

**Fall River Community Planning Group Meeting**  
George P. Vanier Cafeteria, 1410 Fall River Road, Fall River



June 1, 2011  
7:00 pm

**Present**

Michael Creighton – Chair of Community Planning Group  
Jim Simon  
Sandra cower  
Bill London  
Ann McCarron  
Gary Dease  
Paul Burris  
Al McKenzie  
Bill Williams  
Bill Horne  
Barry Dalrymple – HRM Councillor  
Robin Stewart  
Owen Evans

**Staff**

Maureen Ryan, HRM Senior Planner  
Scott LeBlanc, HRM Planning Technician  
Lisa Webb, HRM Planning Controller  
Dave McCusker, Traffic

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm.

Introductions were made by Michael Creighton – Chair of Community Planning Group. Michael turned it over to Maureen to give a quick overview on the watershed study.

In Spring 2011 (March 31 and April 2) we presented the proposed draft municipal planning strategy for the river lakes secondary plan area. Focus at the time was on the Village Center and that's the area from Rolland down to Sobeyes down to the Vegitorium; your commercial core if you wish. Intent was to come up with some design requirements to achieve the look and feel that Fall River has been seeking and what was heard in the visioning process was to maintain the rural village feel of the Fall River area. Phase II of the municipal planning is due to commence in the Fall. Plan is to get the village center ideas approved by Council first because that is the area that has the greatest impact on the community at large. Idea was to develop a very detailed plan and get approved by Council and then we can work on

Phase II which covers the greater Fall River Area from Wellington over Windsor Junction down to Lakeview over to Miller Lake. In this Phase of the process, we plan to look at how density may be allocated throughout this area within the confines of the receiving waters of your lakes and what infrastructure improvements (transportation and central water) will be needed to accommodate it. However, there is an urgent need for senior citizen housing in Fall River area. The Committee received a number of requests to allow multiple and townhouse developments throughout various locations within the Plan Area before the Open Houses were held on March and April of 2011. Since then we have had more. The Fall River Community Planning Group decided to host a series of meetings to review those proposals on June 6<sup>th</sup> and the 13<sup>th</sup>. Before doing so, the Committee asked that we set up this meeting tonight to present the findings of Shubenacadie Lakes Watershed site and the Fall River transportation study to give us context on the current constraints within the Fall River area so that you will know what limitations there are in the system before the Committee makes the difficult decisions.

Monday June 6 will start to hear from the developers the first of which would be on the lands of Laurie Baker request to commit development at a rate of 4 units/acre that would be an increase from the present allowable density which is 1 unit/acre. The second proposer Ziyad Chediak to increase the permitted density of the land adjacent to Sobeys from the permitted to 1 unit/acre to anywhere between 6-10 units/acre he has a small 6 acre site. The third request we are going to hear is from Lawrence Tench who would like to allow for a mix housing and commercial development on 19 & 21 MacPherson Rd.

On June 13 will hear proposals from Chris MacAulay concerning Charleswood Development in Windsor Junction he is seeking an increase in density from 1 unit./acre to 2 units/acre for the townhouse component of his project. We will hear from Ron Nelson, Inn keeper on Inn on the Lake, who is seeking accommodations under the existing MPS (Municipal Planning Strategy) that was approved in 1989. At the time Halifax County was really concerned about the impact on sewage treatment on the lake. Also wastewater treatment technology was in its infancy and the Municipality or the County of Halifax was concerned that it would have had to take them over plants that were inefficiently designed and costly to upgrade. The 1989 Plan prohibited all future multiple unit dwellings however there were a few sites in the area that had an oversized treatment system for which the Plan allows Council to consider multiple unit dwellings on those sites. This includes the lands of the Inn on the Lake, the former Fort Scenic Hotel and the Ashburn Golf Course. Nova Scotia Power has a presentation concerning their response to the proposed sewage gateway zone which is the Farmers Clem and Asplundh sites. Perry Lake Estates is seeking a development of 4 units/acre to allow for 120 multiple unit complex and a commercial component and self-storage facility.

The line-up is: Perry Lake Estates, Baker Site, the Charleswood site, the Chediak site north of Sobeys and the Inn on the Lake.

