



Present

Michael Creighton - Chairman
Jim Simons
Bill Munden
Joy Gouge
Jacqueline Steudler
Gary Dease
Anna McCarron
Owen Evans
Bob Gusscott
Keith Manchester
Councillor Barry Dalrymple

Staff

Maureen Ryan, HRM Senior Planner
Scott LeBlanc, HRM Planning Technician
Sarah Pelrine, Recorder

The meeting of the Fall River Planning Committee was called to order 6:22PM on May 5th, 2011 at the

Staff discussed each of the items on the agenda individually

1A. Jack Eisener – J.R.Eisener Contracting Ltd. – 35 Perrin Drive, Fall River

Submission to expand his current unit with the knowledge that it will conflict with the current by-law within the Fall River business zone.

Q: What about the development on the other side of the Lakeview Service Road, there is a recommendation in 1B?

Yes, this will be addressed on 1B

Q: What is the footprint needed for the unit?

The 20,000 square foot is based on the type of business that is there and is an industrial type land use. This would be one of two businesses in the area with a self-storage unit and the second storage site is currently in the proposal stage.

Decision of the committee to rezone the area Village Gateway

There was discussion of adjusting the zone to have light manufacturing as to manufacturing in general because this may bring unwanted land use. This item will come back to with further clarification at the following meeting (tabled).

COMMITTEE ACCEPTS RECOMMENDATION

1B. Jack Eisener Request Continued

Q: Does the Committee have issues with the storage facility and its visible appeal? As well is there a clause that can be put in the Development Agreement that a landscape buffer must be put in place?

There could be possible concerns with when coming off the highway that fact you will be able to see the tops of the self-storage units and the ventilation equipment. Discussion with regards to the fact if the proposed unit would be legally non-conforming and how this would affect the site in the future. It was brought up that as long as the use is continuously operated and it is not discontinued or abandoned for more than a six-month period the unit will be fine. However, if a legal non-conforming use is discontinued for more than six months but less than eighteen months, the non-conforming use may be reinstated with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. A legal non-conforming use that is discontinued or abandoned for more than eighteen months loses its "legal nonconforming status."

COMMITTEE ACCEPTS RECOMMENDATION

2. Carol Howardson, Holyroad CI

The Fall River transportation study addresses the concerns, which were brought up by Ms Howardson with relations to roads, and these will be brought up in section 2. There is a whole section on signage in the Development Agreement and the types that will work within the area. With regards to having the signage similar to those in Banff, it was brought up that there are so many restrictions that this may not work for the area. The committee would like to leave it as is for the moment, based on what the province is proposing with new sign law and make a decision based on that.

3. Bridget Linder, Fall River

With regards to trails, this has been addressed many times and there are a vast amount of trails proposed within the area. There is a plan currently in the works to make an intra-community transport service and within next year there will be a proposal for a regional transportation system put in place. The transportation aspect will be a phase two development discussion.

4. Thomas E. Swaine, Fall River

The Committee has heard back from the Shubie Committee and believes that there has been approval for the completion of the trail. The area, which was discussed, was from the steel bridge to Blue Hill Road and will allow for sidewalks and connection from the bridge to the lake.

5. Susan A Conrad, Fall River

The Committee discussed a change in the conceptual line but keep the essence of the plan and make the routing more generalized. As well make statement "where opportunities shall arise, HRM should secure route along water where and when feasible".

6. Bob MacIcreith, Beechill Drive, Fall River

The landowner was under the impression that the line along the property by Sobeys, was a green belt. There is currently a landscape buffer put in place, but the Committee does not like the thought of a visual screen. The Committee asked staff to insert wording that says that there must be a visual screen, but to remove “in the form of a fence”, to each of the zones landscaping regulation to avoid conflict with other landscaping provisions.

COMMITTEE ACCEPTS

7. Nathan Rogers, Project Planner, Genivar Consultant for Laurie Baker

Staff had a meeting with Genivar Consultant to show them what a density of 2 units per acre and 4 units per acre would be, and they was not on board with what was Staff asked Genivar to submit a request with what they are proposing for the site. The chair would like to table this to a later date.

8. Nathan Rogers, Project Planner, Genivar Consultant for Laurie Baker (request submitted May 3, 2011)

The Chair would like to have this along with item 7 tabled to a later date.

9. Senior Citizen’s and Developer’s Workshop Table, March 31st, Snow Centre

After some discussion the Committee made is known that there was not a motion made, but rather a consensus to request an increase in density from 2 to 4 acres. The Chair requested this be tabled to a later date.

10. Wendy Pruneau, Windsor Junction

It was suggested to have the committee look at the complex on Millennium Drive in Chester, NS. The chair noted that this space has a one unit per acre ratio, and should be used as an example if what that ration would look like. The second discussion centered on the way Northwood Bedford was built, and that fact that it is a housing community for seniors. The Chair requested this to be tabled to a later date.

11. Deborah VanLees, Fletcher’s Lake

It was noted that the name should be changed to VanLeer.

12. Tom Driscoll, Fall River

No discussion on this comment.

