

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



June 6, 2011
7:00 pm

Present

Michael Creighton – Chair of Community Planning Group
Valerie Williams
Bob Guscott
Jacqueline Steudler
Keith Manchester
Jim Simons
Sandra Carr
Bill Munden
Joy Gouge
Anna McCarron
Barry Dalrymple
Al MacKenzie

Staff

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm.

Michael requested that people complete the sign in sheet including their contact information. Welcome from Michael. This is a presentations/proposal by developers. This is an information only meeting.

Maureen introduced herself working with Fall River community planning group for 3 years to try and develop a proposed draft municipal planning strategy for Fall River area. We are at a point where we presented in the Spring of 2011 a draft municipal planning strategy. We posted it online. The address is at the bottom of the agenda. At this juncture in the process we held open houses on March 31st and April 2nd and we heard feedback from a great number of people about what they like and didn't like about the draft plan for the village center.

We heard from the community a high degree of desire to permit multiple unit housing in various locations throughout Fall River to service the needs of senior citizens and other residents who need access to rental or accommodations or otherwise. The committee wasn't supposed to be making

decisions on increasing density in the Fall River area at this juncture because it has undertaken a watershed study which tells us that the groundwater table of the area is under a high degree of stress and there is a need of extension of water services to various areas in the Fall River area and Windsor Junction of Wellington. That is something that we need to bring forward to Regional Council and consider in Phase II of the planning process. However because of the immediate need for senior for housing, the committee has been approach by a number of developers to allow for multiple unit housing developments in various locations in Fall River under Phase I of the planning process. One of the sites is situated to the north side and the east side (just behind) Sobeys. Another, not senior housing per say but adult housing, would be on the site of the Inn on the Lake where the developer would like to develop a condo development. Another area is the lands of Laurie Baker which is on the Fall River Rd. Another area is in Perry Lake Estates, at the end of Ingram Dr. before Cobequid Rd. The committee having received these requests decided it would hold these meetings, to have developers present their proposals. Under the draft plan the committee initially proposed to allow something in the order of 2 units/acre on the lands of Laurie Baker in light of the surrounding low density residential community and the fact that the area is outside the municipal water service area and the groundwater table is constrained and the transportation system at the intersection of Fall River Rd and Highway #2 is so congested during peak AM and PM traffic. The Committee also previously looked at the Perry Lake Estates development and if that development could have access to the Cobequid Rd. direct access, it wouldn't impact development in the Fall River area at that intersection of Fall River Rd and Highway #2, so they recommended 4 units/acre on that site. On the Charleswood site, in Windsor Junction, they recommended 1 unit/acre and made provisions to allow a townhouse component as part of this proposed single unit dwelling development.

We have 3 developers here to present their proposals tonight. This includes Ziyad Chediak who will be presenting the proposal for the lands around Sobeys, Nathan Rogers who will be presenting on behalf of Laurie Baker and Lawrence Tench who has a proposed development on MacPherson Road.

The committee won't be making a decision tonight. It will be hearing all proposals from all the developers first so it can consider the impact of all those proposed developments on the surrounding area.

Meetings will be scheduled later in June for the committee to deliberate all proposals.

First on the agenda we have Nathan Rogers who is the consultant for Laurie Baker. He will give us a presentation on the Fall river Rd. project.

Laurie Baker wanted to say a few words before Nathan began his presentation.

Laurie asked if the public would be allowed to ask questions since there are a number of people here who have a lot of interest in these presentations? Michael said it wasn't planned, it was supposed to be just the presentations, just gathering facts. Laurie stated that the citizens would be disappointed if not allow to pose questions. It was decided that questions would be allowed at the end of each presentation for a limited amount of time.

Laurie stated that the number of people in the audience was indicative on how crucial housing is or lack of housing is in the Fall River area. He complimented the committee for his land being chosen as a

potential site for alternative housing. In 2005 Nancy McDonald collected over 1800 signatures on a petition for an apartment on the Carr property.

