

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
Public Information Meeting
Case 21460

The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.

Wednesday, June 13, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Gordon R. Snow Community Centre - Multipurpose Room - 1359 Fall River Rd, Fall River

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Stephanie Salloum, Planner, HRM Planning
Thea Langille, Principle Planner, HRM Planning and Development
Iain Grant, Planning Technician, HRM Planning
Tara Couvrette, Planning Controller, HRM Planning
Councillor, Steve Streach, District 01

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Cesar Saleh – Applicant, W.M. Fares Group
Jacob JeBailey – Applicant, W.M. Fares Group

PUBLIC IN

ATTENDANCE: Approximately: 225

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:05 p.m.

Call to order, purpose of meeting – Stephanie Salloum

Ms. Salloum introduced herself as the Planner and Facilitator for the application. They also introduced; Councillor Steve Streach, Tara Couvrette – Planning Controller, Iain Grant - Planning Technician, and the Applicant – Cesar Saleh and Jacob JeBailey – W.M. Fares Group.

Case 21460 - Application to Amend the Planning Districts 14 & 17 (Shubenacadie Lakes) MPS to enable a Development Agreement for 22 townhouses and 120 Multiple Unit Dwellings in 2 buildings on Site C in Fall River

Ms. Salloum explained; the purpose of the Public Information Meeting (PIM) is: a) to identify that HRM has received a proposal for the site; b) to provide information on the project; c) to explain the Planning Policies and the stages of the Planning Process; d) an opportunity for Staff to receive public feedback regarding the proposal. No decisions are made at this PIM.

1a) Presentation of Proposal – Ms. Salloum

Ms. Salloum provided a brief introduction to the application and then made a presentation to the public outlining the purpose of the meeting, status of the application and the applicants request. Ms. Salloum outlined the context of the subject lands and the relevant planning policies.

1b) Presentation by Jacob JeBailey, Applicant

Mr. JeBailey explained the reason for the application showing the site plan as well as renderings of the proposed development.

2. Questions and Comments

Jay Cameron – Waterford Crt, spoke to the planning vision that was created for a handful of density opportunities in the Fall River area. Mr. Cameron stated they were chosen because of their strategic access to main arteries in and out of the LWF area. The planning documents included verbiage to qualify the development on Site C as requiring access to Cobequid Rd. Mr. Cameron stated that; Fares stating that because there will not be a commercial component, the road leading to Cobequid Rd. is not needed, they find that to be an ill-informed speculation. The impact the traffic from this development would have is undeniable. Because that outflow to Cobequid Rd. is not possible, the planning requirements are not met and this proposal only advances against the vision of the community and at the expense of the residents that call the village their home. What benefits will this bring to the people of Fall River? Infrastructure has seen a 30% growth over the last decade. Between this site and the others marked for density, they are looking at almost 1000 new units. Schools are at capacity, roads are full of traffic and the doctors are taking no new patients so how would this benefit current day Fall River? The only viable development for today's LWF area is to complete the cul-de-sac with more single-family dwellings and seek out density somewhere else where it makes sense. They have 400 letters they would like to present to the Councillor to have their petition put in front of council and deliver their sentiment that they are not for this proposal as it stands.

Terry Maulcahy – Canterbury Lane, indicated to Councillor Streach that they are opposed to this application. The key problems they have with it are: traffic – the traffic on Ingram makes going for a walk impossible, 142 units multiply that by 1.5 – 2, and the issue of the mailbox on Winley Dr., property values are going to be affected, this doesn't contribute anything to the neighborhood.

Gordon Wolfe – Ingram Dr., Every home in Fall River Village is a single-family dwelling and they would like to keep it that way. The traffic would be a problem, it is a problem now. Ingram Dr. is as straight as an arrow and cars drive up there are 90-100 km/h and it is not safe to walk. With this development it would just be getting worse and worse. If one of these development goes through in our area somebody else will be looking for land to put in another and we don't need that. Fall River Village is a wonderful place and this development will total y change that. Mr. Wolf and his wife are both totally against it.

