8	13.8	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.4	7.4	7.4		
LOS		A	A	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A		B
95th% Queue (m)		20.1	20.1	9.4	50.9	50.9	50.9	17.4	17.4	17.4	0.1	0.1	0.1		
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Total Traffic															
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	Wentworth Road			Wentworth Road			Payzant Drive			Driveway			Intersection	
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Vehicle Count		6	592	96	141	586	6	151	6	227	6	1	6	10.48	
v/c		0.49	0.49	0.08	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.02	0.02	0.02		
Delay (s)		8.3	8.3	3.6	11.9	11.9	11.9	13.2	13.2	13.2	6.9	6.9	6.9		
LOS		A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A		B
95th% Queue (m)		21.4	21.4	2.0	37.4	37.4	37.4	24.2	24.2	24.2	0.6	0.6	0.6		

4.3 FUTURE CONNECTION TO KING STREET

4.3.1 2033 Background Volumes

The 2021 WSP assessment evaluated the impacts of extending Payzant Drive to connect to King Street as a stop-controlled T-intersection. The proposed intersection geometry includes a warranted eastbound left turn lane on King Street and separated right and left turning movements on Payzant Drive.

The WSP report evaluated the intersection for 2030 background traffic volumes, where 1.5% annual growth was applied between 2021 and 2030. The background volumes also consider the redistribution of trips caused by the Payzant Drive connection and trips generated by the Hants County Exhibition Expansion.

The 1.5% annual growth was applied for three additional years to reach 2033 background volumes. The 2033 Background Traffic Volumes for the intersection are shown in Figure 15.



Figure 14 - Approximate location of the future Payzant Drive connection



Figure 15: 2033 background volumes for the AM and PM peak hours at King Street

A level of service analysis has been completed for AM and PM peak hours using background traffic volumes to evaluate the impact the connection has on traffic operations. A summary of the intersection is shown Table 8. Though the southbound left turn movement experiences a level of service of F and high delays, it operates below capacity.

Table 8 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measured for 2033 King Street background traffic volumes.

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Volumes														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	King Street			King Street			Payzant Drive			Intersection			
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR		SBL	SBT	SBR
Vehicle Count		112	276			463	96				90		82	
v/c		0.12	0.00			0.00	0.00				0.39		0.15	
Delay (s)		9.0	0.0			0.0	0.0				30.1		12.5	4.26
LOS		A	A			A	A				D		B	A
95th% Queue (m)		2.98	0.0			0.0	0.0				13.2		3.9	
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Background Volumes														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	King Street			King Street			Payzant Drive			Intersection			
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR		SBL	SBT	SBR
Vehicle Count		109	478			567	89				94		125	
v/c		0.12	0			0	0				0.6		0.25	
Delay (s)		9.38	0			0	0				58.43		14.75	5.72
LOS		A	A			A	A				F		B	A
95th% Queue (m)		3.0	0.0			0.0	0.0				24.6		7.9	

4.3.2 Trip Distribution

Considering the distribution of site generated trips to the future intersection of Payzant Drive and King Street, we have assumed an even split between vehicles heading north and south. In this scenario there is 50% of site generated trips are assigned to the new intersection.

Distribution of trips at the future Payzant Drive and King Street intersection has been estimated using the distribution proposed in the 2021 Infrastructure Needs Assessment. The turning movement distribution at Payzant Drive and King Street is shown in Figure 16. The site generated trip distribution is shown in Figure 17.



Figure 16 - AM and PM distribution of traffic at the future Payzant Drive and King Street intersection




Figure 17 - Estimated distribution of site generated traffic at King Street

4.3.3 2033 Total Traffic Volumes

The 2033 Total Traffic Volumes result from 2033 Background volumes plus site-generated traffic added by the development. The 2033 Total Traffic Volumes are shown in Figure 18.





Figure 18 - 2033 future volumes for the AM and PM peak hours at King Street

A level of service analysis has been completed for AM and PM peak hours using total traffic volumes to evaluate the impact site generated traffic will have on the proposed intersection. A summary of the intersection is shown in Table 9. The southbound left turn movement experiences increased delay but still operates below capacity. The southbound right turn movement experiences a decrease in level of service from B to C due to site generated traffic.

From these results, we can conclude that site generated trips do not result in a significant impact on this intersection in the future scenario. The southbound left LOS 'F' for the PM Peak Hour is observed under both the future background growth and total traffic scenario and is not created by the new trips generated by this development. We recommend that once this intersection is constructed, the Municipality monitors the location to determine if traffic signals are warranted in the future.