Laurie stated that the density of 2 units/acre, as suggested at this point, is totally unacceptable. First of all it is not financially feasible. Talking about infrastructure, roads, water, the seniors would like underground parking which is concrete construction, all added costs and based on 2 units/acre that doesn't work. Number 2, these seniors tonight and many more have a list they call their waiting list. 2 unit density will not even meet those or even half meet those demands. Number 3, when a group limits a low density to a property, it creates a low supply but there is a big demand. So what it creates is rich people - those in the upper income they will end up buying or renting units. Middle class will be left out of the picture. On March 31, when I attended a future planning workshop, the group asked for individuals to participate in a round table discussion at the time. Three developers, Larry Gibson, Laurie Baker and Chris Macaulay, along with 12 seniors had an informal discussion and informal voting. Their suggestion as registered with Michael Creighton was "you are all aware of those of our group are totally committed to the vision to providing alternative housing with a great emphasis on senior living." My property - the Carr farm was identified as the location suitable. At the workshop, we were asked to discuss the question "what suggested changes do you have to improve the plan?". Our table, by unanimous vote stated that we will not accept a density limited to 2 units/acre on site B and wanted it increased to 4 units/acre. Maureen asked how many people were at the table? Laurie began to read out the names but Michael asked for just the number of participants, the number was 13 people. He also has their names and phone numbers.

He received information from the Fall River Family Practice. Laurie proceeded to read a few features of John McNab article: "a recent recurring theme in our care for our geriatric patients is the urgent need for housing." "It is tragic when one of our seniors can no longer maintain their property. The social impact of having to leave the community to find suitable housing frequently has negative repercussions in terms of personal health, network of supportive relationships, loss of friendship, church and social circle involvement and not least, the loss of long-standing relationship with their doctor. Clinical depression is not infrequent consequence, as is a decline of overall health." We wholeheartedly support the proposed development as was explained to us, with a density of 4 units per acre." That was document number 2. The 3rd issue is Phonse Jessome approached Laurie he would like to do an article on the housing crisis and the barriers that Laurie is encountering further with this project. He talked it over with the seniors and they have formed a little group. He stated he is hoping for a positive response for this development. If not, they decided they are going to go the media and involve the politicians. He then introduced Nathan Rogers of Genivar.

Nathan Rogers introduced himself; he is a professional planner with Genivar Engineering Group, formerly known as Terrain Group.

The lands of Laurie Baker are identified as site B along the Fall River Rd.. This is not an infill site. The site isn't an outlier it is in the heart of Fall River. It's not in what the Community Planning Group calls the Village Centre but it is outside. It is approximately 2 km to get to the Sobeys center. It is an important site and the planning group has recognized that.

Would like to give opportunity to visualize what the site would look like. Have been working on this site with Laurie Baker since 2008. Did test pits on site to determine what the soil capacity is like. The reason for this is you have to understand what the site can handle with regards to septic systems, according to survey, the site is 48 acres. At 4 units/acre that is approximately 192 units. The illustration has multiple

unit dwellings, apartment buildings, 3 storeys in size, townhouses, and single unit dwellings all on within 40% of the site. There are 3 areas left in natural state. They carefully looked at the site to determine it can handle 4 units/acre. Environmental Engineer Heather Nunn, looked at test pit information and based on where the watercourses are, based on the soil conditions and where the wet areas are because you have to be a certain distance away from wet areas for sanitary system. Based on that, this site can handle 200 units in terms of the flows. Also looked at topography the site. It has natural drainage enabling gravity flow of the sanitary sewer water to the dispersion field which is a benefit because no pumping stations are required which would require extra costs, land and energy to use. Looked at where mature forests are located, trying to concentrate the proposed development in the areas that are most suitable.

Look and feel of 4 units/acre. They believe 4 units/acre makes sense for a number of reasons; variety living options, diverse open space, common areas, 4 meadows identified as important to the community, single loaded streets, at this density single loaded are possible. What is meant by single loaded streets are streets that have houses only on 1 side; it enables people to have views into the green space and increases liveability - community connectedness. In the last meeting with community planning group, talking about the watershed, the planning group wants to encourage this form of cluster development which make it the most obvious chose for this site. At 4 units/acre it is a no brainer. The reason he suggested going with that classic cluster development is because it is a central wastewater treatment. If the site was developed as 50 homes, each home would have their own septic system that is an unmonitored septic system, leaking septic systems can impact your lake. A central system is monitored by NS Environment. A certified operator will be required and quarterly reports will go to NS Environment and they can flag issues about any leaking or malfunctions of the plant. It is not an individual septic system on your lot, it's a central treatment system that is managed. Other options are alternatives to cul-de-sacs in this area, we are proposing a court or crescent that can be developed that the storm/rain water run off of streets runs into the middle green area that enables increased water retention.