The Shubenacadie Lake Study was undertaken by the former Jacques Whitford Limited a team of Hydrogeologists, Engineers and Ecologist and ABL Engineering and Center for the Water Resource Study to prepare this study which was concluded in 2007 but was updated again in 2009 because there was a discovery of an error in one of the models. Objective of the study was to identify ethological constraints, and opportunities for development within the Shubenacadie Lake watershed, to examine servicing options, water and sewer in certain areas not all areas and determine the impact on the roads in the Fall River rural core center what we are calling the River Lakes Secondary Plan area.

In terms of the ethological assessment there were two categories of constraints identified. One were legislative constraints, Category 1 those are the areas set aside by legislation either at the municipal, provincial or federal level that are worthy of protection from development. Second Category is Non-Legislative constraints where Cultural Resources should be protected.

Within the Fall River area Category 1 constraints include the Shubenacadie Canal birds' migratory corridor, a 200 meter buffer minimum set back from the lake to maintain the shores. Fresh water wetlands designated old growth areas in the Northeast corner.

Category 2 constraints include the Shubenacadie Corridor which is a migratory corridor for birds and rockland areas. Forrest cover plays vital role in maintaining water quality. Regulating water flows within the study areas. The soil in the area is combination of Wolfville and Bridgewater soil and presents management challenges; these areas are highly erodible when exposed.

Key Recommendation from Ecological constraints component of this study is the retention of the 200 meter buffer along the Grand Lake natural corridor and restrict land clear on the Rockland site. They're not saying sterilize development within the corridor but they are saying low impact. It is your migratory bird corridor it is the reason for being for Fall River. It is a cultural corridor with the historic canal system. Also an area that houses significant archeologically sites it is the main transportation system for the Mi'maq.

Municipal servicing options: we examined those, we created scenarios. The commercial development scenario for the village center looked at low density scenario of 2 persons/acre a total of 244 people would constitute 31 additional units in the village center. Medium density scenario that would be 16 persons/acre would constitute 1700 people in total 1 additional 670 units. Those were early days for the village center when we were looking at 16 person/acre we have since scaled back. This was the start-up of the planning process.

The low density central wastewater servicing option that was looked were to upgrade the Lockview MacPherson plant or to construct a new sewage treatment plant. Terms of cost converting the wastewater treatment plant only in the village center to a membrane bioreactor process was someone in the order of \$5 billion or \$50,000/property the two other options looked at were reactor with either pressure sewer or gravity sewer would cost in the order of \$3.1-4.9 million the pressure sewer being the cheaper option but they cost the property on a low density option \$41,000-66,000/property and the last option was the recirculating sand filter and pressure sewer collection system at a cost of \$3.6 million or \$50,000/property.

The medium density central wastewater option construct a new sewage treatment plant either a sequencing batch reactor or the membrane bioreactor. The capital costs for constructing the sequencing batch reactor would be \$12 million or \$20,000/unit. The membrane bioreactor would be \$11.9 million or 19,570/unit if were to construct a new sewage treatment plant. The difficulty with this option is 1989 the Lockview MacPherson plant was constructed to service the existing development along Lockview Rd. and some of the central core area and the people who would be paying for that sewage treatment plant have already paid for a sewage treatment plant a long time ago. This is a decision that we will have to bring to council in Phase II of this planning process if they want to pursue said option.

In terms of central water services we looked at low density commercial option the total cost of constructing it would be \$61.4 million, \$18,000/unit. The commercial district medium density would be 64 million or \$15,000/property. The traditional design areas under growth management plan they are allowed to develop at a rate of 25 lots/year. There are 125 lots that are approved out of 800 potential. 25/year is slow and gradual. Traditional design in area is 1 unit/acre which would bring in addition population of about 3,000 or 1,000 units the open space design option which is another scenario that we looked which is cluster development in a more concentrated area and set aside larger area for green space retention would develop at a rate of 1 unit/1.62 acres bringing the same population and the same number of units.

Growth management wastewater option we only looked at onsite septic system in this area only and for traditional onsite septic system the cost would be \$20,000/unit. For an open space design septic it would be serviced by a recirculating sand filter treatment plant within would be reduced \$8,700/unit. In this area central sewer is not an option, in terms of receiving water as there is no place to discharge.

Growth center one option servicing existing would be \$61 million or \$18,000/unit the traditional subdivision design scenario together with servicing existing development would be \$99.6 million or \$23,000/unit. Under the growth center open space subdivision it would be reduced to \$89 million or \$20,000/unit.

