



20' front yard set-back to porch or verandah;
front steps permitted in front yard set-back;
porch or verandah not permitted in front yard
set-back.

ATTACHMENT IV**Public Information Meeting Minutes****Case 00180****June 13, 2001**

In attendance: Councillor Rankin
Grace Ho, Planner, Planning Applications
Gail Harnish, Planning & Development
Rob MacPherson, Armco Capital Corporation
Gary Pierce, Armco Capital Corporation

Grace Ho called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. in the cafeteria of the Ridgecliff Middle School, Beechville.

Grace Ho advised the purpose of the meeting was to give the public a first glimpse or an understanding of the proposed changes to the existing development agreement for Beechville Estates. She pointed the location of the subdivision on a location map, noting the site is within the Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville plan area. The zoning is CDD, which means that before that area could be developed the developer had to enter into a contract with the Municipality. The original development agreement was entered into with the Municipality in June of 1997. She reviewed the amendment process.

Rob MacPherson indicated that he wanted to talk about some proposed amendments to the development agreement and to get some feedback from the community. He provided a quick overview of the status of development within the subdivision which included the areas now constructed, and the areas that have been designed and received final approval to begin construction. The amendments being considered are: going from large 60' single lots to small lots; including the school as part of the development agreement; increasing the curb cuts for driveways on Beech Tree Run to 20'; replacing a portion of the semi-detached lots on States Lane with single family lots, which would result in half a block of semis and half a block of single family lots; increasing the number of lots from the single entrance from 150 to 162 on existing infrastructure; reconfiguring the size of Park A (increased by 3 acres) and Park E (decreased by .5 acre); and making changes to the building setback distances. Presently they cannot have steps encroaching on the front yard which limits the ability for getting variances and setback of houses.

Darren Forrest, 47 Beech Tree Run, questioned who would pay to widen the existing driveways. It was responded that the existing owners would pay to widen their own driveways at their own cost. This problem would be resolved for future landowners. The consensus at the time of the original agreement was that it was a good design but they found it was not working.

Grace Ho explained that the intent behind shared driveways for the original development agreement was because Beech Tree Run is a minor collector and they wanted to limit the amount of accesses and egresses onto that street.

Derek Cann, Governors Glen, indicated that it is the developer and not the community looking for the wider driveways. He questioned why the developer would not go back and fix the existing driveways, realizing it was a mistake. He further questioned how many driveways there now are on Beech Tree Run.

Rob MacPherson responded he was not sure about the number of driveways. When they look at the plan, a wider driveway cut makes more sense but the Municipality is pushing for the 10' cut because of the number of cars on the street.

Derek Cann commented the developer demonstrated the Y entrance to the driveway would also provide additional parking along the curbs especially along parkland. They want to change that now but yet the existing residents would not be compensated.

Rob MacPherson responded that was unfortunate. They would have liked to have seen the 20' cut in the first stage but there was no choice.

Grace Ho noted that the request for increasing the curb cut still has to be reviewed by internal staff and is subject to Engineering's approval.

Myles Parks, 23 St. Margarets Bay Road, asked in what price range the new houses would be.

Rob MacPherson responded that the price for the 60' wide lots would be significantly higher than the small lot singles. The small lot singles would fall into the price range that is similar to what is there now. The final price with the house on the lot is up to the builder and depends on the final details.

It was questioned whether they would have a set price.

Rob MacPherson responded the prices for the lots are set but they do not control the price on the house. The type of house will determine the final cost. It is bringing it into the same price range as the rest of the subdivision.

An individual stated they have a lot of questions to ask Mr. Armoyan. Also, that the people in this subdivision live in Beechville and not Timberlea or Lakeside.

Rob MacPherson responded that he agreed 100%. Their subdivision is called "Beechville Estates" and they have no plans to change that.

Michael Hebb, 103 Sheppards Run, said he was concerned about the change to the small lots. In speaking with real estate agents, he was told people want the big R-1 lots. People do not want to live in Clayton Park anymore. They want an alternative. He said he would love to live in a neighbourhood with the bigger houses. All of those who bought here have invested with the hopes of a growing community and there will be plenty of houses the size they have. There is a big development for semis and small single lots. He said that he did not hear any justification for changing them to small lots other than having more lots to sell. Being able to increase the value of the houses will increase the value for all of them.