The only way this type of development works is with central water. According to Councillor Dalrymple water is coming to Fall River sometime. Interested in individual common areas, recreation space for people on site and that would be accommodated.

Maureen asked for Nathan to go back to other site plan. Wanted to be shown where multiple unit dwellings would be. Maureen also asked how many units (A: proposed at 69 units dwelling/3 stories). The rest are townhouses, singles are on south end. The lower site would have its own wastewater management system. There would be 2 systems that are cluster septic system with drip arrogation field. Nathan stated that this is an idea not a development proposal. There are trails proposed throughout the site.

Some things that make a community desirable to defined private space even though this is cluster development houses are closer together, you still have your own space, you will have your own house, townhouse or unit in the multiple dwelling unit. And you have your own yard. There is also common space, space to get together, space for recreation.

Most important point to consider tonight: open space designed development is the way to go with for Fall River protect your water resources by encouraging open space design development. The way to encourage this is enable great density. This will help to protect the natural features and the central sanitary system.

Questions the committee:

Q: Michael Creighton asked if it was decided yet whether it will be a coop or condo or private ownership or rental?

A: Nathan responded that according to NS Environment would permit big central treatment system is through condominium.

Q: Maureen asked if they looked at hydrology because the Fall River watershed study tells us the groundwater is in a dewatering situation, wells are deepening and the water tables are dropping. The Hydrologist Dave MacFarlane of Stantec Engineering recommends a density of 1 unit/1.6 acres to maintain a safe threshold. How would you plan to service the area with water?

A: This development will not go forward until there is municipal water supply.

Q: Have you thought about how it clearly stays in senior community?

A: Unless you do an assisted living type of development there is no way to exclude people. What you can do is market towards seniors and provide them with all the amenities that make it desirable for them to live here. This would be market as an adult lifestyle community.

Q: You mention on some studies. The site could handle the wastewater treatment facility. What studies were done to help you come to that conclusion?

A: 2008 did test pits all over the site. Taking soil sample, soil cores determining the stratified soil levels, and from there was a matter of looking at all the topographically features, the wet areas. Heather Nunn determined based on that information the site could handle approximately 200 units which would equate to 4.2 units/acre.

Richard Boyce stood and asked that people state their name, if they part of a committee, etc.

Heather Fisher – Wellington Resident

Q: Commended the committee on being vigilant on their water. Concerns about the lakes. Where do the condos go? They are downhill correct? You were planning on setting those further back? She asked Laurie if there are going to be on slab complete wheelchair accessible independent living units? She also reiterated the need for accessible living. Concern about the lakes is that they are sick and going to become sicker. It was spoke about that the lakes are going to get blooming algae we already have it. This sounds more viable than putting in 50 homes, 50 septic fields that aren't monitored.

A: Correct they are set back from Fall River Rd. to protect the nature of the site. In this case they are further from Fall River Rd. and the site does change grade down. Laurie responded: He has a list of what people require and will accommodate them.

Pam Clarke – Fall River Rd Resident

Q: How is this type of larger system going to impact all surrounding properties?
Central water need to go thru would usage not increase, where would the increased wastewater go? She heard the seniors wanted underground parking. What about blasting and protecting the other homes. It is also the wells that are a concern when it comes to blasting, has it been thought thru?

A: Pipe would enable flows downhill to the treatment system that is monitored which would have a large dispersion field so once the effluent has been treated it gets dispersed and filter out into the field. It was suggested that they might require a UV filter. Don't have all the details of the system but it would be much better than what would be proposed on individual lots. It is sized to handle the flows.

There are regulations for blasting to be controlled. There are specific blasting regulations and if people experience for example cracking in their foundation that's considered when there is an undertaking. At this point Nathan would have to say no what we are showing is an idea. For this to get constructed we are a lot of thought and time away from that.

Barry Dalrymple – what is being proposed tonight is not the actual development. All that is presented hear tonight is an illustration to support the request for an increase in proposed density. If this all goes through the full development has to go through an HRM development agreement that's when the line by line the details and all that stuff gets done along with public meetings. HRM does have a blasting bylaw, department of environment has to approve the septic systems etc. We're not at that stage for Nathan to give you specific answer tonight.

Wendy Driscoll

Wendy just wanted to make a comment the location of the 3 storey apartment building - they are not back in the woods, they are next to her house.

Anna McCarron

Q: Was modelling done to consider the impact of brining in the extra piped water into that site and its being drained into the septic and what that will do to the wetlands.

