Response to Written Public Submissions (Received July 6-19, 2013)* - Supplementary**

*Refer to Submissions Packages 3 and 4: http://www.halifax.ca/planhrm/Phase3Comments.html

This series of responses is provided as supplementary information to that tabled with the CDAC on July 31, 2013. New issues, not previously included in the responses tabled on the 31st are highlighted in **BOLD text in the supplementary table.

POLICY AREA - GREENBELTING			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	**COMMUNITY FEEDBACK** (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	**STAFF RESPONSE**	**CDAC DIRECTION**
4.12	**Designate potential open spaces and corridors on maps; then negotiate with landowners/developers via land swapping, parkland dedication, purchase using the parkland reserve account, and partnerships with the Province.**	**This will be done at the community planning level, informed by the Greenbelting and Public Spaces (GPS) Priorities Plan.**	
4.12	List Old Growth Forests in Tables 2-1 and Table 3-2.	The GPS will address this.	
3.54	Update Map 13 to reflect the work done on Blue Mountain Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park since the last RP, including the watershed study. Table 2-3 should read NSE and DNR/HRM.	Council has directed a facilitated negotiation take place towards acquiring lands for the regional park. Maps will be changed following this process.	
3.54	Provide a Glossary, and include an explanation of the term "Greenway".	Agreed, the term will be defined. A glossary of planning terms can be found on the PlanHRM website, but it is not included in the Regional Plan.	
3.54	Add "Greenway" to Table 2.2.	Agreed.	

POLICY AREA - GROWTH CENTRES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	4.12	**For Rural Growth Centres, consider creating Waste Management Districts as per Policy SU-21, so adjoining developments can share potable water wells and wastewater.**	**Current policy enables this consideration.**	
	4.12, 3.72	Add Hammonds Plains as a Rural Local Centre.	Hammonds Plains is under growth management policy.	
	4.12	**Emphasize "Community of Communities" in the RP.**	**This concept is embedded in the vision and principles.**	
	3.72	Chapter 3 lacks definitions for low, medium and high density.	Plan policy allows flexibility to be determined at the secondary planning stage.	

POLICY AREA - GROWTH MANAGEMENT

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	4.13	Densification should occur within selected locations, as shown on a map, with development targets to achieve density goals.	This is the purpose of the Growth Centres, which would allow a denser variation of open-space subdivision in rural areas. Urban densification is being examined through Centre Plan. Suburban densification is to be achieved through plan reviews.	

RP+5
Regional Plan 5 Year Review

Phase III Response to Public Input. Page | **3**

POLICY AREA – GROWTH TARGETS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	4.13, 3.72	Detail what population densities are required to achieve desired levels of sustainability and services. Growth targets should not be the foundation for a Community Plan.	Detailed population targets are worked out in secondary planning.	
	4.12	Apply growth targets as each development is considered for approval.	These interpretations will be made through secondary strategies.	
	4.12	Provide regular reports on development statistics, to help track growth target compliance.	Agreed, will provide Council with regular reports as part of RP+5 implementation.	
	4.12	Pause development pending Secondary Plan amendments.	This is not permitted under HRM's Charter.	

POLICY AREA – POLICY G-16

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	3.54	Remove Policy G16. It is vague and misleading.	Policy G-16 is necessary to provide limited flexibility as the land use designations are not mapped along specific property lines. The policy will change in Draft 3 to clarify the intent this flexibility is limited in scale.	

POLICY AREA – SERVICING

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	4.31	Policy SU-15 is too permissive in encouraging growth by creation of new water service areas	Policy SU-15 is consistent with the Plan's growth strategy for rural areas.	
	3.72	In 8.6.1, the provincial regulations' "management plan" is a storage and disposal system for communal systems, and the regulations do not contain measures for maintenance, nor has NSE the legislative authority to require maintenance. HRM has that authority.	The Plan has policies to consider commercial wastewater systems in conservation design developments and policies to allow creation of wastewater management district by laws.	
	3.72	The sections of Policy SU-16 (expanding existing water service areas) are "or" rather than "and" as in the current RP.	Draft 3 will reflect this change.	
	4.41	Piped services for Musquodoboit Harbour.	Watershed study has shown this is cost prohibitive.	
	3.72	No developments on communal systems should be considered until HRM has a wastewater management bylaw.	The Plan has policies to consider commercial wastewater systems in conservation design developments and policies to allow creation of wastewater management district by laws.	
	4.13	Commit to identify and acquire, within 5 years, new solid waste sites to serve HRM for the next 200 years, with low-impact practices and non-development buffers.	This is the subject of a separate HRM process, currently underway.	

