

Fall River Community Planning Group Meeting
Gordon R. Snow Centre, Multi-Purpose



August 25, 2011
7:00 pm

Present

Michael Creighton - Chairman
Jim Simons
Sandra Carr
Bill Munden
Joyce Evans
Jacqueline Stuedler
Anna MacCarron
Allen MacKenzie – arrived 7:30 pm
Gary Dease

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 7:00 pm.

Presentation by Ziyad Chediac

Mr. Chediac had concern that there may not be development on site. He presented initial design – 88 suite rental units. 4 units/acre was approved by CPG in July. He has incorporated trails, buffer. Timeframe for water. Revised application for 2 storey duplexes and mix of rental suites. Decreasing to 8 units/acre from 10 units/acre. Water solution based on rain harvesting. Seek approval to eliminate water requirement until water shows up. 24 structures in Phase 1 – 48 units, 4 unit/acre. Once municipal services comes in then develop Phase II – for 48 more units. It wouldn't be feasible to only develop Phase I.

Mr. Chediac went on to show the design of the duplexes and apartments.

Mr. Jeff Pinhey from Able Engineering Inc. took over from Mr. Chediac to explain the sewage and water systems.

Does a lot of work on South Shore where most homes on Chester Island are using collected rain water for drinking. He explained the sewage system, which is called a drip irrigation system. In rural schools they use this sewage treatment system. It has a recirculated filter sewage treatment. This system cuts down on pumping out costs. Mr. Pinhey went on to explain how the septic tank worked. It is very efficient and effective way of treating sewage. Halifax Water hasn't been willing to take over and look after these systems.

Chair – who would be responsible to look after this system?

Maureen Ryan – this would have to be looked after by a condo corporation.

Mr. Pinhey – every quarter they would have to submit 5 tests.

Anna McCarron – what are they testing for?

Mr. Pinhey – TSS, PH, fecal coliform

Mr. Pinhey proceeded to water. Everyone on Tancook Island is using rainwater collection. This system works everywhere.

Chair – what does a system like that cost?

Mr. Pinhey – same as a well

Taking out about 10% of runoff by putting it in water collection. Street runoff would be into rock bed and then a runoff for large waterfall.

Maureen Ryan – all stormwater will be retained on the site?

Mr. Pinhey – It would be hydrological invisible.

Maureen Ryan – pre and post flows will be the same?

Mr. Pinhey – yes

Mr. Chediac – what happens if it doesn't rain?

Mr. Pinhey – buy water and fill it. There is a fill spout. Use low flow fixtures.

Sandra Carr – why have you broken it into Phase I and Phase II and it not be in Phase II the same method?

Mr. Chediac – started looking at that but based on increasing it to that density we would most likely require municipal services. Didn't want to rule that out completely. If we used the same method it would have to be lesser density

Maureen Ryan – 20 instead of 40 units

Mr. Chediac – yes. It would eliminate the rental option.

Seniors are looking at rentals. Proposed what would best suit. Mr. Chediac's biggest risk is to convince the public that they won't run out of water.

Maureen Ryan – given the rate of precipitation what are the odds of running out of water?

Mr. Pinhey – 1,000 sq. ft. roof would have 14 outages in a 40 year period. Based on statistics from Halifax International Airport that is 10 year old data.

Maureen Ryan – you're talking about combined system lessens probability of running out.

Mr. Pinhey – yes

Anna McCarron – how is the precipitation handled in the winter do you melt the snow?

Mr. Pinhey – a lot of that happens in Nova Scotia, there are some issues with the architecture of insulation. A lot of our total precipitation is rain in Nova Scotia. There are issues with over insulation that the snow would remain on the roof longer.

Maureen Ryan – what other areas in Nova Scotia has this water system been used?

Mr. Pinhey – All of Tancook Island. This is old technology.

Chair – can you give a quick overview of storm water management system?

Mr. Pinhey – provided a description of how the system was created.

Ann McCarron – were composting toilet facilities looked into for a water saving technique?

Mr. Chediac – open to any green ideas as long as it makes sense.

Jim Simon – would the irrigation bed be used as part of the open space?

Mr. Chediac – yes part of the open space along with another location

Jim Simon – what kind of space are we looking at there

Mr. Chediac – just about an acre.

Jim Simon – can you elaborate on amenity spaces?

Mr. Chediac – walkways, gazebos, and within the building (gym and other common areas)

Jim Simon – would you be putting in sidewalks from Phase II to Phase I?

Mr. Chediac – original design incorporated walkways down to the Sobeys, wanted to bring senior amenities to the site, for example, meal plans, laundry services, cleaning services, etc.