Table 9 - Summary of AM & PM peak hour level of service measures for 2033 King Street total traffic volumes

AM Peak Hour - 2033 Future Volumes														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	King Street			King Street						Payzant Drive			Intersection
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Vehicle Count		125	276			463	103				111		104	
v/c		0.12	0.00			0.00	0.00				0.50		0.19	
Delay (s)		9.1	0.0			0.0	0.0				36.1		12.9	5.48
LOS		A	A			A	A				E		B	A
95th% Queue (m)		3.23	0.0			0.0	0.0				19.2		5.2	
PM Peak Hour - 2033 Future Volumes														
LOS Criteria	Intersection Control	King Street			King Street						Payzant Drive			Intersection
		EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Vehicle Count		130	478			567	106				104		140	
v/c		0.14	0			0	0				0.74		0.29	
Delay (s)		9.57	0			0	0				81.08		15.32	7.75
LOS		A	A			A	A				F		C	A
95th% Queue (m)		3.8	0.0			0.0	0.0				33.2		9.0	

4.3.4 Auxiliary Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Turn lane warrants are not required for this site until the extension to King Street has been completed.

The site access has been reviewed for a southbound left turn lane and a northbound right turn lane into the development for the future scenario with this connection made.

Left Turn Lane

Site generated trips and the anticipated trips at the Payzant Drive and King Street intersection were used to evaluate a left turn lane into the development. The MTO Design Supplement for TAC 2017 was used to identify the need for a left turn. Based on the analysis, a southbound left turn lane into the development is not warranted. This analysis is included in Appendix B.

Right Turn Lane

Site generated trips and the anticipated trips at the Payzant Drive and King Street intersection were used to evaluate a right turn lane into the development. The Ohio Department of Transportation's State Highway Access Management Manual right turn lane warrant analysis was used to identify the need for a right turn lane. Based on the analysis, a northbound right turn lane into the development is not warranted. This analysis is included in Appendix B.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were developed from this traffic impact study:

- The proposed development will add four mid-rise multi-unit buildings (280 units) and 18 townhouses for a total of 298 units.
- Townhouses will front Payzant Drive, and multi-unit buildings will be accessed from a driveway connecting to Payzant Drive.
- The proposed development is estimated to generate 112 two-way vehicle trips (29 entering and 83 exiting) in the AM peak hour and 126 two-way vehicle trips (76 entering and 50 exiting) in the PM peak hour.
- Sight distance was not measured at the proposed access locations since this street has not yet been constructed.
- The Payzant Drive and Wentworth Road intersection is the critical intersection for this analysis. The traffic analysis shows that northbound left turn movements exceed capacity in the AM peak hour under existing conditions.
- Two scenarios were evaluated for background and future conditions: the existing two-way stop control and a proposed roundabout. Northbound left turn movements continue to operate above capacity in the AM and PM peak hours under two-way stop control in the background and total traffic volumes. The intersection operates at a level of service F under total traffic volumes in the AM peak hour. These issues are resolved with the construction of the planned roundabout.
- The proposed Payzant Drive connection to King Street was evaluated for background and total traffic volumes. Under both scenarios, the southbound left turn movements operate below capacity but have high delays. The overall intersection operates at an acceptable level of service.
- Auxiliary left and right turn lanes entering the site are not warranted.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no recommended improvements to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development.

The street network, under future conditions, can accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development without upgrades beyond those already planned by the Municipality. We recommend that if the Payzant Drive extension is completed and a new intersection is constructed at King Street, the Municipality monitors the location to determine if traffic signals are warranted in the future.

APPENDIX A – VISTRO REPORTS

Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth

Control Type: Two-way stop
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 269.2
 Level Of Service: F
 Volume to Capacity (v/c): 1.122

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	65	1	170	1	1	1	1	395	230	295	420	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	67	1	175	1	1	1	1	407	237	304	433	5
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	17	0	44	0	0	0	0	102	59	76	108	1
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	67	1	175	1	1	1	1	407	237	304	433	5
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	1.12	0.01	0.32	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	269.21	56.67	14.82	108.79	64.59	13.39	8.21	0.00	0.00	10.64	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	F	B	F	F	B	A	A	A	B	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	5.49	1.43	1.43	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.41	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	41.81	10.93	10.93	1.07	1.07	1.07	0.02	0.00	0.00	10.72	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	85.13			62.26			0.01			4.36		
Approach LOS	F			F			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	14.77											
Intersection LOS	F											