A: The treatment system is the answer to your question. There will be central water and Genivar prides themselves in the fact that any system they design is up to the utmost standards. No the only modelling done was with regards to the site

Al MacKenzie

Q: Will the developer designate this property an over 55 community? Are we using the seniors and their needs as a shoehorn to get this development on the road?

A: Answer by audience it is allowed to be specifically designated. No.

Ziyad Chediac began his presentation at 8:10 pm.

This is a concept plan looking at proposing and just gathering more information from the community and HRM on what is the best development for this specific site. He presented an initial rendering by TP Felix, he offered to send the renderings to anyone who would like a copy.

He is looking at proposed a mixed use site with townhouses and apartment complexes - 2 complexes and 36 individual town homes in a 2 phase approach. The vision is a residential anchor in the village center of Fall River which would include multi residential site that are mainly catering towards the senior community. Looked at a 55 years of age restriction to be put into place. The issue with that is the legal ramification of doing so, still working through the process to find out how we can but we can't from what he is being told. Rather than labelling it a senior complex, we plan to create an environment that truly caters to the senior community by having elevators on site and having certain types of lifestyle rooms for other forms of activities and so on.

He was interrupted by an audience member who wanted details on where the site is located. It is at the intersection of Fall River Rd and highway #2 right behind Sobeys. It is directly behind Sobeys and adjacent to the United Church as well.

Why they are in love with this site for this type of development is mainly for its proximity to the amenities around it. Living in this area, you don't need a vehicle whether it is going to the clinics, church, schools and access to the Sobeys. The transit system is proposed to stop in front of Sobeys and this site would provide great access to that. The draft Secondary Plan proposes a maximum of 3 unit/acre for multiple unit residential development in this area. That limits us to just the 36 townhouses. What has been learnt from the watershed study is that the water in this area is not so abundant and we have started working with Engineers to try and figure out possible solutions to the water systems here. One thing they are looking at is catching rain water and using some of that as part of the solution but mainly looking at centralized wastewater treatment systems, one or two not exactly sure yet. Looking at a 2 phased approach. The first phase would be for the townhouses and looking at an approval to future develop the apartment complexes subject to a hydrologist giving okay with HRM on having the right water capacities for the residents of the area.

Richard Boise posed a question: What about your wastewater sewage, are you going to hook up to the system on Lockview Rd? Maureen Ryan said the Lockview MacPherson Plant is at capacity and that would not be allowed. Mr. Boise posed another question: What is going to happen to the wastewater. Michael spoke and told Mr. Boise that Ziyad was going to get to it. Ziyad than reiterated that he would get to that.

Looking at understanding the specific structure of the environment of this piece of land and how we are going to meet vision HRM requirements, mainly the requirements of the Fall River residents, the proposed development will be for a senior friendly environment. Looking at spacious environments, forests, surroundings, walking trails, elevators in the multi-unit complex's, obviously to allow for senior friendly accessibility, plus that we are so close to all the village center amenities.

What would this look like? The townhouses would be in the vicinity of 1800-2200 sq. ft. The apartment buildings would have lifestyle rooms, games rooms.

To Mr. Boise's request Ziyad responded through his presentation.

At this time we are still contemplating on some requests from our Engineer to do some pump tests and different soil tests on the site specifically, because we are still concept phase we have not gotten those answers yet.

Maureen stated were you proposing a recirculating sand filter or some sort. You're proposing an onsite system. You will not be allowed to connect to the Lockview MacPherson plant because there is no capacity there so it would have to be an onsite system.

We looked at what other options we could do this is the best usage of this specific site. Mainly because we are already within the Village Center. Some people say we are attracting more traffic here I feel like we are taking a strain off of traffic by placing people here because they are already in the core.

Looking at a mixed site in terms of look and feel. Looking at using different elements to create a not one long building type of affect, we thought to put some jogs in and out of the site to create more of a cluster homes as opposed to one long narrow building that in essence is an eye sore for the most part. Trying to keep as many trees on this site as possible since the site is quite undisturbed as it is. We propose to maintain a maximum height of 3 stories. Usually it isn't feasible to put in an elevator in a 3 story complex in terms of cost but in this case we are really looking at promoting this as a seniors facility. Therefore having an elevator is mandatory. With regards to the handicap elements of these types of sites, 6% of the units must have handicapped capabilities regardless if they are designed that way or not, they must have that percent of capability in the actual development. With the townhouses , we are trying to maintain a similar look and feel and trying to drive home the village/town concept. The proposed building design follows the draft architectural requirements under the draft secondary plan for the certain types of roofs, certain peaks of the roofs the fact that there are dormers, the fact that certain windows are a certain size. We really have decide to design not only for the community but truly try to partner with the community because you would be the people buying and renting these sites.