13. Unknown Resident

No discussion on this comment.

14. Robert Mills, Fall River

The committee had a meeting with the community on April 13 as per this request of expanding trails and constructing a senior’s complex.

15. Sandra Carr

There was not a clear consensus among the committee regarding the issues of senior's wanting/not wanting to live in a mixed aged complex. It was noted the comment came out of the April 2nd meeting. Some committee members do not think there should be age discrimination if someone younger would like to buy into the complex.

16. Evangeline Brown

The ability to have a community garden is in the works now. It is thought this could be good for the community based on the success of the one down town in bringing residents together.

17. Elaine Jollymore, Fall River

When there are low-rise residential unit and a commercial unit in close proximity, there should be a landscape buffer put in place, based on the slopes of the land so that you will not be able to see the units on the site. As well the use of landscaping and topography to create a buffer between low-rise residential units should be considered. Some Committee members noted that less of a buffer should be used between low-rise units in the senior community so there is not a loss of connectivity. The Community would like to add an amendment stating there be a common area built (100 square feet) for every unit built.

The Chair would like to table the 120 units on the Gibson site to a later date, and be combined with items 7 and 8.

18. Unknown Resident

Issues regarding traffic and water will be addressed in phase two of the development process. If the community would like to see additional facilities and such in Fall River there would need to be a greater population. An increase in population may not be desirable but it would be needed, and no matter how much of an increase is in the population there would be some negative effects to the lakes. There could be a heightened potential for sewer issues based on the soil make up and the sewage system here, i.e.; no central sewage or water.

It was discussed not to increase the Fall River population, but increase the use of the current land very practically. An increase in density will go against the idea of the community, because it is slowly reaching the capacity of the lakes and land. This could lead to potential septic systems issues by possibly leaking into the lakes and cause issues to the environment. The committee would rather see one cluster with a well-planned sewage system (commercial) as to 40 single units with systems that will fail and poor design (personal).

19. Unknown Resident

Discussed in combination with item 18

20. Larry Gibson, Perry Lake Developments

It was noted that it would be a single 4,000 sq. foot print or could be a total unit size of 4,000 sq. feet, just as long as it fits within the 40% then it will be ok with the committee.

The Committee accepts the recommendation, granted the unit stays within the 40% land usage.

21. Inn on the Lake

It was noted that on March 3 there was a retail association formed within Fall River. There is a meeting Monday morning (May 2, 2011) at 9:30AM for discussion between the Inn on the Lake and staff regarding site uses. It was suggested to the Committee to revisit policy p-68, the Chair would like to table this to a later date.

22. Angela Walsh, 3061 Hwy. 2

It was noted staff had sent a letter to Ms. Walsh stating they would like to meet with her to discuss if the land could be to make it more viable for her and HRM. Staff took out certain items restricting certain businesses from being developed on the land in keeping with the look of the community. The committee decided to table to a later date, until they find what Ms. Walsh has planned for the land.

23. Angela Walsh, 3061 Hwy. 2

No discussion on this comment.

24. Letter from Miller Development - NEW ITEM

The Chair read a letter to the Committee from Miller Developments; they would like to voice their disapproval of the Fall River development, and are objecting RL-13. Miller development acquired new land mass and now have 140 acres of land as to the 98 original acres. They are proposing 92 town houses in the new area, which would be developing 60% of his land.

The committee would like to table this until they can have discussion with Miller Developments to understand exactly what they are proposing.

25. Nursing Home Development – NEW ITEM

A letter from Mr. Shediac was presented to the Committee, proposing a new senior development. The committee would like to table this issue to discuss more with the developers to gain more information before making a decision.

DISCUSSION

The Committee expresses interest in the formation of a draft a policy to allow the developers make a Development Agreement for all new construction.

The Committee discussed making the water study conducted in the area made public and whether or not talks should continue regarding multi unit dwellings that do not fall within the Village Community Centre zone until there is more information from the water study. If the study was chosen to be made public, then the Committee would cease talks until it is released, and this would push back the process by 2-3 months. After discussion it was determined to carry on as planned and can conclude issues or look for further explanation to keep things moving and not delay the process any further. It is suggested to have the proposals presented to the Committee over three evening meetings, allowing each developer an hour to present their proposal to the committee. The Committee would like if possible to have the water study presented by staff on the night of the first meeting before the developers commence.

Staff noted they would talk to HRM to see if there is permission to present the water shed study and the transport study to the Committee before they meet with the developers for further information on what developers are proposing.

DECISION:

Schedule a meeting with developers over 2-3 nights and possibly a presentation from staff on the water and transportation study. It was also noted that the community would be notified of these meetings (as on webpage)

Night 1 – study (2 hrs) and 1 developer

Night 2 – 2 developer

Night 3 – 2 developers

* It was suggested to use doogle.com to set up these meetings.

Staff will get back to the committee on Monday, May 9th, 2011 with regards to the dates of the meetings.

FLOOR QUESTIONS

Laurie baker: said that was a good meeting

With no further question or discussion the meeting was adjourned at 8:40PM