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type: Two-way stop
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 92.3
 Level Of Service: F
 Volume to Capacity (v/c): 0.803

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	110	5	165	5	1	5	5	495	55	80	490	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	113	5	170	5	1	5	5	510	57	82	505	5
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	28	1	43	1	0	1	1	128	14	21	126	1
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	113	5	170	5	1	5	5	510	57	82	505	5
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	0.80	0.03	0.31	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	92.26	30.61	15.29	50.20	29.74	13.36	8.43	0.00	0.00	8.90	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	D	C	F	D	B	A	A	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	5.01	1.52	1.52	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	38.16	11.55	11.55	1.83	1.83	1.83	0.11	0.00	0.00	2.03	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	45.76			31.59			0.07			1.23		
Approach LOS	E			D			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	9.77											
Intersection LOS	F											

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type:	Two-way stop	Delay (sec / veh):	826.0
Analysis Method:	HCM 7th Edition	Level Of Service:	F
Analysis Period:	15 minutes	Volume to Capacity (v/c):	2.263

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	65	1	170	1	1	1	1	395	230	295	420	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	78	1	203	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	20	0	51	0	0	0	0	118	69	88	126	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	78	1	203	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	2.26	0.02	0.41	0.06	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	825.97	90.04	17.96	222.38	110.80	20.89	8.41	0.00	0.00	12.05	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	F	C	F	F	C	A	A	A	B	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	8.77	2.15	2.15	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.02	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	66.86	16.36	16.36	2.02	2.02	2.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	15.39	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	241.71			118.02			0.01			4.94		
Approach LOS	F			F			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	38.43											
Intersection LOS	F											

Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth

Control Type:	Two-way stop	Delay (sec / veh):	272.6
Analysis Method:	HCM 7th Edition	Level Of Service:	F
Analysis Period:	15 minutes	Volume to Capacity (v/c):	1.311

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↕			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	110	5	165	5	1	5	5	495	55	80	490	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	33	2	49	2	0	2	2	148	17	24	147	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	1.31	0.05	0.41	0.12	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	272.64	41.11	19.01	84.22	42.17	18.46	8.68	0.00	0.00	9.31	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	E	C	F	E	C	A	A	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	9.21	2.33	2.33	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	70.21	17.76	17.76	3.60	3.60	3.60	0.14	0.00	0.00	2.59	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	118.88			50.63			0.08			1.29		
Approach LOS	F			F			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	24.32											
Intersection LOS	F											

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type: Roundabout
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 13.6
 Level Of Service: B

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Lane Configuration	+			+			+r			+		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	65	1	470	1	1	1	1	395	230	295	420	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Proportion of CAVs [%]	0.00											
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	78	1	561	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	20	0	140	0	0	0	0	118	69	88	126	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	78	1	561	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Number of Conflicting Circulating Lanes	1			1			1			1		
Circulating Flow Rate [veh/h]	483			952			362			82		
Exiting Flow Rate [veh/h]	642			8			593			1055		
Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	78	1	561	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6
Adjusted Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	78	1	561	1	1	1	1	472	275	353	502	6

Lanes

Override Calculated Critical Headway	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Critical Headway [s]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Override Calculated Follow-Up Time	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Follow-Up Time [s]	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
A (intercept)	1380.00	1380.00	1420.00	1420.00	1380.00
B (coefficient)	0.00102	0.00102	0.00091	0.00091	0.00102
HV Adjustment Factor	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
Entry Flow Rate [veh/h]	653	4	483	281	879
Capacity of Entry and Bypass Lanes [veh/h]	843	523	1022	1022	1270
Pedestrian Impedance	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Capacity per Entry Lane [veh/h]	827	513	1002	1002	1245
X, volume / capacity	0.77	0.01	0.47	0.27	0.69

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

Lane LOS	C	A	A	A	B
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh]	7.74	0.02	2.58	1.12	5.98
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m]	58.96	0.13	19.69	8.55	45.59
Approach Delay [s/veh]	21.47	7.09	8.10		12.56
Approach LOS	C	A	A		B
Intersection Delay [s/veh]	13.60				
Intersection LOS	B				

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Roundabout
HCM 7th Edition
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:

9.4
A

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Lane Configuration	+			+			+r			+		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.00	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	110	5	165	5	1	5	5	495	55	80	490	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Proportion of CAVs [%]	0.00											
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	33	2	49	2	0	2	2	148	17	24	147	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Number of Conflicting Circulating Lanes	1			1			1			1		
Circulating Flow Rate [veh/h]	616			828			104			146		
Exiting Flow Rate [veh/h]	165			18			737			811		
Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6
Adjusted Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	131	6	197	6	1	6	6	592	66	95	586	6

Lanes

Override Calculated Critical Headway	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Critical Headway [s]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Override Calculated Follow-Up Time	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Follow-Up Time [s]	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
A (intercept)	1380.00	1380.00	1420.00	1420.00	1380.00
B (coefficient)	0.00102	0.00102	0.00091	0.00091	0.00102
HV Adjustment Factor	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
Entry Flow Rate [veh/h]	341	14	610	68	701
Capacity of Entry and Bypass Lanes [veh/h]	737	593	1292	1292	1190
Pedestrian Impedance	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Capacity per Entry Lane [veh/h]	722	582	1267	1267	1166
X, volume / capacity	0.46	0.02	0.47	0.05	0.59

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

Lane LOS	B	A	A	A	B
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh]	2.46	0.07	2.60	0.16	4.03
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m]	18.74	0.52	19.83	1.26	30.72
Approach Delay [s/veh]	11.53	6.45	7.28		10.36
Approach LOS	B	A	A		B
Intersection Delay [s/veh]	9.35				
Intersection LOS	A				

Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth

Control Type:	Two-way stop	Delay (sec / veh):	1,289.0
Analysis Method:	HCM 7th Edition	Level Of Service:	F
Analysis Period:	15 minutes	Volume to Capacity (v/c):	3.278

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	65	1	170	1	1	1	1	395	230	295	420	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	25	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	16	13	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	26	0	65	0	0	0	0	118	73	92	126	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	3.28	0.02	0.53	0.08	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	1288.99	100.59	21.56	324.14	128.27	28.57	8.41	0.00	0.00	12.41	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	F	C	F	F	D	A	A	A	B	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	12.13	3.34	3.34	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.19	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	92.44	25.48	25.48	2.65	2.65	2.65	0.02	0.00	0.00	16.70	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	379.43			160.32			0.01			5.19		
Approach LOS	F			F			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	71.55											
Intersection LOS	F											

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type: Two-way stop
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 539.9
 Level Of Service: F
 Volume to Capacity (v/c): 1.910

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Lane Configuration	↔			↑			↔			↔		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	60.00	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	25.00	30.48	30.48	80.00	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	110	5	165	5	1	5	5	495	55	80	490	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	20	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	30	46	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	38	2	57	2	0	2	2	148	24	35	147	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane	No	No		
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	1.91	0.06	0.48	0.18	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	539.92	50.75	21.86	126.65	57.56	25.80	8.68	0.00	0.00	9.70	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	F	C	F	F	D	A	A	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	13.26	3.11	3.11	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	101.05	23.70	23.70	5.24	5.24	5.24	0.14	0.00	0.00	4.19	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	226.03			74.79			0.08			1.87		
Approach LOS	F			F			A			A		
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	48.90											
Intersection LOS	F											

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type: Roundabout
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 11.0
 Level Of Service: B

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	+			+			+r			+		
Lane Configuration	+			+			+r			+		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.00	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	65	1	170	1	1	1	1	395	230	295	420	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Proportion of CAVs [%]	0.00											
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	25	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	16	13	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	26	0	65	0	0	0	0	118	73	92	126	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Number of Conflicting Circulating Lanes	1			1			1			1		
Circulating Flow Rate [veh/h]	483			990			375			107		
Exiting Flow Rate [veh/h]	671			8			618			749		
Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6
Adjusted Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	103	1	261	1	1	1	1	472	291	366	502	6

Lanes

Override Calculated Critical Headway	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Critical Headway [s]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Override Calculated Follow-Up Time	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Follow-Up Time [s]	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
A (intercept)	1380.00	1380.00	1420.00	1420.00	1380.00
B (coefficient)	0.00102	0.00102	0.00091	0.00091	0.00102
HV Adjustment Factor	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
Entry Flow Rate [veh/h]	373	4	483	297	892
Capacity of Entry and Bypass Lanes [veh/h]	843	503	1010	1010	1238
Pedestrian Impedance	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Capacity per Entry Lane [veh/h]	827	493	990	990	1213
X, volume / capacity	0.44	0.01	0.48	0.29	0.72