Rob MacPherson responded that different agents have different opinions. They have within their company an excellent marketing team and they take from them what they see there is market demand for in certain areas. They look at future projections and growth and what types of communities are being built. When they looked at this and 60' lots in their area, they felt it did not add. They are not creating any additional lots than originally proposed. The original agreement allowed more lots than they will have with this proposal.

An individual pointed out the reason for that was because of the school being located in the subdivision.

Terry DeLeon, Beechville, stated that changing those lots to 32' wide lots would mean more houses which would look like sardine boxes. He did not think it was what this community as a whole would want. The first part of this subdivision looks great. He questioned why they are trying to make it like sardines rather than single lots.

Rob MacPherson responded they heard a lot of good things from people building the homes and because of that they will be similar type quality homes.

It was questioned whether they asked the people in the subdivision if they preferred seeing more of the 32' wide lots developed, since it was them investing their money. Rob MacPherson responded no.

Grace Ho stated that "this is not a done deal" and that the proposal is up for consideration. The minutes from the meeting will be attached to the staff report.

It was commented that it was said the houses were affordable. The individual stated these houses are not affordable and that they could not afford a \$200,000+ house, although they would like to stay in the community.

Stacey Ingraham, 54 Sheppards Run, said she was very pleased with the subdivision so far and was pleased to see the growth that has gone on. When she bought, she bought one of the starter homes from an apartment in Clayton Park. She came with the idea of buying in the first phase and having the ability to move up in the 2nd or 3rd phase and did not want to see that option removed from the subdivision.

It was requested that the change to the parkland be clarified.

Rob MacPherson advised that they have increased the parkland by three acres. The original piece of parkland was quite a bit smaller. Also, part of the proposal was already accepted by the Municipality.

It was commented that it is not parkland but rather just swamp.

Rob MacPherson indicated that the piece accepted by the Municipality is now with the Parkland Planning group for future development.

Grace Ho advised that there is nothing in the existing development agreement that specifies what has to be done with the parkland at this point in terms of facilities. Park A has been accepted as part of Phase 1 approval by HRM.

Darren Forrest, 47 Beech Tree Run, commented that most of them do not have any driveways. The homes are not centrally situated on the lot so on one side they have a 2-3' sideyard and 15' on the other side. He questioned whether there is going to be a new development agreement. They have no place to put a new driveway except on front lawns. It all goes back to the driveway openings. Most people do not want a shared driveway and questioned whether there was anything that could be done. They have 2' on one side which is the driveway and cannot cut out in the curb on the 15' wide side. Most people nowadays have two cars. On these small lots there is no sideyard.

Grace Ho questioned whether the concern was that the lots are too narrow.

Darren Forrest commented that a house on a 60' wide lot is not for the first time home buyer but is for the people in this subdivision moving up.

Charles Wright questioned whether there would be blasting in the next phases.

Rob MacPherson responded that he could not say for sure. It was his understanding that all the blasting was complete, however, there might be some blasting when they put in the new municipal services.

Charles Wright stated that the blasting the last time did a lot of damage. He had a couple of houses with damage to the ceilings and basements. When he came down for compensation he was given the run around and was not given any money. If there is to be more blasting, they should go and take a look at what is there.

Derek Cann agreed with the comments made about the 60' wide lots. He indicated that there is a lot of green shown but obviously all the green is not parkland.

Rob MacPherson responded that it is parkland and open space.

Derek Cann asked for confirmation that the school lands are not part of the deeded lands they get credit for. Rob MacPherson concurred.

Derek Cann questioned how Park A at the bottom was increased by 3.5 acres. He asked if it was correct that the lots fronting on the highway were deemed to be unbuildable because it is an environmentally sensitive and protected area. Rob MacPherson responded he did not know.

Grace Ho indicated that it was a combination of things. It was because of wetlands and stopping sight distances along the highway.

Derek Cann stated they would not be able to use wetlands as a credit towards designated parkland.

Grace Ho responded it might be a bit of a passive area. For instance, they might be able to have trails around it.

Rob MacPherson indicated that there are three different types of parkland; active parkland, passive parkland, and conservation open space.

Derek Cann said it was his reading of the by-law that it shall not be deemed passive parkland. When you look at the remainder of the area, you have the school property and very little parkland left.

Rob MacPherson indicated that he thought this area falls under the conservation designation of parkland. They have other developments where they got full credit for conservation. It is recognized by Parkland Planning as part of an overall plan. It is usually a mix of the three types of parkland.

