



**Fall River Community Planning Group meeting**

**Thursday, March 31, 2011, 7:00 pm**

**Gordon R. Snow Centre**

**1359 Fall River Road, Fall River**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Maureen Ryan, Senior Planner, HRM Planning Services  
Scott Leblanc, Planning Technician, HRM Planning Services  
Maria Jacobs, Planner I, HRM Planning Services  
Sharlene Seaman, Planning Controller, HRM Planning Services  
Councillor Barry Dalrymple

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Michael Creighton, Chair  
Jim Simon  
Anna McCarron  
Allen McKenzie  
Valerie Williams  
Bob Gusscott  
Bill Munden  
Owen Evans  
Jacqueline Steudler

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:** Approximately 33

---

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:10 pm.

**1. Opening remarks / Introductions / Purpose of meeting – Maureen Ryan**

**Maureen Ryan**, introduced herself, the local Councillor and the members of the Fall River Vision Implementation Committee. She advised of the overall agenda, including the Village Centre, plans for alternative housing to accommodate the needs of seniors and young adults and the plans purposed by the Open Space and Trails Task group. She noted that there would be time towards the end of the general discussion for a question and answer period, after which there would be a workshop.

**2. Presentation of Proposal – Michael Creighton**

Mr. Michael Creighton introduced himself and gave the agenda for the meeting. He noted that the meeting would be covering the planning process, proposed regulations for Village, proposed housing policy, proposed Open Space and Trails System and the workshop.

He stated that the Fall River Vision Implementation Committee was appointed by Regional Council in October of 2007, to recommend a Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) to carry out the Fall River Vision an Action Plan in consultation with the community.

He advised that the Vision and Action Plan would be taking place in two phases.

- Phase I is designed to carry out the goals of the Vision and Action Plan to maintain the rural village feel of Fall River and surrounding area, to develop design regulations that would foster the future development of a nice centre, to provide for a mix of housing types that meet the people's needs and create a well-integrated network of trails and open space for recreation and active transportation services.
- Phase II will be seeking the Regional Council's direction on the implementation of the findings of the Shubenacadie Lakes Watershed study and the Fall River Transportation study. These studies contain recommendations for future infrastructure provision with respect to municipal water services and the roads. It also contains recommendations on strategies to protect the lakes and ground water systems. They will be seeking Regional Council's directions on the options for future growth in the greater Fall River area.

He stated that for now they are dealing with the recommendations regarding the future development of the Village Centre and a few options for housing development to meet the critical needs of seniors and young adults. Currently in Fall River the existing zones, apart from the residential zones, are the C-2 (General Business) zone and C-4 (Highway Commercial) zone. The C-2 (General Business) zone permits a wide variety of commercial uses up to a maximum of 10,000 square feet. This is mostly applied to the majority of the Village Centre. The C-4 (Highway Commercial) Zone permits a wide variety of commercial and industrial uses at the Gateway leading into Fall River, with no current limitations on building sizes. The current regulations have a few requirements to prevent impact on adjacent properties. The regulations do not have any design requirements for landscaping or architectural. It will not prevent Fall River from becoming a highway commercial strip.

He noted that in preparing the proposal Plan, they had held numerous workshops dating back as far as 2007. In 2007, they held workshops on senior housing, trails and bikeways, transit and commercial development to form the Vision and Action Plan. In 2009 they held a workshop to gather community input for options for the future growth of the Village Centre. In 2010 they undertook a housing preference survey to determine what types of alternative housing forms would be acceptable in Fall River and what locations would be best suited. The Fall River Visioning Implementation Committee had been meeting since 2008 and all of the meetings have been opened to the public.

He advised that in the Spring 2009 Open House and Design Workshop, the Committee presented with three alternative growth models for the Village Centre for public feedback. Model 5 was

selected as the preferred model based on public input from which to create the proposed design regulations for future growth.