POLICY AREA – RURAL SUBDIVISION

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	4.12	Option for developers to provide lot layouts based on physical constraints and features.	HRM already enables this.	
	4.12	Assess developments based on entire watershed, not just "zero net increase" at the downslope boundary. See Waterloo Region, 2000.	Watershed studies are required to precede major community planning processes.	
	4.12	Create Lot Grading By-Law under Stormwater Management Plan.	This is in progress as required by Plan Policy.	
	4.12, 4.41	Establish Rural Road Standards in the Red Book.	This is in progress as required by Plan Policy.	
	4.12	Require Peer Review by HRM consultants of entire development, not just the Hydrogeological Assessment.	HRM focuses external expertise where internal expertise is not already available. Conservation Design Developments are subject of community consultation	
	4.12	Exclude exposed bedrock from net developable area.	Agreed, for substantial areas.	
	4.21, 4.45	Grandfather applications that are already in process.	Application status to be validated through Development Services.	
	3.72	Exclude existing structures or remaining development from net developable area, including any required setbacks.	Existing residences are counted as existing density.	
	3.72	There is no definition of "community facilities designed to service the development," nor controls on size and types of use. Can they be commercial facilities?	Size and type will be negotiated in a Development Agreement.	
	3.72	"…the parcel of land to be developed only has frontage on a local road…" "Only" is new. Is it a typo?	A 100 series highway does not count as frontage under the revised plan.	

3.72	What is the difference between a private driveway and a private road?	A private driveway is part of a condominium corporation.	
3.72	Will 5% park dedication be required for land condominiums?	No.	
3.72	What is a "non local road"?	Typically, a provincial highway.	

POLICY AREA – RURAL COMMUNITIES

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
4.13, 4.41	Create a new Rural chapter, drawing together rural content from elsewhere in the new Regional Plan.	Agree in principle, but rural issues should not be deleted from the existing RP+5 chapters. The rural discussion in the Economic chapter will be expanded, and could include cross-references to other parts of RP+5 that touch on rural issues.	
3.58	No more urban development on the Eastern Shore.	RP+5 removes most Eastern Shore Growth Centres. Cluster development requires future subdivisions to set aside large portions of natural land in perpetuity.	
3.58	No more pesticides, chemicals or aquaculture in our waterbodies. Protect what we have.	HRM has a pesticide bylaw. Aquaculture in waterbodies is a provincial matter.	
4.41	Streetlights.	The Province requires NSPI to use LEDs wherever lamps are replaced. LEDs reduce upward glare, enhancing visibility of the night sky. Restrictions on glare may also be considered when proposing new zoning regulations and development agreements at the community level.	
4.41	Fishing village zoning.	This is provided for at the Community Plan level.	

POLICY AREA – RIPARIAN BUFFERS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	3.3, 3.17, 3.31, 3.52, 3.81	Restrict removal of regulation from riparian buffers	A vegetation removal policy will be drafted for Council's consideration.	
	3.3, 3.17, 3.31, 3.52, 3.81	**Establish a 60m to 100m setback for exposed coastal areas.**	**The Plan establishes a minimum of 20m for coastal setbacks which may be expanded through secondary planning and the GPS.**	
	4.41	Riparian buffers must be enforced.	Agreed.	
	4.41	Protect private beaches and surrounding ecosystems.	This can be addressed through future community plan reviews.	
	4.41	Increase coastal buffers to 30m and establish 3.5m minimum elevation. (Cross-reference to Coastal Inundation Policy Area)	Buffers can be increased through Community Plan reviews.	
	3.19	Increase vertical elevation to 4m.	Draft 3 will leave the policy unchanged from RMPS 2006 and add a preamble committing Council to review and revise the 2.5 m elevation setback in light of the upcoming IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) AR5 (Fifth Assessment Report) which will be released later this year, with new sea level rise estimates.	
	3.19	Watercourse buffers should be required in portions of Halifax Harbour that are non-industrial and do not host marine dependent activities, such as Bedford Waterfront, Northwest Arm, Mill Cove, Cow Bay and Eastern Passage, which should have area-specific plans.	Consideration will be given to this issue during the GPS process.	