Wayne Tamara – Winlake, HRM and the Councillor need to recognize that this is not a taste of just a few disgruntled home owners. In less than 2 weeks we have assembled almost 400 letters of opposition to this development. This an example of a community coming together to save their neighbourhood from a development that simply makes no sense at any level. Mr. Tamara stated he is going to present Stephanie Salloum with the 400 letters that they would like to form part of the report to council. There concerns are: waiving the requirement for direct access to Cobequid Rd. will create unsafe conditions for motorist and pedestrians, Winley Dr. is a safety concern now and this will make it worse, the negative impact the traffic increase will have on the neighbourhood. The addition of high density, multi-unit apartment buildings and townhouses will fundamentally change the character and makeup of the neighbourhood. The increase in density will create two bottle necks, one at the corner of Winley Dr. and Winsor Junction and the other the other at the corner of Winsor Junction Rd. and Cobequid. These are already bad intersections and if there was ever an accident or during peak traffic hours the traffic will be backed up. There are numerous environmental considerations and potential concerns that have not been addressed by the developer. The impact on existing natural habitats and wetlands. The introduction of the massive sewage disposal system that would be required to service those units. Homeowners are very cautious about what they put down their sinks etc., renters are not going to be as cautious so the chances of that septic field having a failure are very high. If that goes sideways it will destroy the lakes in the area. The proposed development is counter to HRM's own vision of requiring direct access to Cobequid Rd.

Fred Grayburn – Foster Ave, had questions regarding the initiation report that went to Regional Council. Mr. Grayburn questions the logic of some of the statements in it. They feel that HRM is going contrary to the MPS. **Ms. Salloum and Ms. Langille** explained that the initiation report was an ask by the planning department to go out to the community and get their feedback on this proposed development. The report does not have to do with their position on this proposal, at this time they are neither for or against it as it is too early in the process. **Mr. Grayburn** would like to know why staff would recommend this proposal when it didn't even pass the initial criteria of the MPS. **Ms. Langille** stated they had heard back from CN that a crossing was not going to be permitted so they wanted to explore with the community what their options would be for the site and that is why we are here. **Mr. Grayburn** stated that the original proposal was shut down in 2016 with 216 multi housing units (just regarding the apartments) partially because of the road blockage and now you are coming back asking for 142 still with no road, can't follow that logic. Would like to see what the apartments are going to look like other than just the drawings. Would like to know what kind of social economic research/studies have been done to put an apartment building of that size at the end of a street with no buses for miles. On their calculations they estimate that this development will generate 150 thousand liters of effluent per day which is about 5 highway tanker truck loads of poop everyday.

Jenny Lugar – resident of North end Halifax with the Ecology Action Centre, is all for density but this is not the right place for density. They are begging for density on the peninsula of Halifax, asking for more development and more infill to be done. That is where it can be supported with transit, business and good walkability. This is not the right place because they physically don't have the means to be able to support this many new people. There would be too many cars being added to the road. If you are thinking about sustainability at all you don't want to be adding that many more cars to the roads. Ms. Lugar is putting her support behind that community. This is not the kind of development that adds wealth to a community, the kind of development that adds wealth to a community is the one that is supporting local business and transit. This kind of development goes in and then the developer moves out and the city pays for it incrementally over the next several years and that is why your taxes keep going up.

Peter Stocker – Fall River Village, has two logistic questions: 1 – the road on CN, can they absolutely say no to a road pass or is there a higher authority, or government authority, that can override that, and 2 – has it been considered that there is be a bypass road that connects over the highway onto the bridge. Mr. Streach – who has the final authority to block it all, is it CN or another level of government. **Ms. Langille** explained CN is a higher authority than the municipality and they will not permit an at grade crossing at that location which means possibly an above grade. Given the technical challenges in the area that is near impossible to do.