#### Turned attention to impact on the lakes.

1993 Vaughan Engineering study local residents told them that an aesthetic pleasing lake system that could be used for water based recreation. Criteria that requires an Oligotrophic or Mesotrophic to be maintained. Maureen explained the two terms: Oligotrophic status means the lake is at a fairly pristine state, the water quality is highly oxygenated; you have no algae in system that is the more pristine condition. As you escalate ages naturally to a Mesotrophic status that is when you see periodic algae blooms arising which create nuisance affects not only for boaters but for water intake system and they can be toxic, especially for those who are drawing well water from a lake for water consumption. The Eutrophic status is when you have algae growth more frequently and they do carry toxins and then the lake becomes aged and more green permanently and you start to see a lot of growth around the perimeter or a shallow lake in the center of the lake. This is a natural process of evaluation which should take 1000's of years but because of human impact from fertilizers, transport of phosphorous from onsite septic systems that are within 1000 ft. of the lake that can happen more rapidly within decades.

#### Talk about impacts of development on the Lake.

The lake carrying capacity model taken in this study. Five lakes were model they included Charles, William, Thomas, Fletcher and Grand. The parameters measured were phosphorus, trophic and bacteria. Baseline samplings were taken in June 2007 and August 2007. Trophic status of the lake is young. Many lakes are at 10 micrograms per litre (pristine condition). If your under 10 micrograms per litre you have pristine conditions. Mesotrophic if you're at 20 micrograms per liter require water treatment devices. Eutrophic a very aged range of algae bloom toxins. All lakes according to the study are Oligotrophic. Lake Charles, William and Fletcher are near the boundary to turnover to Mesotrophic they are at the 10 micrograms threshold. Based on existing development we already have within 1000 ft. of the lake it's predicted that within 25 years if nothing is done Lake Williams and Lake Thomas will

become mid-range Mesotrophic. Lake Fletcher will become upper range Mesotrophic and Lake Charles and Grand Lake will become upper range Oligotrophic.

Prosperous effects on Lake Thomas for commercial medium density scenario (higher end) would move the lake from mid to upper range mesotrophic the commercial low density scenario would increase slightly to hover to the mid mesotrophic range. Traditional development growth center scenario Lake Thomas is unaffected by this. Only looked at commercial development or residential development. Possibly will remodelling with the two combined. Lake Fletcher in the upper range mesotrophic. Prosperous effects on Grand Lake commercial district low density the lake would maintain its oligotrophic status. The growth center to the North would bring the lake into the low mesotrophic range. Implications of trophic levels would be taste and odour problems, toxins causing gastrointestinal problems, large algae population, nuisance around docks, safety hazards on fish and fish habitat.

The commercial district low and medium density scenarios are predicted to have negligible impacts on the receiving waters in terms of microbial conditions. Traditional development growth center scenarios if centralized water management are used significant reduction. E-coli levels within Lake Fletcher at certain times will well above the main levels.

Total suspended solids effects on commercial medium density scenarios 10% increase in PSF not significant. Commercial low density scenario no impact. Traditional development growth center 30% increase in Lake Fletcher will not increase levels.

There are inherent risks; development within the area sounds to be unsustainable there's water drawdown in your groundwater. Contaminants include road salt, malfunction septic systems, petroleum storage tanks, urban chemicals, and active drainage of the pyritic slate.

Aquifer vulnerability – northern portion of Fall River growth center is a vulnerable area.

Hydrologist examined 872 well logs from 1951 to 2006 shows the depth of wells have been steadily increasing since 1951. Depth of the water table has been declining. This trend has been observed in Wellington, Fletchers Lake, Fall River communities. Up to 2002 well drillers reported 94 wells were deepened due to declining yields. Additional well deepening has been reported since that time.

### Recommendation

Restrict land development density

Establish storm water management practices to recharge groundwater

Restrict land clearing

Undertake long term monitoring

No further develop of onsite wells should occur

Recommended future density is 1 unit/1.62 acres but preferred 1 unit/acre

Open space subdivision on cluster system – typical 50 lot subdivision on a central well would mean 2-4 drill bedrock pumping wells. This is the preferred approach.