Layout of the land – the slope of the property grades down and slopes in different ways. We are looking at building slab on grade, therefore, to not disturbing any pyretic slates. Removing any pyretic slates encountered can not only be costly, it can also be harmful towards the environment. We are looking at preserving as much of the site as possible therefore it is slab on grade making the piratic slate stay on site as much as possible. Looking at not moving 1 oz. of slate off this site, the shape of the site, water capacity and sewer as discussed will be dealing with that with our Engineers in great detail. Another feature of this proposed development is the opportunity to nestle the properties within the trees. The site has 12 acres and provides the opportunity to live, work, and stay in the village centre. Created buffer zones in the scenario, also embedded green space, park space to allow people to really enjoy living on this site. Referencing the Fall River preference survey on the understanding that multi residential housing is needed in Fall River.

Questions:

Michael Creighton

Q: Contemplating condo ownership, rental or mix?

A: Looking at condo ownership of the townhouses, it is easier to utilize the condominium ownership while using a cluster type of septic system especially in this type solution where you are looking at 2 major septic systems or 1 specific. Managing that type of process would be suited under a condominium type process. Apartment buildings would be rentals.

Q: What is the grading of the slope behind Sobeys where you are planning your apartment buildings.

A: There is probably 20 meters slope between the back and front of the property. Maureen spoke up one thing the committee is recommending is that no development take place on slopes exceeding 20% because of the fine particulate nature of the soils. No portion of this site exceeds 20% Maureen believes since it has not appeared as a 20% slope in the GIS analysis.

Sandy Balcolm

Q: If you build the development, will there be another way to come into Sobeys besides the area that is down there now? She meant cars?

A: We haven't spoken to Sobeys yet. He can only imagine Sobeys wanting them to create an easy way for you to go and shop there as much as possible. Looking at some form of walkway or access to behind Sobeys. No they will not be creating another way into Sobeys via car.

Patty Snow

Q: Is it my understanding that you will cater to the seniors but it could be anybody in the world living in there, families etc. and there is no way to control that?

Keeping that in mind there could be 100 families living there with children correct? Or there could be 10 seniors and 90 families in that area.

A: That is what I am being told legally.

The multi residential units will mainly be 1 and 2 bedrooms mainly catering towards smaller units, single units for 1, 2 maybe 3 people maximum. There will be no 3 bedroom apartments in this complex. The majority would be 1 bedroom plus den.

Bonnie Currie

Q: How do you prevent it from looking like Sackville. The drawings you have up I don't like them. It looks massive. What bothers her the most is she doesn't picture Fall River, Waverly, Wellington become another Sackville and that is what I see when I see townhouses like that.

A: We had to follow HRM guidelines given for the specific design, how the roofs look or what the windows look like. As far as the look and feel, it was very much constrained in terms of what we had to work with. I can come up with wonderful looking stuff from all over Canada but not sure it would fit the local environment. Would gladly take suggestions. HRM has been gathering different thoughts on different types of development and have come up with a bible and that is what they are following. At the end of the day we want to provide what the community is looking for.

Richard Boise

Q: Do you have any idea if you going to have condos or apartments. Do you have any idea what the rent would be?

A: The multi units are apartments.
Yes. It would be about \$1250/month

Frank – Fletchers Drive

Q: If building condos what the condo fees?

A: Haven't gone that far yet but looking approximately \$250-300.

Susan Hawkins – Lake Fletcher

Q: Will this only go forward if there is municipal water supply?
Are you also talking about drilling wells?

A: No, well to this part, I wouldn't say municipal water supply. Municipal water supply would be the obvious answer but if we do have the proper technology and proper ability to catch enough water to service this site through a hydrologist.
As of right now we would be looking at wells as an option. Please understand this is just a concept.

Jim Simon

Q: How many acres? Will it block the people above - it won't affect the view of the lakes or anything?