	3.19	Under RP+5, riparian buffers are not required for as-of-right development, and need only be "considered" for development agreements. Riparian buffers should be required for all developments adjacent to a watercourse.	The Plan requires buffers for "as-of-right" development as well as development agreements.	
	3.19	Do not grandfather or relax buffers for pre-2006 lots, particularly when on floodplains or low-lying coastal areas.	The current relaxations are limited in scope. Lot owners are still required to adequately flood proof and meet the 2.5 metre elevation for residential use.	
	3.19	Provide a timeline for completing a Northwest Arm plan and bylaws.	A community planning strategy for the NW Arm was completed in 2009.	

POLICY AREA – COASTAL INUNDATION

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
3.3, 3.17, 3.13, 3.52, 3.81	Require Halifax harbour to be included in riparian Buffer Policy	It is inappropriate to include a buffer on a working industrial harbour; however, residential development is required to meet the 2.5 metre elevation respecting coastal inundation.	

POLICY AREA – WETLANDS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	3.19	Restrict development on smaller wetlands of high local social or ecological significance, not just to larger wetlands.	NSDOE is mapping "wetland complexes". Plan policy can be updated as new information becomes available / need arises.	
	4.12	Where fish habitat is a resource require consideration of the impacts of metals and suspended particulates in any development application, under Required Studies (Table 3-4).	Consideration may be given through provisions of a Development Agreement and through watershed studies (E-24).	
	4.41	Water quality examined in all harbours and inlets.	Plan establishes a water quality protocol.	
	3.19	Allow stormwater fee waivers for owners with environmental professional evaluations of stormwater management features on their property which capture and infiltrate all stormwater.	Policy SU-13 supports Halifax Water's efforts to create a rate structure which includes incentives for stormwater retention.	
	3.19	Along with Halifax Water, consider stormwater quality regulations, including discharge of nutrients.	To be addressed in the Stormwater Management Bylaw.	

POLICY AREA – HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
4.12	Add "housing that is affordable" to Regional Plan, including S-37.	Agreed. A principle will be added to Draft 3 to state that "the municipality will strive to ensure the regulations regarding future development do not impact housing affordability throughout the municipality".	
4.12	Provide options and incentives such as tax deferral for multiple unit dwellings and one-level housing in or near Rural Growth Centres.	These can be considered under policy S-33.	
4.12	Enable Site Plan Approvals or establish predictable timelines for Development Agreement processes.	HRM is committed to improving timelines.	

POLICY AREA – MOBILITY

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
3.12	Policy T-4 is the first reference to the term "greenway".	A definition will be added to Draft 3 and the glossary of planning terms on the PlanHRM website.	
3.12	The Active Transportation Plan should not be focused primarily within the urban core of the region, as AT is equally important in suburban and rural areas.	Staff believes the plan and its ongoing five-year review will achieve that balance.	

3.44	Greater AT focus less on road expansion.	Draft 2 included a reference to the Active Transportation Functional Plan and its review, but Draft 3 will include an actual list of AT projects.	
3.15, 3.44	Improve frequency of service.	Policy T-5 commits HRM to updating transit plans.	
4.1	HRM should invest in multiple types of education followed by enforcement to make streets safer for all.	This will be considering in the review of the active transportation plan.	
4.11	True active transportation corridors should provide connectivity, be usable at any time of day and not be speed restricted. I hope the regional plan will distinguish between recreation and transportation when planning and developing networks.	The AT plan will better define active transportation as being designed to facilitate purposeful trips and not recreation.	
4.10	In Objective 1, 4.1.1, though the word "integrated" is present, it is important that the words "and connected" also be present.	Those words will be added to Draft 3.	
4.10	The RMPS has divided transportation issues into five separate functional plans. It was our understanding that an uber plan would tie all five of these disparate elements together.	To a large extent, the Transportation Demand Management Plan ties all of the functional plans together.	
3.12	There should be a clear definition of major and minor collector roads	A definition will be added to Draft 3.	

	3.28, 3.48, 3.61, 3.74, 4.8	Becoming a collector road would increase traffic on a street where speeding cars have long been identified as a problem.	Collector streets are identifiable as streets that connect neighbourhoods to the regional roadway network. As such, priority for street rehabilitation, and levels of service related to street maintenance and snow clearing are increased. Policies related to on-street parking, traffic control, truck, transit and emergency response routing are not dictated by street classification. Further clarification of street classification will be added to the plan.	
	4.41	Remove Map 8 or return to the previous version of street classification.	A street classification map is needed to set service standards and Map 8 has been used for many years to do that. The previous map predates amalgamation and has inconsistent designations between the former municipal jurisdictions which would result in inconsistent operational service and rehabilitation and maintenance priorities.	CDAC passed a motion on July 31, 2013 requesting the removal of Map 8.