Promote strategy landscaping

Water conservation opportunities

He recommends that central water service is recommended if it has to be developed but if not possible it is recommended that further study be undertaken to determine if further development will negatively

impact groundwater resources in the area. Rockland soils is not suitable. We need legislative authority to access groundwater impact which the municipality now has as of the spring of 2010.

Open space design alternatives the study suggest in the area where you have depth soils along Kinsac Lake maximum density in this area is suggested to be 1 unit/1.62 acres and central water option which would cost \$10 million less if you were to develop in this location versus in the upper Rockland area. This is that HRM will have to consider.

#### Where to go from here

Regional Council has not seen or accepted this report at this time. A presentation will be made to Regional Council in the Fall. Recommending that the plan take place in two phases beginning with the adoption of a Plan for the Village Center and phase two would deal with the great Fall River area. Look at where and how we can allocate density. Proceed with the adoption of the village center plan under the village center plan we have scaled back the amount of committed development that is currently allowed. Need to retain vegetation and groundwater recharge. Establish regulations for architectural design landscaping and lighting, and consider low scale multiple unit house in 3 opportunity sites by a development agreement. Establish a policy for future development of trail systems. This is phase I.

To preserve your water shed work with local environmental watershed society. It will take a concerted effort of everyone.

#### Transportation Study Results were reviewed next

The way that these studies are approached is to map out potential growth in the study area involving Fall River and Waverly area to determine how much traffic that is going to generate and where that traffic expected to go and lay that on top of the existing road way network to determine where there is problems and what the correction needs to be.

One clear observation is that there is really only 1 access point for a majority of the trips that generated in the traffic thru this area which is at the Fall River interchange at highway 102. Looked at individual intersection on whether traffic signals are needed or not. There potential 2 intersections which need signal control added. They also determined that 3 intersections that have concerns with growth but also have performance concerns today or the near future with a small amount of growth.

When there are problems in a particular area there are two ways to address it 1 is to add more capacity or build extra lanes at the facility so that it can perform better another option is to undertake another project somewhere else that would draw existing traffic away from that problem area. The study did come up with suggestions on both and dealing with new interchange access to the area was one of the medium term recommendations. Some of the interchange locations really didn't work well. One suggestion was to build a little bit more capacity into the existing operation. The other suggestion was create new interchange access at either point A (Existing Aerotech Interchange) or point C existing location where Cobequid Rd underpasses highway 102 and add ramps there.

Now actively looking at opportunities to preserve our ability to make connections at either A or C. We haven't determine the best fit in the longer term for us but we are taking measures to allow us to make those connections when needed.

### Questions:

The following questions came from a gentleman that did not state his name.

Q: What area would Option A connect to highway #2?

A: Connects to the existing Holland Rd and use existing access points.

Q: How will they decide?

A: A lot will depend whether growth is allowable or acceptable in the area. It is expensive and ineffective to build a long section of roadway unless you can use it to perform development.

Q: Do you have plans where the roads come to?

A: No we don't have that. It is high level conceptual. There was a vision of the Department of Transportation that the interchange at Aerotech that was left for connection. There is a conceptual corridor but details studies have been undertaken where that road or alignment should be. Council would have to decide where roads would go before we could get into that level of detail. Can't undertake a detailed study until we know where the roads are going to go and that would be in Phase II.

### Wayne Stobo – Waverley

Q: Modeling looked at community growth versus commercial side and you were modelling together right. So we know both are going to produce loading. Would it be the intent or would council consider doing a second phase of the modelling before making a decision. The report basically says that any development is going to have an effect on loading the system. We all know loading is cumulative. So will they consider that before they make a decision?

A: The committee has decided and the regional plan has decided that the center for growth is in the village center because that is the area that benefits everyone. The committee had looked at this and said development in the center right now we have no regulations pertaining to architecture, lighting, or landscaping etc. So we need to get that in place first so let's make improvements to the best of our ability along the way. The committee's proposal right now is to recommend the planning strategy that they presented to the public with adjustments based on public input to council later this summer. Phase II of this we will have to model the impact of the traditional road scenario on the receiving waters together with commercial development. We modeled in 2009 a selected scenario #5 which was about 2/3 the amount of development that we had modeled under the 16 persons/acre so it was less than that. With the proposed regulations that we are putting in place the village main street area for example, the biggest change is 50% of the site would have to be retained as pervious service, right now there is no requirement for the retention of anything. Throughout the C2 commercial zone which extends from Graves Lane to Fall River Rd is C2 zone and it permits development up to 10,000 sq. ft. The proposal is to allow development up to 8,000 sq. ft. on two floors with a maximum footprint of 4,000 sq. ft. on the ground floor that is how you get your 50% pervious surface. The interchange which is currently zoned C4 there is no limitation on size except what the site can bear in terms of onsite septic systems. We are proposing a limitation of 10,000 sq. ft. with a maximum 5,000 building footprint and a retention of 50% of pervious surface.