A: A little under 12 acres.
No

Jackie – Wellington

Q: You said there was a 6% mandatory handicap that is plan you would go ahead with 6%.
Are you going above that or staying with the mandatory?
How many handicap units would 6% be?
So with the demographics that you're aiming at being seniors, if it is a seniors complex would you really only need 5 or 6 wheelchair accessible units.
So if I'm in a wheelchair I will be able to go into my shower without having the special handicap unit? I'm not talking nursing home. I'm talking someone who has MS perhaps.

A: It is mandatory.
Haven't looked at that option yet.
Would be about 5 or 6.
There all accessible. We will have elevators throughout.
There's a difference between a seniors friendly type of complex and an actual nursing home. A person that doesn't use a walker may not necessarily want a chair in their bathtub. That would come in a dialogue with the residents of the community.

Joy Gouge

As of this year 1000 Nova Scotians/month are turning 65. We have a lot of things to think about.

Unknown man

Q: What is the depth of this property from front to back? You said there is a 20 meter drop that is quite a substantial drop.

A: Don't know off hand.
Yes that's right it's about 60 feet. It is at least 3-500 feet. I know it is 150 at the bottom so using that as a gauge it's about 3-500.

Krista Snow

Q: The road frontage is 100 ft.
Road frontage the normal resident on highway 2 don't they need 200 ft. of road frontage?
Maureen is there any frontage on highway 2?
I thought there was someone up the street who tried to subdivide but couldn't because there wasn't 200 ft. road frontage. Will that go up the street as well?
What are you doing for sewage treatment?
There is no chance of that being connected to sewer treatment plant on Lockview Rd?

A: 150 ft. to be exact.
Maureen spoke: The frontage would be subject to the proposed regulation or by-law. But he would need a minimum of 100 ft. to gain access to the rear property in order to construct this road way.
Maureen spoke: We are proposing to apply new regulations only in the village center. The village center ends at the St. John United Church.
We are still waiting to find out from our Engineers what the best solution is right now. Right now the developer would have to use an on-site centralized wastewater treatment system.
No.

Peter – Fletchers Lake

Q: With the development going up on a steep slope, where will the stormwater be going. It will end up in the lake. Every time you build a surface, the water runs off so where is it going? What about from the parking lot?

A: Part of our solution is to catch some of that rainwater and utilize it for the site.
That would be determined through our Engineering studies. We will try and recapture as much as possible.

A question for the committee was posed.

Q: Is the committee looking at approving both developments or choosing one or the other?

A: Michael Creighton- We don't approve any development at all. What we're doing is developing secondary municipal planning strategy for the Fall River area to encourage development in the direction that the community wanted Fall River to develop over the next 25-30 years. Phase I was only supposed to be essentially looking at the commercial area. Early in the process it was identified that there was a strong need for senior housing right now what we are doing is examining some possible areas that were identified by the community in workshops and open houses that would be suitable for development of a senior complex or senior friendly housing. What we are doing now is essential due diligence. We are looking at proposals to see if they can fit into the regulations that we are proposing for Halifax Councils consideration. If they don't can we expand the rules so that we can accommodate some of these proposals.

Maureen made a clarification:

The committee is making recommending that multiple unit housing developments only be considered through the provisions of a development agreement. The development agreement follows a discretionary approval process that is subject to the approval by the Marine Drive, Valley and Canal Community Council. What the Committee is doing now is looking at creating a policy framework so that community council could consider these proposals at a later point. Some of things we are hearing here tonight is that we shouldn't allow for one singular type of housing development. We need a mix of housing type so that you don't have everything centered in one place. We are also hearing that there is a need to fully examine the traffic impact of the development. We are hearing that views are very important to surrounding properties and from surrounding properties. We are hearing also that groundwater is particularly important and that we really need to carefully examine those issues. Those are the types of conditions that we would place under the development agreement policy which would guide future consideration if Regional Council adopts the future recommendations of this Committee. The Committee won't be approving any particular one of these developments but it may create policies to allow for these developments to occur in the requested areas through a development agreement.

Lawrence Tench began his presentation at 8:50 pm

Drawing was passed around.

Talking about a development on MacPherson Rd. that is going to be in what's called the proposed Canal Court. It is 19 & 21 MacPherson Rd.. At 21 MacPherson we have an existing multi-unit resident building there. Most of the development will be on 19. What presently have a building at 21 MacPherson Rd which we plan to expand. What we're proposing is a lane way to make a road and plan to develop townhouses that are going to be owned by the people who buy them. We are not going to own them. We will set regulations of what you can build there. We are kind of looking for is a kind of brownstone look effect. They are all facing the water. We have about a 2 acre property. We are talking no more than 6 or 7 dwellings there. We want them individual owned we want to be in a combination of stone and whatever the appropriate look is for the area for the canal court theme.