3.5, 3.25, 3.69, 4.1, 4.10, 4.41	The decision to plan for the widening of Bayers Road is of concern. Why is the car given preference over people? I very much disagree with the premise (Policy T-12) that we must control congestion to ensure it does not pass existing levels. I think it is a good thing that the bridges are clogged with cars during rush hour. The statement, "The plan will determine where vehicle capacity is required to meet demand and to prevent existing congestion levels from increasing," is telling because it focuses on meeting demand for vehicles, not on reducing demand. The statement should be re-written to focus on reducing demand through TDM strategies, active transportation and transit, which is more in keeping with the four stated objectives of the plan.	The plan prioritizes sustainable commuting modes (4.1.1) and sets targets for shifting demand away from cars. While increasing demand for vehicle capacity is limited, it is not expected to be completely eliminated. The Road Network Priority Plan identifies projects needed to accommodate increasing vehicle demand while maintaining existing congestion levels.	
3.25	Have the vision to create public spaces that do not allow cars and make people a priority.	Policy T-3 includes these provisions.	
3.69, 3.74	The acknowledgement of various transportation modes in the current Plan is not sufficient.	Details on projects and programs will be contained in Priority Plans for demand management, transit, and active transportation. A list of priority projects for active transportation will be added to the plan.	
3.5	I'm strongly opposed to a third harbor crossing. A third harbour crossing is not needed and should not be in the plan.	The plan anticipates that shifting demand towards transit and active transportation will eliminate the need for a third harbour crossing during the life of the plan.	

![RP+5 logo] RP+5 Regional Plan 5 Year Review

Phase III Response to Public Input. Page | **14**

3.5, 4.10	How do we expect people to be motivated to switch to transit and active transportation if we continue to make their driving experience better and easier? If we stop building more roads our would-be drivers will be forced to find other options. Easing commuting and easing congestion work against the goal of convincing residents to move in ways other than in their private vehicles.	The Road Network Priority Plan is not intended to reduce congestion or improve travel time, but to accommodate increasing vehicle demand while maintaining current service levels. The plan recognizes that choice of travel mode is largely based on relative travel times, but the intention is to improve the effectiveness of travel by transit and active transportation but not to allow travel time for vehicles to deteriorate.	
4.9	I'm not sure why you propose widening Herring Cove Road when the bottleneck is the rotary. A better approach would be to make proper bike lanes.	Additional capacity on Herring Cove can be accommodated with modifications to the entry and egress from the Armdale roundabout. Inclusion of bike lanes will be considered in the design of Herring Cove Road.	
SRA	Include a bridge across Northwest Arm as a future potential project and establish a transportation reserve zone for it.	A bridge across Northwest Arm would be costly and impactful. Without this connection, however, roadway capacity to the Mainland South area is limited. This limitation is reflected in the strategic growth pattern which does not identify major growth centres for this area.	
3.65	Better integration of transportation objectives into the rest of the Regional Plan, measurable targets, and concrete steps to achieve targets.	The 2006 plan included targets for increasing the percentage of trips for all modes other than automobile. Those targets will be restated in the RP+5 document. Concrete steps to achieving those targets will be included in the priority plans.	

	3.65	Decrease the size of the urban transit service boundary (map 7A) to the Centre Plan area	The boundary sets the limit of where urban-style transit will be delivered, not where higher level of service will be focused. Dramatically reducing the geographic size of our overall transit service area would severely harm our ability to meet transit mode split targets. Where urban transit service will be focused is part of the Transit Priority Plan.	
	3.65	Establish bold targets for transit, such as minimum services standards and modal share targets for densely populated urban areas.	Modal share targets and minimum service standards have been established and will be considered through the Transit Priority Plan.	
	3.65	Make a clear commitment to connect rural community transit systems to the regional transit network.	Policy T-10 allows council to consider programs to support this new model of community-based service.	
	3.65	Introduce more concrete policy to ensure new communities are built such that they can be connected.	Policy T-9 sets transit-oriented development as a priority for community development. TOD is also emphasized in Chapter 3.	
	3.65	RP+5 should have a transit functional plan and establish very clear commitments to a cohesive transit network, including a commitment to identifying a high frequency network in the urban core.	The Transit Priority Plan will be developed with those objectives in mind.	
	3.65	Maps showing proposed higher order transit routes and the rights of way required to support them	The intent to investigate the demand and feasibility of higher order transit routes (i.e. ferry, bus rapid transit) is recognized in the plan and will be pursued.	