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

Lane LOS	A	A	A	A	B
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh]	2.28	0.02	2.64	1.23	6.68
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m]	17.40	0.14	20.12	9.39	50.92
Approach Delay [s/veh]	9.97	7.38	8.29		13.81
Approach LOS	A	A	A		B
Intersection Delay [s/veh]	11.00				
Intersection LOS	B				

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 1: Payzant at Wentworth**

Control Type: Roundabout
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 10.5
 Level Of Service: B

Intersection Setup

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Approach	+			+			+r			+		
Lane Configuration	+			+			+r			+		
Turning Movement	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right	Left	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.00	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28			48.28			48.28			48.28		
Grade [%]	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
Crosswalk	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		

Volumes

Name	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound		
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	110	5	165	5	1	5	5	495	55	80	490	5
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300	1.0300
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Proportion of CAVs [%]	0.00											
Growth Factor	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600	1.1600
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	20	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	30	46	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	38	2	57	2	0	2	2	148	24	35	147	2
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0			0			0			0		

Intersection Settings

Number of Conflicting Circulating Lanes	1			1			1			1		
Circulating Flow Rate [veh/h]	616			896			151			166		
Exiting Flow Rate [veh/h]	243			18			758			842		
Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6
Adjusted Demand Flow Rate [veh/h]	151	6	227	6	1	6	6	592	96	141	586	6

Lanes

Override Calculated Critical Headway	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Critical Headway [s]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Override Calculated Follow-Up Time	No	No	No	No	No
User-Defined Follow-Up Time [s]	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
A (intercept)	1380.00	1380.00	1420.00	1420.00	1380.00
B (coefficient)	0.00102	0.00102	0.00091	0.00091	0.00102
HV Adjustment Factor	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
Entry Flow Rate [veh/h]	392	14	610	98	748
Capacity of Entry and Bypass Lanes [veh/h]	737	554	1238	1238	1165
Pedestrian Impedance	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Capacity per Entry Lane [veh/h]	722	543	1214	1214	1142
X, volume / capacity	0.53	0.02	0.49	0.08	0.64

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

Lane LOS	B	A	A	A	B
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh]	3.17	0.07	2.81	0.26	4.91
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m]	24.18	0.56	21.43	1.96	37.39
Approach Delay [s/veh]	13.18	6.92	7.63		11.83
Approach LOS	B	A	A		B
Intersection Delay [s/veh]	10.48				
Intersection LOS	B				

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 3: Payzant at King**

Control Type:	Two-way stop	Delay (sec / veh):	30.1
Analysis Method:	HCM 7th Edition	Level Of Service:	D
Analysis Period:	15 minutes	Volume to Capacity (v/c):	0.389

Intersection Setup

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Approach						
Lane Configuration	↵↵		↵		↵	
Turning Movement	Left	Right	Left	Thru	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	1	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28		48.28		48.28	
Grade [%]	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Crosswalk	Yes		Yes		Yes	

Volumes

Name						
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	86	78	112	264	443	92
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	90	82	117	276	463	96
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	23	21	29	69	116	24
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	90	82	117	276	463	96
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0		0		0	

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane			
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	0.39	0.15	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	30.10	12.49	9.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	D	B	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	1.74	0.51	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	13.23	3.87	2.98	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	21.70		2.69		0.00	
Approach LOS	C		A		A	
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	4.26					
Intersection LOS	D					

**Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 3: Payzant at King**

Control Type: Two-way stop
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 58.4
 Level Of Service: F
 Volume to Capacity (v/c): 0.605

Intersection Setup

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Approach						
Lane Configuration	↵↵		↵		↵	
Turning Movement	Left	Right	Left	Thru	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	1	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28		48.28		48.28	
Grade [%]	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Crosswalk	Yes		Yes		Yes	

Volumes

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	90	120	104	457	542	85
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	94	125	109	478	567	89
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	24	31	27	120	142	22
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	94	125	109	478	567	89
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0		0		0	

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane			
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	0.60	0.25	0.12	0.00	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	58.43	14.75	9.38	0.00	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	B	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	3.23	1.00	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	24.62	7.59	3.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	33.50		1.74		0.00	
Approach LOS	D		A		A	
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	5.72					
Intersection LOS	F					

Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 3: Payzant at King

Control Type:	Two-way stop	Delay (sec / veh):	36.1
Analysis Method:	HCM 7th Edition	Level Of Service:	E
Analysis Period:	15 minutes	Volume to Capacity (v/c):	0.497