Four key goals came from these consultations was:

- The desire to maintain the rural village atmosphere of Fall River and to not allow it to become another highway commercial strip.
- To maintain a high quality natural environment and to protect the lakes.
- To foster the development of an attractive Village Centre for people who want to congregate.
- To attain a safe and well managed transportation system and municipal water infrastructure.

He noted the 10 key design principles that emerged from the Community workshops:

- Buildings close to the street or landscaped with attractive front yards.
- Parking at rear or side.
- Attractive Architecture that builds upon Sense of Place.
- Controlled signage, in keeping with the Village Centre atmosphere.
- Coordinated Streetscape.
- Secure views and access to Lake Thomas.
- Riverfront park & village green.
- Transit Station should be located near exit 2 to enable access.
- A variety of housing types should be permitted to meet the needs of residents.
- Minimize impact on Natural Environment.

He stated that there are 5 proposed zones for the Village Centre that contain regulations for permit uses, building and lot lay out, architectural, landscaping and lighting. Each of the zones reflects a unique character of the areas to which they apply.

He noted that the aim of the plan is to foster the continuing development of unique areas to prevent the future development of endless highway commercial strips. He reviewed each zone:

- The Canal Court applies to the lands surrounding the historic Shubenacadie Canal and Fall River Run. It is intended to support continued development of a pedestrian oriented commercial and residential area on a small lot pattern. This small lot pattern gives the area its special character.
- The Village Core Comprehensive Development District applies to the Sobeys Shopping Centre site and supports the continued development of the larger scaled commercial development through the process of a development agreement.
- The Village Gateway zone applies to the lands around interchanges and is intended to create a visually pleasing entryway to the community.

- The Fall River Business zone applies to the light industrial area on Perrin Drive and is designed for continued development of commercial and light industrial type uses that are highway oriented in nature.
- The Village Main Street zone applies to all the remaining lands within the Village Centre. This is also intended to provide for a pedestrian oriented commercial and residential area with a wider mix of commercial uses at a medium scale relative to the Canal Court zone.

Maureen Ryan stated that the building floor space proposed for the Village Centre is an important piece of information. They had talked about the need to create special enclaves and the proposal is to allow for the Canal Court zone to have a maximum floor space of 4,000 square feet, the Village Main Street area, which has larger lots, to have 8,000 square feet, the Village Gateway, to have 20,000 square feet and for the Fall River Business zone to have 20,000 square feet.

Mr. Creighton talked about the prominent sites by proposed zone. The Chef Jeff's building, the Jessys Plaza and the Inn on the Lake represents the floor space that is currently there. The floor space for the old recreation centre is a proposal that will allow more development. The Nova Scotia Power site, by Farmer Clems, will encourage a bigger business area.

Ms. Ryan stated that it is intended to create a focal point in the centre of these areas as an attraction or a prominent site where development could be built around it to become a focal point.

Mr. Creighton stated that the Comprehensive Development District applies to the Sobeys property which is partly under a development agreement. The development agreement was approved in 1995, amended in 2000 and amended again last Fall. If the agreement is amended again, it will have to comply with the proposed architectural, lighting, pedestrian facilities and landscaping requirements of the Plan.

He talked about the architectural sections. Proposed regulations are introduced under the Land Use By-Laws for architecture. One of the primary gains of these regulations is that it adds character to new buildings that is keeping with the rural character for the area. They are also designed to reduce the massive scale of buildings. It does this by requiring the incorporation of architectural detail such as: traditional, rectangular windows which recess in the front façade of buildings, multiple roof lines and a minimum roof pitch are required, cladding such as wood shingles, vinyl and brick are required and awnings, canopies and accessory structures should be designed to complement the main structure. These proposed regulations would only be applied to new buildings and the additions to the front or side of existing buildings.

He advised that a maximum of two signs are permitted on a property under the current and proposed regulations. Ground signs are permitted in the Village Mainstreet, Village Core Comprehensive Development District and the Village Gateway zones. They are also permitted on the Jessys Plaza and the Chef Jeff's properties, leading to the Canal Court. Facial signs, the signs flat against the buildings, and Projecting signs are permitted in all zones.