RP+5
Regional Plan 5 Year Review

Phase III Response to Public Input. Page | 16

	SRA	Halifax already has the rail cut through the peninsula to the downtown and port areas. Partner with CNR, Ottawa and the Province to build a light rail commuter train. Find innovative ways to span the North West Arm or have water taxis such as False Creek in Vancouver.	The existing rail corridor is a freight corridor, and although it may be possible to operate commuter trains on this corridor, they would be heavy rail, not light rail. Regional Council has asked for a study that analyzes the feasibility of commuter rail. That study is currently on hold, but it is still HRM's intent to proceed with this study as soon as possible, to help determine if commuter rail is the right solution for HRM. While an active transportation connection across the Arm may be a longer term opportunity, we do not believe water-based transit to be practical at this location.	
	3.12	HRM adopt the SmartTrip program internally.	Currently being considered by Regional Council.	
	3.12	Bus stops and terminals should include the provision of parking.	This will be evaluated in the Transit Priority Plan.	
	3.12	Dedicated bus lanes should include High Occupancy Vehicles and reversing lanes should be used in bottleneck areas.	These will be considered in Priority Plans.	
	3.12	Policy T-10 should state that Council "shall" rather than "may" consider community-based transit in rural areas.	The case for supporting community-based transit is still being evaluated and Regional Council's commitment can't be made until that is completed and considered.	
	3.12	A barrier to efficient community based transportation is the provincial rule that community based transit service cannot be provided on a fixed route basis	That limitation will not necessarily be part of an HRM policy on community-based transit.	
	3.25	Why can't I take a bus to the beach?	Transit service is provided to beaches within the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Travelling longer distances to reach additional beach areas is not consistent with urban-type transit service.	

3.5	**Why do we say transit priority measures "may be made"? Why wouldn't we commit to building them?**	**Until specific measures are designed and evaluated, we can't commit Regional Council to funding them.**	
3.12	**Community based transportation could be specifically identified as a travel mode in the first objective**	**The chapter make a distinction between urban-style transit and community-based transit, but we consider both to be "public transit". Nevertheless we do see some value in making that addition.**	
4.31	Transportation issues should not be referred to a priorities Plan	The Priorities Plan allows for the appropriate level of detailed investigation.	
4.41	Sidewalks or walkways in Musquodoboit Harbour are needed from High School through village core. Put a crosswalk light in the Musquodoboit Harbour village core.	Initiatives of this nature can be worked out through Secondary Planning Strategies.	
3.54	Trails Map 3 is incomplete in terms of volunteer and developer-built trails.	Map 3 represents major trails.	
3.54	Improve signage, promotion, resources, staffing and standards for trails.	This is an AT Functional Plan issue.	
3.58	**No new big highway on the Eastern Shore.**	**Province determines new freeways.**	
4.12	Emphasize multi-modal routes, to include rail, park-and-rides and bike routes.	These issues are emphasized in the Transportation Demand Functional Plan and transit servicing strategy.	
4.12	Create incentives for more park-and-rides and private car shares – e.g., reduce parking requirements where tenant car-shares are provided.	These issues are emphasized in the Transportation Demand Functional Plan and transit servicing strategy.	
4.12	Set targets for public transit use.	Agreed.	
4.12	Provide Community Transportation financial support.	Policy support for community based initiatives is included in the draft plan.	
4.13	Provide Metro Transit or community-based transit along Highway 333 (Prospect Road).	Policy support for community based initiatives is included in the draft plan.	

| 4.41 | Commuter bus service to Halifax and Dartmouth from Musquodoboit Harbour/Eastern Shore | Policy support for community based initiatives is included in the draft plan. | |

POLICY AREA – COMMUNITY ENERGY

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
3.54	2008 Climate Risk Management Strategy is too dated to provide guidance.	Plan policy indicates that HRM will follow updates requirements when changes area approved.	
3.54	Hire an ecologist or other specialist to address climate change impacts.	??	

