

Chapter 3. Settlement and Housing – Supplementary Table (Comments from June 17, 2013 Public Open House)

PROPOSED POLICY CHANGE/ISSUE	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC Direction
Growth Targets	1. Cap suburban growth so we can meet urban targets		
	2. I think it was fairly clear at this town hall that people aren't satisfied with the growth targets and how we are meeting/not meeting them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I did not hear anyone (except Mr. French) say they were pleased with 59% growth in suburban areas. I heard lots of people displeased at not meeting the 25% urban areas. I also did not hear enough answer or solution to these issues Mr. French said (as his/HRM's solution) is to make the urban area "more attractive" (urban areas cannot be "more attractive" when suburban areas are even more attractive), when in fact HRM is doing the opposite: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> building up the Dartmouth and Bedford Commons tax breaks for suburban development high property taxes on Peninsula fledgling downtown 		
	3. Why is there not a 5 year target for Densification Growth 25-50-25? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many household dwellings; not the % Percentages mean 0 if a base number is not detailed So give us target numbers 		
	4. Report % if you want, but for each 5 year period 0-25		
	5. We already have enough suburban lots for 30-40 years; there should be a moratorium on further suburban lot development until HRM catches up with its growth targets; this would help prevent SUBURBAN SPRAWL.		

	6. HRM growth targets, status quo is not acceptable; the plan should follow Stantec's growth target recommendations.		
Growth Centres	7. Have incentives (+ or -) to really direct development to growth centres as mixed-use centres. Out of the box ideas needed.		
	8. Incorporate STANTEC report recommendations		
	9. Incorporate our HRM Alliance recommendations		
	10. Food and food security was in Draft 1 of RP+5, but is not in this second draft. This is a key issue to include. It would be great to see it back in with some clear language on food/food security and what the HRM envisions around this to support the health of the community (e.g. supporting access/addressing food deserts/supporting local agriculture, local producers, etc.)		
	11. Include a policy that supports work on food security, a regional food strategy / charter and eventually a creation of a municipal food policy. This was in draft 1.0 but not draft 2.0.		
	12. I disagree with the proposed designation that Musquodoboit Harbour be a Local Centre not a District Centre. We need piped services and community trails.		
	13. Please make Musq Hbr a District Centre. We are a hub along the Eastern Shore.		
	14. Save \$670 million in taxpayer dollars; follow Stantec's growth target recommendations, not the status quo.		
	15. Promoting growth in the Regional Centre is not strong enough to deter sprawl! We need stronger restrictions in these places and a clear greenbelt ere no development is permitted.		

	16. Agree but... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the overall objectives and principles which growth centres have priority? We cannot support all of these at the same time. There should be more detail concerning how rural growth centres are going to benefit from the Regional Plan. *Rural Projects DO NOT get enough support. 		
	17. Focus development where there is existing infrastructure.		
	18. Focus development as close as possible to employment		
	19. Disagree...Would be great to save \$3billion by adhering to Stantec's Scenario B. No matter what the target needs to stick with it and follow the RP. Plan needs to be implemented.		
Community Design	20. We need to ensure we build and develop on a HUMAN Scale. People live here. Have more green space, active transportation, affordable housing, increased density without high rises. We can do it. It takes a vision and citizens to act with politicians who think past their election term!		
	21. Access buildings – no-step entries		
Affordable Housing	22. Accessory apartments –permit them outside HRM centre e.g. Sackville, Fall River – many people want to live or continue to live in their communities		
	23. Looking for methods to increase density in residential locations and in particular “laneway” type housing for accessibility, low income, student/sewer type occupancy for inner city locations. Thanks for your consideration.		

	<p>24. Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a bad example of how to do affordable housing. • It is a concentration of one demographic (single homeless men) in a bldg that has no respect for the streetscape. • Density bonusing only assists the developers. Housing is a human right – we do not need to coax developers to build it. We need to make it law. These are people not projects we are talking about. <p>25. ‘More affordable units’ does not mean affordable housing. Density bonusing can be a good tool to encourage a range of unit prices within buildings, but doesn’t go far enough to provide housing for low income families.</p>		
Conservation Design Developments	26. Please put RURAL CONCERNS all in ONE area of the draft plan for those of us in rural areas. Please try to be less urban-centric!!		
	27. Hybrid design looks like a good step forward		
Urban Reserve	28. I am concerned about what I heard regarding discretion in rezoning Urban Reserve via some policy by-law to adjacent designations. That effectively voids the plan. Ok, the intent may be been to allow re-designation of small pockets, but leaves open the door to arbitrary changes. Needs to be addressed.		
	29.		
	30. Remove Policy G-16. Do not allow developers and councilors this “wiggle-room” to change the zoning against the wishes of HRM residents. If this area opposes the rezoning – cannot be left to the discretion of councilors.		
	31. Protect urban reserves – take the discretionary loop-hole out		