Davis Nunn – Fall River Village, increase in density equals about 67 people on that site if you were doing single family houses. The density calculation if you get into the multi is about 320. The storm water management system that is going to balance this thing, we would like to see that study. It also mentions a prosperous net loading assessment, and the traffic study for the impact as there may have been a lot of miss information (not really sure) and what is that balance and before that increase the density from 4-5, we would like to see that study. The Halifax Regional Plan that was amended on June 2, map 5 identified to have significant habitat endangered species areas and that area, has there been any studies done because there appears to be wetland in that area. Area map 9 has elevated archeological potential and doesn't know if that has been looked at in a study. Remind staff that the master plan for Wentworth any units over 48 units in 2002 require underground parking. There is a lot of added density into this equation and not a lot of balancing. No sports fields or recreation areas, we are increasing this by 320 people but not adding one play field in this development itself. The other option is the trail going over CN's line. We have already heard CN doesn't want car access but are you developing a trail so kids, people in general, can access that railway line more. I don't think that is an official trail going across CN. How are we protecting the kids and residents from going back and forth across CN lines? These

are other consideration points that should be put into an assessment before we make any changes to the plan itself. **Ms. Langille** spoke to the studies, traffic impact statement, phosphorus loading, storm water, and sanitary study stating they are anticipated to come forward once this consolation session was completed.

Brian Mathison – Winley Dr., stated the streets are starting to max out when he comes to traffic. Every 30 seconds there is a car or heavy truck that passes by his home. It is getting out of hand where it is hard to walk along the road, it's not safe to get your mail, the road is crumbling from all the heavy traffic, everything comes off Windsor Junction Rd. down Winley and it is a speed strip. We don't need anything more down there because everything is going to come down Winley Dr. heading for this place. If CN doesn't cooperate they feel this thing should just evaporate. This is unsustainable, there is no infrastructure for this, it is a crazy idea.

Jennifer Capon – Ingram Dr., would like to know how their privacy and property values would be protected. Would also like to know what kind of people would be purchasing the units and what price point would they be looking for, high rent / low rent. **Mr. JeBailey** stated they couldn't comment on market as that isn't his area of expertise's and those things change. **Mr. Salih** also spoke to what the policy allows. Explained it gives opportunities for people that live there to rent in their own community. It will be predominantly families that they are going to be there. **Ms. Capon** stated families are going to have children that are going to be going to the schools that are there now. This is something that should be part of there vision and if it is something that is going to affect us in any way we should know. **Mr. Salih** explained the change in designation of the land and where they are at now. **Ms. Capon** appreciates that the developer is going back to the drawing board and that noting is set in stone but would like them to listen to what they are hearing, and that is that, apartment buildings don't work in Fall River Village.

Jennifer Ginnions – Fall River Village, is not opposed to development however, they fee the market has spoken because the old equestrian farm that was developed had not sold one property. The developers mandate comes from there client and they want the most bang for there buck. You can't drive on Ingram with your kids because it is not safe. There are no sidewalks in the existing subdivision. As far as infrastructure, I can't share a septic field with my neighbour however you can have a mass quantity of people sharing one septic field next to a water shed. It is scary. They were permitted to do that at the equestrian farm but again, the market has spoken and nobody is buying those properties. The demographic in Fall River is most of the people that this development is marketed too and they are opposed to it.

Christine Mirabelli, Regency Court, is concerned with the traffic issue that already exist in the area and at one of the two exits to Fall River Village and this will only make things worse. If you have a doctor's appointment at the Sobeys mall you can be stuck in traffic there for 20 minutes or more as it is right now. This is urban sprawl; which King's Warf was supposed to eliminate. There are no police in this village, there are no sidewalks in this village. Children stand on the side of the street waiting for buses. Where are the children who are going to live in these new apartments going to go to school, out schools are maxed out. Out whole system here is maxed, we don't have municipal bussing, we don't have bus stops for these kids to wait at to go to school. If anyone went though Winley Dr by the mailbox's, which is 40 km/h, at 80 or 90 where kids get off the school bus and walk on the crumbling road there could be a really bad disaster. People do not care and there are only two exits to this village and there is no possibility of a third. We need to consider where the traffic is going to go and how it is going to feed into the system that exists. There is no way to enlarge the roads because most homes are very close to the edge of the road.