He stated that lighting regulations are proposed to reduce the amount of light pollution in the Fall River area. It must be designed to direct light to driveways, parking areas, building entrances and

to direct light away from the adjacent properties. Full cut off fixtures are required to make sure the lighting is downward directed and pointed to the site and not the surrounding area.

He stated that landscaping is required along all property lines exclusive of driveways. It may consist of grasses, ground covers, pavers, stone, mulch, etc. Existing trees and shrubs may be used where possible.

Mr. Creighton talked about the housing vision. The Vision and Action Plan states that housing should remain primarily single unit dwellings. However, it is acknowledged that alternative housing forms, such as, town houses and low-rise multiple unit dwellings are needed to meet the needs of seniors and young adults. Through consultations, they have been told that townhouses may be appropriate in certain locations. They have also been told that low-rise multiple unit dwellings may be appropriate in certain locations if they do not exceed three stories in height. Future housing for single and two unit dwellings are currently permitted in the Fall River area if designated as conservation design development. This is an approach that aims to preserve the natural and cultural features of a site by clustering the development on a portion of the site and leaving the remainder as open space. The Hybrid form of conservation design, the entire parcel of land may be subdivided into individual lots if the housing development is situated on a maximum of twenty percent of the lot. The permitted density for this design approach is 1 dwelling per 2.5 acres. If the developer proposes to cluster the development on a maximum of 40 percent of the site, the development density can be increased to 1 unit per acre. Only single and two unit development forms are currently allowed in the Fall River Area.

Mr. Creighton stated that the Regional Plan allows an increase in density of classic conservation design approach where a secondary municipal planning strategy is proposed. This can only be done from a classic form of conservation design where the development is clustered on a maximum of 40 percent of the site. Town houses and low-rise multiple unit dwellings can also be added as a permitted form of residential development. There was a workshop held to figure out the best location for these types of housing in 2007. They also followed this up with a housing preference survey in 2009. He showed the four sites where these houses might be located:

- The Gibson Site is 30 acres and is located at the south end of Ingram Drive and Fall River Village. The maximum purposed density is 4 units per acre. This would allow a total of 120 units. The alternative housing form recommended is multiple unit and/or townhouse dwellings. The site is purposed to be rezoned from a service industrial zone to a Residential Comprehensive Development District zone. The new zone would allow consideration for a small scale, local, commercial, convenience store and a self-storage building in association with the residential development.
- The Baker Site is 46 acres and is located at the north end of Fall River Village, running parallel with the Fall River Road. The maximum purposed density is 2 units per acre. This would allow a total of 92 units. At a meeting earlier in the day, the attendees decided that they would like the density to be 4 units per acre, which would be 200 units on the property. These density allowances were based on many different factors, such as traffic and water studies.

Ms. Ryan stated that another issue is that the Fall River Transportation Study has indicated that at Fall River Road and Highway #2, the intersection is failing at peak AM traffic times. They are trying to be conservative with a proposal of 92 units to allow for the senior citizen housing development to occur, but not at a scale that would overwhelm the intersection.

- The Charleswood site is 98 acres and is located in the Charleswood Road and Windsor Junction area. The maximum purposed density is 1 unit per acre. This would allow a total of 98 units.
- The Village Centre site is 38 acres and is located at the Village Main Street. The maximum purposed density is 3 units per acre. The vast majority of lots in that area ranges from 20,000 square feet to 3 acres. This would allow a total of 1 to 9 units.

He gave illustrations of the total acre, total units and the unit per acre, in regards to how many houses could fit onto each proposed lot. The recommendation would be that alternative housing developments be considered on the proposed sites under the provision of a development agreement, which are subject to the examination of traffic impact analysis, water availability, compatibility with the surrounding areas, retention of cultural and environmental features and that they are subject to a Public Hearing before a Community Council.