Maureen asked you are proposing 6 townhouses on 19 MacPherson? Mr. Tench said yes. He also said that he is planning to develop a parking lot on 19 MacPherson and that you will not see the parking lot from the road but the businesses will be able to utilize the parking lot to allow for 20 vehicles, it will be gated. The gate is to provide safety so that it will not be a hang out. Will build a look off down to the Canal thinking of putting placard and can walk down and there would some history of the Canal and of

Fall River. The whole concept is going to be under what we call conservation through environmental design. Design it to discourage loitering, light it up, landscaped, a lot of lighting is going to go inside the landscaping as well as overhead lighting. With the existing building, we are planning on cladding it to make it fit in with the buildings we want people to build along the waterfront. Basically not looking at anything bigger than 12-1600 footprint for each place. That way keeping it not huge but not small will keep the area vibrant. We want to promote as much pedestrian traffic as we possibly can. Asking that we be allowed to put 5 more units in the existing multiple unit building. You won't see them since they will be in the back. We also request policy support to put up a commercial piece in front of the multiple unit building. Some possible businesses for this portion of the building include an art gallery, small area for business services, a boardroom, photocopying, whatever people require.

Questions from committee members:

Q: How much square footage is that for the commercial aspect of it?

A: Talking a building that is 40 ft. x 30 ft. and front part of that encompasses 3 residential units so we are talking 1600 sq. ft.

Q: So that commercial component would be part of the multi-unit dwelling?

A: Yes all in the same.

Q: How many units now?

A: There is an existing 10 we are asking for 5 more.

Q: So you are looking for 5 units in the multi-unit dwelling and 6 townhouses at 19 MacPherson?

A: What we are going to do for the townhouses and the lots is we are going to have a surveyor go thru there and tell us what is the maximum amount of lots that can go there, it might be less but it won't be anymore.

Q: So you're looking for approval to allow for or a policy that would allow for 5 additional dwelling units in the existing 10 unit building, you're looking for a commercial component of 40 ft. x 30 ft. as a part of the multi-unit dwelling on the ground floor and your also looking for 6 townhouse dwellings maximum with building footprints of 12-1500 sq. ft.?

A: That's correct on 19 MacPherson. Relatively small based on what you have been hearing here tonight.

Richard – Lockview Rd.

Q: How are all these units going to impact sewer systems?

A: I really can't answer those particular questions as the Engineering is not here.

Tom Mills – Enfield

Q: I know for a fact that a lot of that land you are showing on your plan is in a flood plain and does flood. Have you done any studies to see how much land you actually have there that is going to stay dry?

A: We are doing that now. Once it is surveyed we will know exactly what we are talking about in the amount of lots.

Unidentified woman

Q: Would you be considering filling that property more? What on a river?

A: Yes, not on the river.

Unidentified man

Q: That is already serviced by central sewage?

A: Correct.

Unidentified man

Q: What is the acreage between the 2 properties?

A: Almost 2 acres.

Elsie Doucet – Fall River

Q: How many acres did you say was there? So you only have 2 acres between the existing building and where you are building.

A: Almost 2. That is for the existing building, 19 and 21 Macpherson and there is another piece of land. Yes a little less than 2 acres.

Fred Fitzsimmons

Q: Who makes the decision of whether or not the presentations prepared this evening by Mr. Baker, Mr. Chediac, and Mr. Tench proposals are accepted or not. Who makes those decisions?

Does it make any difference of how many people are in support or in opposition of the proposals to your committee?

It would be more feasible if there was a vote here tonight. What I'm hearing is that if you had more people that were supporting a project than were opposed to it that would have a determination on your outcome to the Council correct?

A: Council. Maureen spoke: no actually the Fall River Vision Implementation Committee/Community Planning Group will convene a meeting and they will make a recommendation to Regional Council as part of the proposed plan about whether or not there

should be policy support to accommodate those developments. Right now the Baker property is already part of the proposed plan at 2 units/acre, the request is 4. So the committee will have to consider that in light of the impacts on the surrounding community and the comments that it hears and likewise with the Mr. Chediac proposal behind Sobeys and Mr. Tench's and two others that are coming forward next Monday night June 13.