Patti Gouthro – Ingram Dr., questions the decision by staff to bring this forward given it contradicts the access though CN property. People have already indicated their feelings and emotions and feel that bringing this back out here is a great waste of people's time and energy. No of the things around the environment, looking at the fact that the schools are maxed out and

doctors are not taking any new patients, none of those factors seem to be taken into consideration and those are all things that are important for planning. Traffic, the environmental impact as far as septic is concerned is also important for planning. All of these things make me question how much time and energy now has to be spent of this now that you have initiated this process. Can it be stopped at any earlier stage or does it have to go through 10 stages and 20 studies. What has to be done for a decision to be made to halt this process or tell them they have to come up with a substantially different proposal, for example 40 single dwelling houses at the end of Ingram Dr.? **Ms. Salloum** explained where they were in the process and explained unless the applicant chooses to cancel the application, which she doesn't think they are, the process will continue. **Ms. Gouthro** would like to know why the developer has so much control. **Ms. Salloum** explained that the application did go to Regional Council and they made the decision to proceed with this application through the process. **Ms. Gouthro** feels this is just a blame game and it is problematic that it has even got to this level. **Ms. Langille** explained the process and how it works and that they can't make any assumptions on behalf of the community.

James Dean Moore – Lexington, wanted to know where the water was coming from for the septic system. Ms. Langille stated the property in question is within the water service boundaries so it would be municipal water. **Mr. Moore**, so chlorinated water in a septic system. Wanted to point out that the elected officials are accountable to the people directly. They would like to know why the decision was made to take this forward because that isn't really clear. They would also like to know where the developer was. There are two representatives from an architectural firm but no developer. They believe it is an act of cowardice not to have put themselves in a position to be here. **Ms. Langille** advised the developer name is Larry Gibson (because members of the public were asking for it)

Peter Sprum - Ingram Dr, feels this is a shell game, at the start of the process, the ask is for a 20 storey building, when all they really want is a 3 storey building. Mr. Sprum thinks they knew from the start that CN would not allow the crossing so now they are coming back now with what they want now.

Anthony Steel - Devonport Ave, The lady from the Ecology action center spoke about the nimby effect and that is not the case here. The people here made the decision to escape urban density and live where we live. We don't want apartment buildings in our area. Disappointed that Mr. Gibson did not show up at this meeting tonight. Mr. Gibson developed Perry Lake Estates many years ago maintaining the rural character of the area. Why would he all the sudden want to stick this urban density in their back yard. Their feelings are it just has to do with greed, it's all about money. **Mr. Salih** stated when they go out to do these meetings the owner is never there, they are there to behalf of the owner and also spoke about density and feels it isn't density that they have an issue with they feel it is the form.

Steve McCoul – Ingram Dr., wanted to know where the traffic study was done at. How many PID's are on the development. 2 of the PID's are wetlands. So, you are down to 26.6 which is 5.6 units per archer when they worked out the numbers because they don't feel they are being given the right information. Septic fields, these are going to be 1.5 – 2 archer septic fields which are going to be clear. The Traffic Study will be put on the website for people to review.

Glenn MacIsaac - Ingram Dr., two houses up from this development which will greatly affect the value of their property. They had the opportunity to pick anywhere they wanted to live 20 years ago and this is where they choice to live. The developer at that time said they would never do anything at the bottom of the street to negatively affect the community. They are very disappointed in that and no longer trusts them. I planned to retire in this home, does anybody want to buy my home up from this development, no. What is my house worth, what is my retirement worth, what has my service been worth when I can't find a place to retire with my family in the community that I wanted to?

Luke Miller - Lower Sackville, transparency and trust, in how this process works. Both are very important when it comes to this. Has concerns about what was proposed and what they are coming forward with tonight. Perry Lake Developments also owns a small PID at the end of Bolton so is there any intention that Bolton will be a secondary exit for that, is that in the plans that we will see next month? They have all this land and hugging all the way over to one side, what else should be expect? Are there plans for more apartment buildings. If you want to get anywhere you need to gain some trust from these people and this is not an effective way to go about it.