Mr. Creighton stated that the goal of the open space and trails component of the Secondary Plan is to protect the vast system of interconnected trails and walkways that have been developed throughout the River Lakes area. These trails create a formal and informal link between the various communities, schools and the Village centre. The Open Space and Trails Group for the Vision Implementation Committee, with the help of high school students, inventoried, walked and researched the area to come up with a ranking system to rank these trails. Out of these, the Committee identified five top priority connector trails that they feel are worthwhile goals to work towards over the long term. Four are sited within the proposed River Lakes Plan area:

- The Old Coach Trail connects Fall River Village with the Old Coach Trail, Blue Hill Road. It is a historic trail that has a right of way already in place. It would be fairly easy to upgrade.
- The High Road to Lockview High Connector is well used by students in Saint Andrew's Village as it connects High Road through to the Lockview High school; Future connection to Lockview, Ashlee, George P. schools though the Vanier connector.
- The Lock 4 Connector is historic and is a part of Shubenacadie Canal, Lock 4. It connects Fletcher Drive with Lockview Road and Highway #2. It is one of the few vital canal crossings in the area. It also links to various subdivisions inside the river.
- The Lake Thomas Water Walk provides a scenic lake trail which allows for lake access. It provides a connection to the Gordon Snow community centre. There is a potential for a trail over the 102 bridge with a highway extension and an interchange project.

He stated that the goals for this project is to secure a trail route as close to the water as possible, to develop a multi-use trail along the western side of Highway #2, to develop a trail from Inn on the Lake to MacDonald's sports park, to complete a trail with sidewalk linkages between upper and lower loops around Lake Thomas and Fall River Run, to work towards the creation of a Village green at the Head of Lake Thomas and Fall River Run Canal, to maintain Lake Thomas frontage and Gordon R. Snow community centre in their natural state and to develop a swimming dock with a minimum disturbance of the natural area.

He noted that this is a 25 year plan and there are a number of strategies that can be used to achieve this vision for the future. Step one is the need to form a trail society to work with the Halifax Regional Trails Association to develop a detailed plan. Once these plans are in place, an application can be made for funding from the budget that HRM allocates for the Trails Association each year. They do recommend that HRM consider trading public land for Village Green and other important features within the proposed system. They seek community recreation benefits through future infrastructure improvements.

Ms. Ryan stated that the transportation study calls for the widening of the Fall River Bridge. They are not suggesting that the bridge be raised to create a community benefit but if the bridge had to be raised or reconstructed to alleviate the congestion at that intersection, that would be a good time to consider the community recreation benefit.

Mr. Creighton stated that there would be a workshop, to follow the presentation, to receive feedback from the proposed plan. They are asking what features of the plan do you like and what suggested changes would you recommend to improve it. The committee has developed a ten step process to carry out the project. They are currently at step four. This is where they plan to review the public comments through the month of April and post the recommended changes to the plan by mid-May. Following this, the plan will be brought forth to the HRM committees of Council for approval at a public hearing.

Maureen Ryan provided the website information and encouraged everyone to check it in mid-May. She opened the floor for questions and answers.

#### **4. Questions / Comments**

Steve Gibbon, Grand Lake, expressed concern regarding the old HRM Recreation Centre. He asked if the old recreation centre property actually belongs to everyone or just HRM.

Councillor Dalrymple stated that it belongs to HRM.

Mr. Gibbon stated that it was not an asset to Fall River. He noted an article in the Laker where the Councillor is talking about swapping the recreation centre for other lands that are a part of the Village Green.

Councillor Dalrymple stated that he was correct. The property was up for sale by HRM. If sold, the money would have been put into a general tax revenue account. He approached the Visioning Committee and stated that there was a community need for the building, at that time. The Committee put in a request to hold that property. HRM did put in on hold and it has been like that for a few years. The intent was that the whole community could use that space as a hall. Over the last 6 months, he has become aware that they will not be able to get the building. He noted that there are some budget issues and the property will be going up for sale. He advised the visioning committee that they would probably not be able to hold that property any longer or get it for a dollar, which is what they were asking for. He was happy to suggest to the community that if the centre went up for sale, the money would be gone. He suggested to the Committee, because the four year plan was to have more green spaces, more access to the lakes and more parks for the community, to release the hold on the Centre with two conditions. One being that they did not sell it until the new By-laws were put into place and secondly, in any sale, if there was a possibility to obtain Lake Frontage that should be part of the sale.