Intersection Setup

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Approach						
Lane Configuration	↵↵		↵		↵	
Turning Movement	Left	Right	Left	Thru	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	1	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28		48.28		48.28	
Grade [%]	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Crosswalk	Yes		Yes		Yes	

Volumes

Name						
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	86	78	112	264	443	92
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	21	22	8	0	0	7
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	111	104	125	276	463	103
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	28	26	31	69	116	26
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	111	104	125	276	463	103
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0		0		0	

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane			
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	0.50	0.19	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	36.09	12.89	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	E	B	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	2.52	0.68	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	19.17	5.15	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	24.86		2.83		0.00	
Approach LOS	C		A		A	
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	5.48					
Intersection LOS	E					

Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 3: Payzant at King

Control Type: Two-way stop
 Analysis Method: HCM 7th Edition
 Analysis Period: 15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh): 81.1
 Level Of Service: F
 Volume to Capacity (v/c): 0.739

Intersection Setup

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Approach						
Lane Configuration	↵↵		↵		↵	
Turning Movement	Left	Right	Left	Thru	Thru	Right
Lane Width [m]	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.66
No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket	0	1	1	0	0	0
Entry Pocket Length [m]	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48	30.48
No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exit Pocket Length [m]	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Speed [km/h]	48.28		48.28		48.28	
Grade [%]	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Crosswalk	Yes		Yes		Yes	

Volumes

Name	Southbound		Eastbound		Westbound	
Base Volume Input [veh/h]	90	120	104	457	542	85
Base Volume Adjustment Factor	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457	1.0457
Heavy Vehicles Percentage [%]	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Growth Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
In-Process Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site-Generated Trips [veh/h]	10	15	21	0	0	17
Diverted Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Trips [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Volume [veh/h]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hourly Volume [veh/h]	104	140	130	478	567	106
Peak Hour Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Other Adjustment Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h]	26	35	33	120	142	27
Total Analysis Volume [veh/h]	104	140	130	478	567	106
Pedestrian Volume [ped/h]	0		0		0	

Intersection Settings

Priority Scheme	Stop	Free	Free
Flared Lane			
Storage Area [veh]	0	0	0
Two-Stage Gap Acceptance	No		
Number of Storage Spaces in Median	0	0	0

Movement, Approach, & Intersection Results

V/C, Movement V/C Ratio	0.74	0.29	0.14	0.00	0.01	0.00
d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh]	81.08	15.32	9.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
Movement LOS	F	C	A	A	A	A
95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln]	4.35	1.18	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.00
95th-Percentile Queue Length [m/ln]	33.18	8.96	3.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh]	43.35		2.05		0.00	
Approach LOS	E		A		A	
d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh]	7.75					
Intersection LOS	F					

APPENDIX B – AUXILIARY TURN LANE WARRANTS

Estimated Left Turning Traffic Scenarios for Proposed Development

Data and Assumptions:

Posted Speed: 50 km/h
Design Speed: 60 km/h

Assume 50% of site generated trips turn left into development

Assume 50/50 split from development


Left turn volume= 15 (based off Trip Generation rates)

V_A = Southbound volume + Left turn volume

V_O = Northbound volume

2033 Future Traffic Volumes

2-way Peak Hour Volume = 415 vph
 V_A = 187 vph
 V_O = 228 vph
% Left Turns in V_A = 8%



Estimated Left Turning Traffic Scenarios for Proposed Development

Data and Assumptions:

Posted Speed: 50 km/h
Design Speed: 60 km/h


Assume 50% of site generated trips turn right into development

Right Turn Volume = 38 (based off Trip Generation rates)

V_A = Northbound Volume
 V_O = Southbound Volume

2033 Future Traffic Volumes

2-way Peak Hour Volume = 493 vph
 V_A = 236 vph
 V_O = 257 vph



Estimated Left Turning Traffic Scenarios for Proposed Development

Data and Assumptions:

Posted Speed: 50 km/h
Design Speed: 60 km/h

Assume 50% of site generated trips turn left into development

Left turn volume= 38 (based off Trip Generation rates)

V_A = Southbound volume + Left turn volume

V_O = Northbound volume

2033 Future Traffic Volumes

2-way Peak Hour Volume = 493 vph
 V_A = 257 vph
 V_O = 236 vph
% Left Turns in V_A = 15%