Committee Member

That is sort of a who do you love better your wife or your oldest child. Yes and no if you take a full count at any given meeting you might have 20 people for something and go to another meeting and 24 are against it. What the committee is doing is looking at all the information that we have gathered from the community over the last 6 years and our interpretation of what the community wants Fall River to look like in 25-30-40 years down the line. We applied that criterion to any recommendations that we make for allowing this and disallowing something else. If you got everyone in Fall River to come out and say yes we are all for it then chances are we would probably say yes we will recommend that course of action. If you get a meeting of 40 people to say yes we support it then we know there is a ground swell to support that particular course of action but to have a vote at any meeting and the majority rules no.

We have listened to the proposals and listened to the comments that people are making pro and con and we take all that into consideration and we will then we come up with a proposal to council.

We have to look at the impact of any development on traffic impacts, water impacts. There is also wastewater management impacts and there are stormwater management impacts.

Not necessarily no.

Richard

I'm fully in favour of Laurie Baker's proposal. He is a good citizen of Fall River, a good person to do business with. I don't see what the problem is. You should be backing him 100%. What do we have all the city and staff for? Their the ones supposed to protect us against water problems and studies and all that. Not you. You don't know nothing about that.

I can tell what I want if someone going to develop a housing complex that is going to be favourable to seniors like myself. There is the man I want to do business with. I have been doing business with him for 30 years and I know what kind of person he is. Support the people that are here that have put their life and time into this community like I have I raised a family and they raised a family and now their kids are raising another family and they want to live in Fall River. We got to have development here and we got a man who is from here who wants to do a development. What's the problem.

Krista Snow

Q: How many more years? Because Laurie started this with the former councillor and the former councillor and I believe the former councillor. How long is this going to take. I was a very young woman when it first started being debated and I'm 47. Now I want to put my name on the list.

Laurie had meetings before this started with HRM staff and once the moratorium was finished and the new municipal planning strategy was in place his project fit and now. Can no one build until the plan is finished?

Municipal planning strategy Maureen what was the density at that time?

But if your within the Water Service Boundary and can hook up to that system isn't Mr. Baker in that area?

A: This particular vision project started about 6 years ago. I'm quite sure that we could of up with some proposed regulations to give to councillor maybe 2 years ago Laurie's property wouldn't have been included in that. We're trying

We are practicing due diligence.

Barry spoke they can all build under the existing plans. They all have the right to build under the existing plans but these requests are all requesting higher density.

Density is the only disagreement we have had for the proposal that we put to the community a month and half ago.

Maureen spoke: the current density allowed in this area is no more than 1 unit/acre and that is if you developed in a classic open space design. The watershed study that was produced by Stantec Engineering is telling us some major things. It's telling us that the amount of development that's already in the area is pushing the quality of the lakes beyond its current capacity. It's going to end up in the mesotrophic range meaning the occasional occurrence of algae blooms given the right conditions. It's also telling us that the groundwater table is dewatering so people are drilling deeper and deeper wells. As you know the anticipated costs of extending water throughout the entire Fall River community is a major undertaking that has to be brought to Councils attention. The watershed study is also telling us that there are certain areas within Fall River that are really hazardous to development but most of all the watershed study is telling us that until municipal water is extended that you should go very very cautiously and don't allow anything more than 1 unit/1.6 acres under well monitored conditions and preferably 1 unit/4 acres.

Mr. Baker's property is outside the Water Service District Boundary. Mr. Baker, some years ago, requested a plan amendment of the existing Municipal Planning Strategy outside of this process. But Mr. Baker withdrew his request so that application was cancelled. These requests are beyond the Village Centre which extended the process beyond the Village center to consider how to accommodate this elsewhere.

The proposed plan for the village center and these few spot sites should go forward to Council in early Fall.

Councillor Dalrymple spoke:

Wanted to clear up a common misconception:

A number of people feel that the Committee is against some of these developments and I want you to know they absolutely are not. This Committee, if they were against these density projects they could have let it stand as it is. They didn't have to go through all of this. If they were against it, they could say the existing rules should continue on. The Committee has made an extra effort to extend this process and allow all these presentations, so they can hear everything and hear you folks and make a decision on these. There is nobody on this Committee that has ever said or indicated they are against anyone of these, not ever. That is a misconception. The Committee has gone above and beyond. Barry thanked the Committee for everything they have done.

Monday June 13 is the next scheduled meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.