Ralph Lazaro – also lives two houses up from the development. There is a stream that is behind there house and their neighbours house as well as a pond. Is that an environmental problem with the septic fields? **Ms. Langille** spoke with these water features/elements on the site. **Mr. Lazaro** would also like to know if staff knows about the senior's home that they were going to put there and a lot of people were not against that. They got denied because of CN and didn't have the right-of-way. **Ms. Langille** spoke to the property and that it has had its challenges but is not aware of in the past a refusal from CN. It has only been more recently. **Mr. Lazaro** would like to know why would you go through all this when you know the tracks are a problem. You can't put 300 + cars on Ingram Dr. as the main artery Ingram can't take that and feels their guess of 300 cars is probably low. You can't walk on Ingram either because the road is narrow and small. Two exits on a subdivision is a bad design. When you look at high density you look at Bedford, there are lovely big boulevards where all the apartments are, crosswalks, traffic lights etc. Bedford is designed for that. We aren't even designed to support ourselves and you are trying to stick these things in here. **Ms. Langille** explained the planning process and explained that staff is unaware of anything other than what the applicant has come forward with as a request.

Mike O'Connell – 3 Mile Lake, is concerned about the lakes and the possibility of the septic failing. Is concerned when you start digging who know what you will find. Believes what Peter said, the ask starts high and you end up low. Feels you should but in 20-30 single family homes which would fit into the community better than what is being proposed. Protect the lake!

Sandy Sumarah – Winley Dr., wanted to know why the notification area for the meeting was only within 500 feet of the development, that would only be 3 houses. They would like the notification area to be larger. **Ms. Langille** explained how the notification area works and agreed to make the notification wider on any future mailouts.

Nadine Lamontagne – Canterbury Lane, the look of the of the buildings look like they belong more in Canmore, AB than in Fall River Village. They don't fit with the current design of the neighbourhood. Would like to reiterate the Winley Dr. mailbox issue. Biggest concern is that if the developer leaves here tonight thinking they can get access across the railroad tracks all will be forgiven and everything is ok and that is not the case. The impact to the infrastructure that exists and the traffic trying to get in and out of Fall River during rush hours, it can't take it. This is development in reverse. We need capacity in the infrastructure for these things to happen in a sensible and logical way as apposed to building first and fixing things afterwards. Also has concerns that if there was ever an emergency in Fall River Village, like a forest fire, how will be safely get out, it is next to impossible.

Cheryl-lee Kerr – Ingram Dr., would like to know who is responsible for the studies that are being done and who is paying for them. How do we get access to those studies? At what point in this process will we have access to those studies to review and will that point be well before the joint public hearing with Regional Council? **Ms. Langille** stated it would be available in time to review them and well before the joint public hearing. **Ms. Salloum** explained the applicant does submit those studies (traffic studies, net phosphorous studies) and they are the ones who pay for them. Those studies with the entire application are then distributed to other departments for a detailed review which helps form our recommendation that comes later. **Ms. Kerr** has major concerns

about the school systems that are in place because they are currently at capacity. Who is responsible for taking a look at that, who does an impact study on that? **Ms. Salloum** advised there is no study required for that however, they do circulate information on the development, the proposed density, that will happen to the Halifax Regional Centre of Education and they can provide comment on that. **Ms. Kerr**, so at what point do we say our school can or can't accept or handle more kids. Does that stop it? **Ms. Salloum** stated that could come back as part of their comments and that is something that we would consider in our recommendation. Once the application is on an agenda for first reading the report will be available online.

Peter Sprum – Ingram Dr., Is concerned about the independent studies because they are being paid for by the applicant. Wanted to know why the city wouldn't require the developer to pay them to have the studies preformed. **Ms. Langille** explained that the developer pays to have the studies done by licensed professionals and they provide those studies to HRM who has their own qualified professionals who look at, and give a second opinion on, if that information meets our requirements.

Brian Gouthro – Ingram Dr., wondering what the official response will be from staff to the turnout tonight. Ms. Langille stated they think it is very clear to say that the sense that they are getting in the room is that they community defiantly does not like what is being proposed. Staff will go back to the developer and dialog about this meeting to see how they would like to proceed.

Councillor Steve Streach made closing comments

3. Closing Comments

Ms. Salloum thanked everyone for coming and expressing their comments.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.