POLICY AREA – REGIONAL CENTRE

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
4.12	Enable higher density by allowing developers to contribute towards other nearby parks rather than providing their own.	HRM already does this.	

POLICY AREA – CULTURE AND HERITAGE

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	3.66	The unique historical, cultural and aesthetic aspect of the Purcell's Cove Backlands be recognized in chapter 7.	The Culture and Heritage Priorities Plan (CHPP) and the GPS offer an opportunity to examine this issue.	
	4.40	North West Arm view plane protection desired.	The Plan's section 7.5.1 addresses this issue regarding alterations to the rotary and will be further considered in the culture and heritage priorities Plan.	
	4.41	More cultural activities for Musquodoboit Harbour/Eastern Shore.	This can be expected through the Culture and Heritage Priorities Plan.	
	3.34	Develop, in conjunction with local heritage groups, the Heritage Advisory Committee, and Nova Scotia Department of Tourism and Culture, an inventory of properties that have potential for registration as municipal heritage properties or inclusion in municipal heritage conservation districts, and to evaluate these properties for registration with a municipal heritage designation.	A region-wide inventory of potential heritage buildings, heritage districts, cultural landscapes, cemeteries, and archaeological sites will be carried out as part of the Culture & Heritage Priorities Plan (CHPP). Community engagement will be key to the CHPP's preparation.	

	3.34		Require appropriate criteria be maintained to evaluate properties or districts in the inventory, as well as properties or districts nominated by members of the public, for designation as municipal heritage properties or heritage conservation districts and proactively encourage new heritage property registrations by means of public education through publications, workshops, registration campaigns, and direct contact with potential heritage property owners.	This will be addressed through the inventory component of the CHPP which will include opportunities for public input.	
	3.34		Seek the retention, preservation, rehabilitation and/or restoration of those areas, sites, streetscapes, structures, and conditions such as views which impart a sense of the community's heritage, particularly those which are relevant to important occasions, eras, or personages, or which are architecturally significant, or are of a significant age.	This intent is embedded in the revised Culture and Heritage objectives (Section 7.1) and will be addressed through the CHPP. A new section is added in Draft 3 called Protection of Heritage Resources.	
	3.34		Mandate the consideration of the acquisition of registered heritage properties whenever acquisition is the most appropriate means to ensure their preservation. Budget an annual amount to ensure funds are available should purchase or other financial involvement be considered by the Municipality for a registered heritage property.	It is the overall intent that heritage properties be considered for active reuse by the community. Budgetary commitments should not be included in the Regional Plan.	

	3.34	Provide financial incentives for the restoration and renovation of municipally registered heritage properties and properties in heritage conservation districts subject to availability of funds and the annual budget process.	This is already being done in the existing Heritage Incentives Program and Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District Incentives Program. Draft 2, policy CH-15(b) (Secondary Planning Strategies) referred to Council considering incentives in HCDs and this will be maintained in Draft 3. The CHPP will provide further opportunity to consider other protective mechanisms.	
	3.34	Determine the extent of use of preservation easements and restrictive covenants in the preservation of registered heritage properties.	Agreed. Community easements are enabled under the Community Easements Act. The use of preservation easements and restrictive covenants will be considered under the CHPP.	
	3.34	In the purchase or lease of space for its own use, the Municipality shall first consider accommodation in designated heritage structures."	The scale of HRM's office and programming needs makes the inclusion of such a policy impractical. The Heritage Advisory Committee has requested that the Plan include a clear statement espousing that HRM shall consider ways in which it can lead by example in the area of heritage planning, preservation … etc."). Objective 7.1 will be re-worded in Draft 3 to reflect this.	

3.34	Prior to selling or otherwise disposing of any surplus municipal property which may have heritage significance, an evaluation of the property shall be carried out to determine the level of significance, if any. Where the surplus property is of significance, measures shall be undertaken to ensure the retention of the building to the greatest reasonable extent through heritage registration, restrictive covenants or other appropriate means.	This was already included as a secondary planning policy criterion in Draft 2 and will be carried into Draft 3. Also, the heritage significance of all HRM-owned properties will be considered as part of the inventory phase of the CHPP.	
3.34	Add policy for development agreements to increase development rights for registered heritage properties.	This is included in the Halifax SPS (6.8), Dartmouth SPS (IP-15), and Downtown Dartmouth SPS (H-10). Also, Draft 2, Section 7.7, allows community to determine appropriate measures through secondary planning. This will be carried through into Draft 3.	
3.34	Pursue opportunities to work co-operatively with the Province in accordance with the strategic directions and key initiatives identified in the Heritage Strategy for Nova Scotia, and in particular to secure provincial designation of heritage properties in the Municipality, strengthened legislative heritage protection and improved funding for heritage, including tax incentives.	Good suggestion. This intent is being proposed to be explored through the CHPP.	
3.34	Heritage walks should be developed to provide appropriate directional and interpretive signs and promotional materials pertaining to the built heritage, and the cultural, industrial and natural histories of the community.	Development of policies relating to interpretation and promotion of heritage resources will be undertaken through the CHPP.	