Mr. Creighton quoted the Laker, stating that consideration be given to any sale that included a land swap of river or lakefront properties. This was published about a month ago.

Mr. Gibbon stated that as per his understanding, a land swap is a swap. It does not involve a cash transaction.

Mr. Creighton again quoted the Laker, stating that the motion from the Committee said that consideration be given to any land sale that included waterfront property.

Councillor Dalrymple stated that if the community can obtain some water frontage as a part of this deal, he supports it because the community would be benefitting.

Maureen Ryan clarified that HRM would not allow for the exchange of land, except at fair market value. If there was to be a land trade, they would have to be sure that they are obtaining fair market value for that land according to the policies of HRM.

Wendy Pruneau asked for clarification on the multiple units per acre for seniors dwelling. She asked what is to keep it from becoming a multiple unit apartment complex to have 200 apartments in a small area off of Fall River Road.

Ms. Ryan stated that the Municipality cannot specify who can and cannot live in these units. The Municipality is only enabled under the law to regulate the types of buildings that may be built but cannot regulate who can live there. The developers of these properties are proposing to rent or convey the units to seniors. That is the prerogative of the market. HRM has no control over that. The Committee has assessed the developments from the perspective of the potential impact on the surrounding community, compatibility with the surrounding land use form, traffic impact known to date, water availability and the soil conditions in terms of what it can support. The site at the end of Ingraham Drive, has direct access to Cobequid Road, has water and is zoned industrial. The Committee is proposing to rezone this parcel of land from an industrial zone to a Residential Comprehensive Development District Zone. If approved, the developer may develop approximately 120 units on this site, if 60% of the site is retained as open space, direct access has been provided to the Cobequid Road, and trail connectors have been considered over this site to

eventually connect the Fall River Village to the MacDonald Sports Park. In the case of the Baker property, running parallel to the Fall River Road, that site is outside of the Water Service District so it would be reliant on ground water supply. Another concern would be the intersection of Highway #2 and Fall River Road, which is currently failing during peak AM conditions. The idea is to be a conservative as possible. The Committee is proposing to allow consideration of multiple unit dwellings, townhouses or single unit dwellings to a density of a maximum of 2 units per acre for this site if 60 percent of the land were retained as open space. This would allow 92 units on this 46 acre site. Also, the policy has a proposal to require the retention of important cultural features such as rural heritage sites. It should be compatible and consistent with the natural environment and cultural values of the area.

Wendy Pruneau asked for clarification in that the development will not necessarily be for seniors, if it will be mostly for a lane with a courtyard that will encompass multitudes of apartments.

Ms. Ryan stated that in the case of the Baker property, if the proposed density were increased from the proposed two units per acre to four units per acre, that would permit approximately 200 units which could be developed in about six buildings that could be clustered in an area on the site.

Gerald Burgess, asked if municipal water services were available at the Baker property.

Ms. Ryan stated that water is not the main issue; it is traffic congestion at the end of Fall River Road and highway #2. HRM is confident that they have requirements under the proposed policy to require an assessment of ground water capability. If water services are provided, that would be good but that is not the main issue. Traffic is the constraining factor.

Councillor Dalrymple stated that where water comes into play, there are multiple routes that water can come down Fall River Road. The possible routes are Windsor Junction Road, Ingraham Drive or Lexington Drive. There is no question to him that it wouldn't hurt for the Baker proposal to have one as well.

Wendy Pruneau asked if there is up to 200 units of free flowing water, where will the sewer go.