Sandra Carr – seniors don't want to be in buildings with families which is proven in studies that Ms. Carr provided to Michael Creighton. There are places that only have seniors in the Elmsdale area but I don't know how they do it.

Jim Simon – you can you are just not allowed to refuse to someone because they are not a senior.

Final request of Mr. Chediac: remove requirement for municipal water supply relying on green water for Phase I at a density of 4 units/acre. Phase II would like to have the policy crafted to allow for a maximum 8 units/acre dependent upon the provision of municipal services.

Maureen Ryan – in order to achieve the rental accommodate you are saying you need the multiple unit dwelling and you feel you need municipal services to achieve a multiple unit dwelling scenario. You're not proposing not to do the traffic assessment or the stormwater management assessment and all of the other things for the 4 units/acre you would do it for that as well the only thing you don't want it to have is that it be contingent upon the provision of municipal water. You are saying you would do all the same things for the 8 units/acre when municipal water services are provided.

Mr. Chediac – yes.

Bill Munden – when you get municipal water supply to Phase II would it also service the first Phase?

Mr. Chediac – I am thinking of doing a study at that point to see how viable we can keep that site the way it is.

Bill Munden – if it isn't working to peoples satisfaction who would run services into each of there houses?

Mr. Chediac – it would be a decision by the Condominium Corporation, each condo member would have to vote on it.

Maureen Ryan – if the main goes in front of their houses they would have to pay a betterment charge. The system would have to be paid for by the owner (developer).

Mr. Chediac – I would have to pay to run the water up to the second phase myself.

Jim Simon – would that be a public or private road?

Mr. Chediac – it would be a private road.

Jim Simon – would sewage treatment area be sized so it would accommodate the future building in Phase II or would you have to create a second area.

Mr. Chediac – no, it would be quite a significant investment for something that might not happen.

Allen MacKenzie – can you explain the difference between municipal water and municipal services.

Maureen Ryan – in this case the only municipal service we are talking about will be water. The cost of provided sewer services to the Village Center was \$11 million. That would only provide sewer services to the Village Core and Lockview/MacPherson.

Chair – are all in favour of the changes to remove the requirement for municipal water for Phase I?

Maureen Ryan asked if it was the consensus of committee that you wish to allow for 4 units/acre, with the requirement for the traffic impact study, Stormwater assessment study all those things that you agreed upon without the provision of municipal water. Is it also the consensus of the committee that you want to allow for the consideration of up to 8 units/acre when municipal water services are available.

CPG Committee – yes

Maureen Ryan stated she would draft a policy for the committees review.

Presentation by NS Power

This is a follow up on the presentation give on June 13. Here to provide refine focus. NSP is not land developers they have lots of land. Exit 5 land has become surplus. NSP has had numerous inquiries from commercial developers interested in developing the land. Proposed “as of right” development rule will limit HRM’s ability to approve desirable development.

Jen Jenson – showed a map of NSP lands there are 4 separate parcels of land.

- Proposed Village Gateway zone limits commercial floor area on a lot to 20,000 sq. ft. with building footprint only up to 10,000 sq. ft.
- NSP proposal for “as of right”
- Consider all 4 lots as a consolidated area
- All 25,000 sq. ft. commercial floor area on a footprint of the same size
- Permit 1 or more buildings on consolidated area
- Permit parking in front yards but parking area to be set back at least minimum front yard (30 ft.) which is landscaped.
- Showed slide of what it would look like, 2 buildings would look like, each building is 12,500 sq. ft.
- Consultant showed how road could be designed to connect to highway 102 ramp.
- Some flexibility is desirable
 - o NSP is not interested in industrial development, it would be strictly commercial
 - o Flexibility can be achieved through a Development Agreement Mechanism
- Development Agreement Mechanism
 - o Proposed development subject to scrutiny and negotiation with HRM and community
 - o A Planning study is required
- Can facilitate good planning
 - o Site characteristics are favourable to site and building design
 - o Create visually appealing

Chair – What you are proposing would not permit approval of larger/higher structures in the design?

Jens Jenson – In your proposed by-law there is a Village Gateway Zone in which these 4 properties all lie. In that zone on anyone of those 4 lots the rule that is proposed in your own craft is on any one of those lots there could be a commercial development of up to 20,000 sq. ft. But the building footprint can only be 10,000 sq. ft. It seems it would make more sense to look at the combined area of the 4 lots as a consolidate lot and on that one lot permit a total of 25,000 sq. ft. on a footprint of 25,000 sq. ft. or have it as two separate buildings. NS Power is looking for what they think is a more sensible as-of-right rule but also to allow for developments that would not be approved as-of-right to be considered under a Development Agreement.