3.34		Indicate that both sets of standards will apply - federal Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada and the municipal Heritage Building Conservation Standards.	RP+5 recommends replacing the existing HRM standards with the Canadian Standards & Guidelines. It would be problematic to have two sets of standards in place concurrently. This is supported by the Heritage Advisory Committee. Adoption of the Canadian Standards & Guidelines will provide consistent guidance to Staff, the Heritage Advisory Committee, potential proponents, and Council.
3.34		Prepare a list of character-defining elements for each of the 470 municipal heritage properties.	Draft 3 will include a policy requiring character defining elements be identified with each newly registered property. For properties already registered, files will be updated as resources permit.
3.34		Ensure the presence of a continued heritage display and interpretation programs in the community by exploring all possible means to maintain existing museums.	Inclusion of this proposed policy in the Regional Plan would be premature at this stage, given that one purpose of the CHPP is to develop policies to guide HRM's investment and support for community museums.

![RP+5 logo](RP+5 Regional Plan 5 Year Review)

Phase III Response to Public Input. Page | **24**

3.34	1. Policy CH-13, regarding development abutting registered heritage properties, should be strengthened. In line 5 the word "compatible" should be replaced by the word "harmonious".	1. Staff recommend retention of `compatible` as it is in more common usage in this context.	
	2. A new clause (a) should be inserted: "The careful use of materials, colour, proportion, and the rhythm established by surface and structural elements should reinforce those same aspects of the existing buildings."	2. Agreed.	
	3. In (a) (iii), line 3, after "street wall", insert the words "and abutting heritage properties".	3. Agreed. Adding the words "and abutting heritage properties" after "street wall" would make the clause consistent with the Downtown Design Manual (Section 4.3) which deals with height transition from heritage to abutting new buildings, but the word "setback" is replaced with "stepback".	
	4. At the end of clause (c), insert the words "and heritage resources".	4. Agreed. Clause (c) will be reworded - "not unreasonably create shadowing effects on public spaces and heritage resources".	
	5. In the preamble to this policy, the negative comments about replication should be dropped, so the last sentence would read, "It is the intent of this policy to require innovative design solutions that incorporate architecture, place-making, and material selection of the highest quality that are appropriate in relation to their abutting neighbours."	5. Agreed. This change is being included in Draft 3. The HAC has indicated that it supports this change.	
	6. All proposals for development agreements involving exterior alterations on properties adjacent to registered heritage properties shall be forwarded to the Heritage Advisory Committee for review and comment on how the proposal impacts on local heritage resources."	6. This is an operational procedure enabled by section 4(h) of the Heritage property Bylaw (H-200) and does not warrant inclusion as a policy statement in the Regional Plan	

3.34	It is not clear that lumping together the Heritage Functional Plan and the Cultural Functional Plan, as in proposed Policy CH-3, would be effective. The larger document may take longer to produce than the individual documents. A higher priority for staff time should be the Heritage Conservation Districts.	The Culture and Heritage Priorities Plan and the Heritage Conservations Districts already prioritized by Regional Council are considered to be priorities for staff time. It is recognized that some components of the CHPP maybe be completed prior to others. The Functional Plans called for in the 2006 Regional Plan have been combined under one effort in recognition of the interelated and overlapping nature of the arts, culture and heritage fields and the need for overarching prioritization of investment.	
3,34	The policies in the draft Chapter 7 repeatedly use the words "consider", "considered", and "considering". These words are weak. The Utility and Review Board overturned a decision of HRM Council by arguing that the words "give consideration to" were too weak to allow HRM to deny a development agreement. For example, in draft Policy CH-5(a), "considered" should be changed to "followed". In draft Policy CH-11, "Shall consider maintaining" should be changed to "should maintain". In draft Policy CH-13, line 6, "considering" should be changed to "requiring".	Using the words "shall follow" would remove the discretion of Council to consider the economic viability of development proposals. Staff feel the current wording is stronger as "shall consider" obliges Council to receive analysis of the proposed changes.	
3.34	Policy CH-14, exempting Downtown Halifax from Policy CH-13, should be deleted. Compatible development is just as important in the downtown.	The new Downtown Plan supplants the need for CH-13.	
3.34	Policy CH-15(d), regarding "exceptional new architecture", should be deleted; we should not plan for exceptions.	Agreed. This belongs in the Regional Centre Chapter, where it is covered by Guiding Principles.	