It was questioned whether any parkland was developed other than what the school has.

Rob MacPherson referenced an area with sod and playground equipment, as well as a graveled walk in another area.

Stacey Ingraham indicated that the school has told some kids they are not allowed to be there.

Rob MacPherson responded that it has not yet been turned over to the Municipality. It is designated to be accepted as parkland in Phase 2.

Corey Mosher, 194 Sheppards Run, questioned when they planned on starting Phase 2.

Rob MacPherson responded that they did not have a solid timeline. It depends on the market demand. They look at the trends and try to anticipate.

Corey Mosher questioned where they planned on developing first. Rob MacPherson responded at the second entrance; the area cleared close to the Irving station.

Corey Mosher questioned whether they would pave it all the way around Sheppards Run. Rob MacPherson responded he was not sure they would do it all at once. They would probably phase and market it.

Corey Mosher questioned what type of homes would back onto the homes at the end of Sheppards Run. Rob MacPherson responded that it would be a mix of semi-detached and single family homes.

It was questioned who was in charge of maintenance and cleaning up in the subdivision. Rob MacPherson responded that on existing streets it is the Municipality's responsibility and on the remaining lands it was the developer's responsibility.

It was requested that the developer do some cleaning up. There are a lot of dead trees along the sidewalks and the grass is quite high in some places.

Elaine Helpard, 70 Sheppards Run, commented it was irritating to see the mailboxes being used as a billboard. Grace Ho encouraged that they follow-up with Canada Post.

Ian Peters, 160 Sheppards Run, indicated that he contacted the RCMP quite a few times relative to people dumping garbage. He spent two days on the phone trying to contact the developer and Cresco. He asked that the entrance by Irving be blocked off. They have watched people dump loads of garbage from that entrance. At the end of Sheppards Run the developer had a wall built up but that did not do much good because the section down by the Irving station is wide open.

Rob MacPherson advised that they could get that end blocked off.

An individual living in the last house on Sheppards Run questioned whether there was any plan to pave that particular area. In the winter time it is filled with snow and potholes. If the next phase starts at the other end, that will not help them, and questioned whether there was anything that could be done to help them in the near future.

Rob MacPherson advised that when the equipment is out there doing the other section they would look and see if there is something they could do to fix it up a bit.

An individual indicated that there should be a stop sign at Sheppards Run and Stone Hill Place.

Derek Cann noted the request was to increase the number of R-2 units and make the R-1 lots into small lots, which will increase the number of lots by twelve. Rob MacPherson responded that the number of units will stay the same.

Derek Cann questioned how many of the 60' wide lots were lost as a result of the school being built there. Rob MacPherson responded that a large percentage of them were lost as a result of the school.

Derek Cann noted that 21-27 R-1 lots were absorbed by the school site and 34 lots at the back are being reduced to 32' wide lots. He questioned why they no longer need the 60' wide R-1 lots.

Rob MacPherson responded that 60' lots on a cul de sac made a lot of sense. With the loss of the lots in the school area, the market analysis indicates the need in back is not there any more.

Ann Maffet, States Lane, indicated that at the end of Birch Tree Run, one of the builders has a large container truck for a storage area which she felt was probably against the by-law of the subdivision and should be removed.

Rob MacPherson responded that it is a tractor trailer container.

Grace Ho advised that she would check into this.

Barry Hewitt, Sheppards Run, stated that he bought there because he liked the way it was set up. He questioned who makes the ultimate decision and whether the residents have a vote.

Grace Ho advised that following this meeting, a staff report will be written which will go to the Western Region Community Council. The Community Council consists of three council members, one member being Councillor Rankin. Individuals on the mailing list for tonight's meeting will receive a notice advising of the public hearing date. At that time, there will be a more formal presentation, following which the floor will be opened for public input. After receiving the input, the Community Council will make a motion on the application.

Curtis, Lakeside, questioned who Rob worked for. Rob MacPherson responded that he worked for the development company.

Curtis commented that he grew up in Lakeside and appreciated the development that has happened. He stated that the developer said they would take care of all the homes and any damage from blasting. They have had problems. They were also told they would have access to the school but they cannot because the insurance is too high yet the people of Beechville Estates have access. They were also told the developer would put money back into the community. A number of questions were raised by the people of Beechville which they tried to address but they have had no feedback.