Maureen Ryan stated that in this case, the area would not have sewer. The soil conditions are not great in the area. It would have to be serviced by a cluster septic system approach. It would have to be an on-site system since there is no place to discharge effluent into a surface water body. The approval for the number of lots that would ultimately be allowed on the site would rest with the Nova Scotia Department of Environment. She clarified that the Nova Scotia Department of Environment is the approving authority under the Nova Scotia On-site Septic Regulations.

Wendy Pruneau stated concern as these units are not designated to anyone in particular. She asked about growth to the schools and if that had been considered.

Ms. Ryan stated that the Halifax Regional School Board is planning for the development of an additional school, in the area<sup>1</sup>. She also stated that they have no absolute control as to who ultimately lives in the units.

Sandra Carr asked if she understood correctly that a developer can house whomever and not specify for seniors only.

Ms. Ryan stated that she was correct. That would be contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedom. It would be discriminatory and HRM cannot break the law.

Valerie Williams commented that developers have the right to market in whichever way they see fit.

Sandra Carr questioned how the traffic from the development would impact the Fall River Road and Highway 2 intersection, if it were developed for seniors since seniors do not drive at peak times.

Ms. Ryan stated that seniors would have to drive in order to access the services from the Village Centre that they won't have in the proposed location for this development. However, HRM has no control over who lives there. It may be seniors today but that could change over time. Until the intersection problem has been resolved, HRM Staff and the Committee are being conservative with the proposed amount of development that should be considered for this site.

Unknown speaker asked if there were any plans for cemeteries for the future as she noticed there are a lot of green spaces and trails.

Ms. Ryan stated that this isn't something HRM would be planning for. Real Property Planning has been looking at some options in various locations.

Councillor Dalrymple gave input on cemeteries, stating that for the past 2 years he has been meeting with the union cemetery group and revitalizing the cemetery on Cobequid Road. It should be ready within a year or two.

Barbara Graves asked what possible plan there is to fix the intersection.

Ms. Ryan stated that the Fall River Transportation Study stated that the intersections at Fall River Road and Lockview and Fall River Road and Highway 2 is failing during peak morning conditions. There is a failing intersection at the off ramp of Perrin Drive during peak PM traffic conditions. There are a number of recommendations under the transportation study including the widening of the Fall River Bridge to four lanes. The committee doesn't necessarily agree with

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the Halifax Regional School Board advises that the school referred to was constructed in 2010. The Board advises that the elementary school system in Fall River is currently under pressure. Plans were underway to consider constructing a new school in the Enfield/Dutch Settlement area in the Lockview Family of Schools. As of March 30<sup>th</sup>, the Board has decided not to construct this school but to continue monitoring the situation.

that particular design as they don't want the Village Centre to look like the intersection at the Beaver Bank Connector and Sackville Drive. There are other proposals under that transportation study but the widening of the bridge alone won't alleviate the traffic problem at the interchange.

She stated that there are options in place to examine future potential locations for new interchanges. There are four in total but the two most feasible are; The Aerotech industrial Park connecting the forth leg into that park with an overland transportation route up through Confederation Way and eastward through the southern portion of Wellington. The second option is an interchange down at Cobequid Road connecting to Highway 102. They have to consult with Council in the Fall and the public on the directions for possible future growth within the larger River Lakes Secondary Plan Area before decisions can be made. Council needs to see the growth options in the context of the Shubenacadie Lakes Watershed Study, which is also saying that the receiving waters of the Shubenacadie Lakes are under stress from past development. They also have to look at the findings of the Shubenacadie Lakes Watershed Study with respect to groundwater. The Study indicates that the groundwater aquifer in Fall River is under significant pressure and very limited. The development of the infrastructure depends on the options for future growth. They will be looking at these locations in the Fall.

Unknown speaker asked for clarification on the term village.