Jacqueline Steudler – Fall River residents don't want big box store feature she explained why committee came up with this requirement.

Chair – on your design it is approximately 60 ft. deep by a little over 200 long, it sounds like a strip mall

Gary Foster – these are just examples of buildings, it would be the Development Agreement that would drive this.

Maureen Ryan – how large are these buildings

Jens Jenson – 180 ft. long x 66 ft. asking that this site be allowed. Reiterated NSP's proposal

Jacqueline Steudler – question about public hearing is not the development process correct

Maureen Ryan – reviewed what the process of a public hearing would be.

Maureen Ryan - Also pointed out length of buildings. This building could be built under the regulations as your proposing but it would be on 2 floors. Ms. Ryan also reviewed the design etc.

Anna McCarron – why do you want parking in front

Jens Jenson – because of the odd shape of the lots

Maureen Ryan – could it be an L-shape

Gary Foster – would depend on type of use

Maureen Ryan – if L shape could put parking in rear

Gary Foster – yes it could be

Maureen Ryan – the request is to allow for a maximum of 25,000 sq. ft. in 2 or more buildings on all 4 sites consolidated not 4 - 25,000 sq. ft. buildings. Also with the allowance with minimum front yard parking and retention of the landscape buffer as outlined in the Village Gateway zone. Also introduced a Development Agreement policy that would allow for the consideration of larger scale buildings on that site subject to some parameters.

Jens Jenson – development that would not fit the proposed as-of-right rule might be a smaller building but additional height like a small hotel

Joyce Evans – where would the water come from.

Jens Jenson – because we don't have a specific development there would have to be provisions put in place for that.

Sandra Carr – are you saying you could build anywhere on that land

Gary Foster – that would be subject to a Development Agreement

Joyce Evans – you're asking for more flexibility

Jens Jenson – yes

Jacqueline Steudler – this would mean the whole development part would not go under the Village Gateway?

Maureen Ryan – no it would remain a Village Gateway zone, Ms. Ryan would amend the schedule to include not just the Farmers Clem site but the entire 4 parcels and would write up a clause specify that a maximum of 25,000 sq. ft. in a minimum of 2-3 buildings maybe single storey and we would put some parameters.

Jacqueline Steudler – I just can't agree with that, because our community doesn't want to see big box retail stores.

Maureen Ryan – clarified what a big box retail store would mean.

Jim Simons – percent of frontage that has to be occupied do we have anything in gateway?

Maureen Ryan – no

Discussion was had amongst committee members about the difference.

Maureen Ryan – gave an explanation of what "as-of-right" was. Move to Development Agreement approach – NSP is looking for flexibility in size of building.

Sandra Carr – do we have to determine the outline of the development agreement at this point?

Maureen Ryan – no

Allen MacKenzie – would NSP be developing this property

Gary Foster – we don't sell property and we are not developers. NSP would lease the property and would be responsible for the site.

Maureen Ryan – grappling with larger building will NSP give committee time to check building size?

Gary Foster – yes

Chair – approve “as-of-right” but defer the size.

Gary Foster – agreed.

Presentation by Judith Rosewilde

Maureen Ryan showed a slide of Ms. Walsh property across from drugstore. Property is almost 3 acres in size. Slide shows riparian buffer, Ms. Ryan also gave the size of the buildings on the lots. Property is proposed to be zoned Village Main Street Zone under the proposed Municipal Planning Strategy it is currently zoned C4 Highway Commercial under the existing Municipal Planning Strategy.

Judith Rosewilde – explained that she was there on behalf of her mother Angela Walsh. Ms. Rosewilde explained where the land was located. The Government expropriated a large piece of her property for highway 2 now the riparian buffer has now taken more land. Now with the proposed zoning changes she’ll have a whole new set up restrictions as to what can be built on her property. With her very valuable property as it is zoned C4 is becoming less and less valuable. Although she does not want to lose her C4 zoning she would ask the committee to at least allow the Gateway Village zoning to apply to her property versus the Village Main Street designation. Ms. Rosewilde asks that a 3 storey building be allowed in the area.

CPG had some discussion at this point regarding the Village Gateway zoning.

Chair – reviewed difference between Main St. and Village Gateway.

Maureen Ryan – request – would like it to be Village Gateway zone instead of Village Main Street zone. Maureen also reviewed the differences between the two zones.

Discussion amongst committee members took place.

Consensus is to apply Village Gateway zone to 3061 Highway 2.

Next meeting to be held Monday September 12, 2011.

Meeting adjourned 9:30 pm.