Myles Parks indicated that they had asked for a meeting with Mr. Armoyan but have not been able to get that meeting. Mr. Armoyan was the one who promised the meeting and should be the one to explain why they could not have access to the school and all the other promises made to the residents of Beechville. He questioned when they could have that meeting.

Rob MacPherson advised that he would pass on the comment that many people wanted to meet with Mr. Armoyan but he could not promise that Mr. Armoyan would come.

Mr. Jackson stated that when the negotiations first started for the Beechville Estates Subdivision, he was the Chairman of the Residents Association. Originally the developer wanted to have all the homes with 32' frontage with a 40 unit apartment building. After a considerable amount of negotiation, it went from 880 units to 440 units. The residents agreed with that because they needed development in the area but they did not want development that would look out of place and look like a sardine box. They thought it was a good mix. They wanted good people to come into the community that would add to their community. He thought it was important for the people to come in here with the idea of staying in the community and to have a stepping stone to move from what he called a starter home into something a little better as their financial capabilities grow and their family grows. They agreed the mix was good. There were concerns about the environment and water. They were told the plan would not change. Now because the school was built there they are looking for ways to increase their revenues without consideration for the people staying there. The developer is saying that approval of wider driveways will make it better for them but there is no consideration for the people already there. He urged that they assist the people already there to have their driveways redone. Too many times they come to these meetings and there is no background information. Staff often cannot answer questions and they never get to see the final draft of what is voted on. The people in that subdivision now are the basis of what your future is going to be and need to be included in terms of getting feedback and information. You have to remember that the people there are the ones that are making your future.

Derek Cann asked if it was being proposed to delay building the second access.

Rob MacPherson responded that the only thing that ties into timing is conversion of semis and singles which will add twelve lots to this entrance. That will exhaust the limitation of that infrastructure, at which time they will start on the next one.

Grace Ho advised that the development agreement says 150 lots can be endorsed off the main entrance. The applicant has asked that number be increased to 162 lots.

Laura, 194 Sheppards Run, indicated that she lived at the very end where the road turns into dirt. She said it was her understanding that the second phase would be from their place to the other exit and they understood it would happen soon, but now they are hearing it will not happen that way.

Rob MacPherson responded that it would depend on the market demand. It does not make sense as a business to develop a long strip of street if you cannot build on it. They look at the projection of lots they feel can be sold and phase it. If there is the demand, they would build the whole street.

Laura indicated there is a problem with people turning into their yard. Big trucks are always turning in their driveway and they are anxious to have that fixed. Everybody in the subdivision is experiencing big trucks and everybody turning into their own paved area. It would be great if the trucks had another alternate road.

An individual commented he was only in his house for a week and he noticed the 18 wheelers using a cul de sac for turning around. He asked the developer to consider when paving to create a designated turn-around at the end of dead end streets. On any given weekend there are lots of cars turning around.

Ms. Crawford stated that she was involved with the original plans. She questioned where they are in the planning stage of this phase.

Rob MacPherson pointed out on the map the areas that have been constructed, the areas which have final approval, and the areas currently in the approval process.

It was indicated they are hoping to start the next phase next year. They want to be around 75% sold out in the first phase.

Derek Cann, referencing Park E, commented that the entrance seems to be different and narrower. He believed what the community believes is that parkland directly behind people's homes is a negative and not a positive.

Rob MacPherson responded that in the original plan because of cul de sac layouts, there were different locations to enter the park and the frontage was at one location. Through the approval process, the parkland planners, because of flow through the park and connection to other parks requested that they break it into two separate parks. They thought there was more value in getting flow through two parks rather than a lot of frontage.

Derek Cann commented that having road frontage to parks is important. From the community's perspective access to the parks is important. He asked for confirmation that this was already approved.

Rob MacPherson confirmed this and pointed out that there is a lot of negotiation with the Municipality's Parkland Planning people.

Derek Cann said he thought the access into that park was 250' wide at one time.

Grace Ho advised that there was a large frontage along Beech Tree Run. Part of it came down to money being available for cost-sharing. The Municipality has to cost-share for road frontage over 100'. The Municipality had not set aside any money for cost-sharing so to compensate for that they reduced the frontage for the park.

Derek Cann stated they were told that for a CDD there is much more negotiation power and now they find out there was no cost-sharing and no confidence in negotiations with developers.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.