3.34	"Culture" is often used as an adjective. This should be replaced by "cultural" wherever it is used as an adjective.	Agreed.	
3.34	In Section 7.1, Objective 1, the words, "viability of", should be deleted. "Resources" should be preserved and enhanced, not just their viability.	Agreed. Staff will look at rewording Objective 1.	

POLICY AREA – UNDERGROUND WIRING

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
4.41	Require underground wiring in rural subdivisions.	Draft 3 requires undergrounding of secondary services only.	

POLICY AREA – ECONOMY

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
4.13	Each rural growth centre should have a dedicated socio-economic development plan.	Fall River and Musquodoboit Harbour Community Visions already amount to this, as does a locally initiated vision for Tantallon Crossroads. Other Rural Growth Centres will have a visioning component when their Secondary Plans are reviewed. The Economy chapter of RP+5 will also have additional rural content added.	
4.41	Address rural poverty.	Include in new section on Rural Economy.	

4.41	Economic development with concrete strategies and a rural economic plan.	A section on rural economic development will be added to the RP Economy chapter.	

POLICY AREA – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
3.37	Public consultation needs improvement.	Every effort is made to adhere to the principles and strategic approaches of the council-approved community engagement strategy.	
4.12	Require written responses to all questions and suggestions made by the public at Public Information Meetings and Public Hearings, in a Supplementary Report to Community Council.	Staff summarized each issue raised in RP+5 consultations and provided a response to CDAC.	
4.41	Have meetings in major communities throughout HRM for every step of the process.	Attempts were made to represent each geographical setting at each stage.	
4.41	Have Town Hall meetings for public sharing of ideas, also round table discussions around focused issues.	Round tables focused on issues have proved to be effective, and will be incorporated in future processes.	
4.41	More discussion of senior and gender issues.	These issues are addressed in objectives of Chapter 3.	
4.41	Resuscitation of the Visioning process.	Visioning will be integrated with future plan reviews.	
4.41	Rural community leaders and groups banding together to have a stronger voice.	To be addressed in the revised Rural Economic Section.	

POLICY AREA – PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (The issues and comments received have been summarized below. Please refer to full submission for more detail)	STAFF RESPONSE	CDAC DIRECTION
	3.44	Be more specific about how to achieve the aims of the Plan.	Draft 3 measures are coordinated with Plan objectives.	
	4.31	Set specific targets, deadlines and measures in Appendix A	Targets and measures will be established in appendix A. Deadlines will be explored in priorities Plans.	
	4.13	Add an Objective 9.1 committing to provide a public, online implementation timeline and roadmap with dynamic milestones tied to specific deliverables for the 25-year time period.	Timelines are more appropriately considered in project reports. HRM website provides information on ongoing projects.	
	4.13	Provide end-target values in Appendix A.	Agreed, where appropriate,	
	4.13	Report actual new development numbers achieved during a given period, then the totals from the start date of the RP, and follow with percentages based on the goal's end target number.	Agreed.	
	3.54	Need public tracking system so everyone can follow Functional Plans arising from the RP.	Projects are posted to HRM's website.	
	3.54	Add more emphasis on the Urban Forest Master Plan to show its importance.	This is adequately addressed in Policy E-11.	
	3.54	Use positive, rather than negative measurements.	Agree, where practicable.	
	3.54	Provide public education and, especially, lead by example. Monitor staff's own practices on such aspects as vehicle idling.	This will be addressed in the HRM Corporate Plan to reduce greenhouse emissions E-29.	
	3.54	In the first instance, the amount of available serviced land for development must be established.	This was done in 2010 and will be updated.	

RP+5
Regional Plan 5 Year Review

Phase III Response to Public Input. Page | 29