Ms. Ryan stated that the Vision for the Fall River Lakes Secondary Plan is a small scale, well architecturally designed buildings, well set back from the road with landscaped front yards in some of the zones, parking at the side or rear, multiple roof lines, the use of dormers and traditional cladding in the form of plank, hardy plank, vinyl or brick. In some areas, like the Canal Court, the idea there is to have buildings come closer to the street to create the possibility for a future Canal Court area to emerge along the historic Shubenacadie Canal. The desire to retain the rural village atmosphere, applies not only applies to the Village Centre but to the whole of Fall River and one of the key aspects of this is to maintain the beautiful forest with the many hardwoods and remnants of old growth forest throughout the area. The protection of the steep slopes and hill sides that form the valleys and the views to the lakes are also important features that that shape the form the village and add character to the area. She welcomed suggestions for improvement in terms of the definition of a village.

Chris Macaulay asked if some of the existing buildings would meet the criteria as the plan moves forward because they have flat roofs.

Ms. Ryan stated that the proposed Plan allows for flat roofs on buildings up to 2,000 square feet. That would be something they could look into if the public wanted to seek modification. Currently, the proposal is to allow flat roofs for the small scaled buildings only. The Committee considered whether to permit flat roofs on larger buildings but opted not to since they also wanted to prohibit the future development of large scale "big box retail" development. The proposed Plan contains requirements for the development of buildings with pitch roof lines that have gabled entry ways, etc. The Committee is looking for your feedback on this topic.

Unknown speaker asked if the group have given any thought to having a uniform, rustic signage as oppose to every building having their own gaudy sign with neon lights. They have done this in Vermont.

Mr. Creighton stated that there are design guidelines and criteria for signage throughout the Village area. There is a section on signage and it limits the width and height. It isn't that detailed.

Ms. Ryan stated that there is a need to have visable signage along Highway 2 but to a limited extent. The Committee is proposing to limit the size and location for ground signs. Ground signs, are not proposed to be permitted within the Canal Court Zone, except at the entry ways into the area at the Chef Jeff's and Jessys Pizza sites. Ground signs at the interchange, need to be visible from the highway. The proposal there is to allow for signs 50 feet in height and 250 feet in sign face. It is more limited in the centre.

Mr. Creighton stated that there is not much HRM could do about the highway signs.

Currently, under the Land Use By-law, as well as under the proposal, there is no allowance for advanced signage. It has to be associated with the business on the property.

Unknown speaker asked if there are any thoughts of underground or multi-level parking.

Ms. Ryan stated that it would be cost prohibitive, the amount of density would be too low to offset the cost of underground parking. They did, in the case of the Canal Court, create provisions to allow for the parking to be situated 400 feet away and to allow for a comprehensive development agreement to be applied to that area.

Unknown speaker stated that the parking lots keep growing bigger and they all seem to have a lot of front parking.

Ms. Ryan stated that the proposed Plan would require all future parking to be located to the side and the rear of the property in most of the proposed Zones. She said that the proposed zones do not allow for the future development of strip / commercial shopping centre development, except on the Sobeys site, which is under an existing development agreement. If Sobeys were to seek an amendment to their agreement, they would have to comply with all of the regulations that are in place at the time of any future amendments to that agreement. One of the environmental features that they are trying to advance with this plan is that a minimum of 50 percent of the sites within most of the various zones be retained as a pervious surface. This is to allow for groundwater infiltration for storm water management. They also require that parking be located at the side or the rear of the building. The front yard should have 30 feet of landscaping.

Bruce Wiggins asked if there will be enough parking, on a busy day, when the developments are completed. He feels that at some point a village becomes a city.

Ms. Ryan stated that they have tested the regulations on some of the sites and they have determined that there will be sufficient parking. There are situations where the slope of the land would impact upon the ability to situate the parking to the rear or the side. They do feel that they

can achieve side and rear parking. Future development would have to comply with the regulations to situate parking to the side or the rear of the property if the proposed regulations are approved. She gave examples.

She encouraged everyone to stay and join in a workshop to help with addition questions concerning the proposal.

## **6. Workshop**

The workshop started at approximately 8:10 pm.