

**From:** Phil Corkum  
**To:** Janice Harland  
**CC:** Alok Wadhawan  
**Date:** 3/7/2006 5:13 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Highway 103 - HRM Planning

Janice:

This is a good response. We would never commit to not building an interchange this early in the planning process (I believe they have started the field survey but we have not really started any planning yet). We will be facing some very challenging and expensive land access issues in this section and we don't know what will be required at this point.

Phil

>>> Janice Harland 3/7/2006 12:03 PM >>>

Phil,

I'm writing to recap my conversation this morning with Maureen Ryan of HRM Regional Planning.

I confirmed that we hadn't been recently approached for an interchange on Highway 103 between Exits 5 and 6 but that it is a long stretch between the two interchanges and provided one could be designed and located appropriately we wouldn't be against one being built. I also advised that some interchanges are built at the developers expense and some are built by the Department because we need to replace an existing at-grade access.

→ It is not consistent with HRM's Regional Plan to create growth in this area. She wanted to know if the Province would agree to not build an interchange in support of their planning strategy. I said it was a question I couldn't answer on behalf of the Department but that interchanges are typically built in reaction to development pressures and that I thought land development regulations are the means by which HRM can direct where they wish development to occur. She agreed but said that once an interchange is built, political decisions can be made with respect to development that can divert their plans.

I told her that as part of any twinning in this area that we would need to replace existing entrance points, such as the Bowater driveway with alternate access which could be an interchange or could be a parallel access road. She asked when this might happen and I said we hadn't started the planning and she wanted to know the time frame for twinning in this area. I said I'd only be guessing if I were to name a timeline but that it wasn't imminent and that you could provide better information.

→ In summary, I think they would like to have TPW commit to supporting the Regional Plan by committing to not building an interchange in this area. I said I didn't think we were in the business of directing where development should go by adding or withholding interchanges but suggested that if she wanted a definitive answer on whether or not the department would make this commitment that she should contact you.

If any of this information should to be corrected or clarified with Maureen, please let me know.

Janice