Q: You talked about low or medium density but we have a number of areas that already have a development agreements which I suspect don't coincide in many ways with the recommended areas. Is the total expanded development to the area already consumed by all the development agreements that are in place?

A: We have models Sobeys and all the other potential developments that could occur at the 16 persons/acre in that area so what we are proposing ultimately is less than what we had modelled.

Q: Which includes the current ones?

A: Yes it includes Sobeys is the only one with the development agreement. Inn on the Lake that may have a development agreement pursuant to policy P68 which is that policy that was developed in 1989 allowing for consideration of multiple unit dwellings on properties that had an oversized septic. The big question for this committee is how much more development should that allow in light of the constraints.

Nathan Rogers - Halifax

Q: Question is based on the numbers you gave on the water services. In the range of \$89 million for the central water services.

A: That is if we had a cluster development proposed would be \$99 million if we developed the entire northern portion of the plan area on the bases of traditional water design.

Q: So that number is for the entire plan?

A: Right.

Jens Jenson – Consultant with NS Power

Q: In the media recently there has been some mention study of the transportation corridor from Fall River to Exit 5 to Windsor St in Halifax can you tell us a bit about what the objectives are.

A: Sure it is a corridor study for highway 102 and Bayers Rd. a trunk from this interchange to Windsor St in Halifax. Primarily it is to determine ultimately how many lanes needed on both highway 102 and Bayers Rd. It looks at interchanges along the way and what needs to be done in terms ramps. It doesn't include this intersection it goes up to but not including Fall River interchange but it does give guidance on additional requirements on highway 102. Study is scheduled to be tabled with transportation stand committee on June 25<sup>th</sup> then it would go to Regional Council after that.

Charles Baker – Fall River

Q: Expand slightly on question that Nathan Rogers asked as I was at a number of the meetings an estimate was recently done and that was privy at that time was \$4.3 million to do study.

A: Very accurate that was for a 16" main coming down the Fall River Rd that wasn't the feeder system. When you start to go into the northern portion the reason the costs start to rise because you need booster station and reservoir and that \$500,000 for a reservoir at the top of the hills in back of St Andrew. That kind of structure you're talking about to try and get the water out that far. Just to bring a main down Fall River Rd. Halifax Water had estimated \$4 million.

Councillor Dalrymple spoke: there are 3 estimates put forward about a year-year and half ago there are three locations water could come off the Windsor junction rd. it could come out of two different locations in the village. The estimate (“stressed estimate”) a year and half ago range from \$4.3 - \$6.1 million. That is one line coming down the Fall River Rd. (A) to Sobeyes and (B) to Lockview. Whereas the \$89 million is to do every street, every subdivision.

Wayne Stobo, Waverley

Q: Sewage treatment plants when you mentioned earlier about the membrane systems. To be clear will they all provide tertiary treatment?

A: Valerie Williams responded that Yes they would.

Q: In reading the report it appears that they are saying there is excess capacity available in the Lockview sewage treatment plant did I misread that?

A: No what I think they were talking about is that there is sufficient land a little bit more land at the Lockview MacPherson plant to possibly expand the plant but not by much. There really isn't any excess capacity this system was designed for a certain number of units there are some lots left that haven't been developed yet within that servicing boundary.

Nathan Rogers - Halifax

Q: With regards to the 2 density number – low/medium density where the 2.2 units/acre and 16 units/acre for medium density. Who established that 2.2 was low and 16 was medium?

A: That was the early days and that came from the regional plan we did a settlement pattern analysis. That medium density scenario 16 persons/acre that medium density that would be relative to Bedford and Sackville in Fall River that is not what constitutes medium density so we have learned. That would be high density for Fall River.

Our next meeting in this series will be Monday June 6.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:16 pm.