

### Chapter 3. Settlement and Housing

**INTRODUCTION** The citizens of HRM have indicated through consultation that a balanced approach to growth across the Municipality is the desired approach. To achieve this, approximately 25% of new dwelling units will be targeted to the Regional Centre, approximately 50% will be targeted for the suburban areas, and the remaining 25% to the rural areas. HRM will direct much of its investment to a series of centres where services such as transit, wastewater and water distribution services can be economically provided to support development and land is available to accommodate growth.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. *Direct growth so as to balance property rights and life-style opportunities with responsible fiscal and environmental management;*
2. *Focus new growth in centres where supporting services and infrastructure are already available;*
3. *Design communities that:*
  - (a) *are attractive, healthy places to live and have access to the goods, services and facilities needed by residents;*
  - (b) *are accessible to all mobility needs and are well connected with other communities;*
  - (c) *protect neighbourhood stability and support neighbourhood revitalization;*
  - (d) *preserve significant environmental and cultural features; and*
  - (e) *provide housing opportunities for a range of social and economic needs.*
4. *Maintain the integrity of rural communities;*
5. *Preserve agricultural and resource lands; and*
6. *Support housing affordability*

PROPOSED POLICY CHANGE	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	STAFF RESPONSE (Where no response indicated, Staff believe the proposed Regional Plan addresses this adequately.)	CDAC Direction
Growth Centres	Add Clayton Park West as a growth centre		
	Differentiation between Upper Tantallon Rural District and Tantallon Crossroads Rural Local Centres appreciated		
	Rural Chapter desired in Plan		
	Additional Multi-District Recreation Centres desired throughout HRM	HRM is undertaking a Community Facilities Master Plan (consultation to follow adoption of the Regional Plan)	
	Ensure piped services can adequately handle proposed increase in residential units (in-filling)	Wastewater Management Functional Plan addresses this issue	
	Ensure quality urban design with complete streets/neighbourhoods		
	East Preston, North Preston and Cherrybrook do not desire growth		
	Food Security	Staff agree. Food security will replace “urban agriculture” in Table 3.1 and will be considered as part of secondary planning (see Policy S-9). Definition of food security will be included in the Plan.	
	If we believe in growth targets, what do we need to commit in order to achieve them? What sort of follow through is required? It seems like there have been a number of projects that have undermined these goals.		
	Firm rules where you can't develop		
	Direct growth		
	Make a market for downtown		

	Be open about meeting our growth targets		
	Ensure access to healthy food in the Regional Centre		
	Regional Plan presents an opportunity to work on food security		
	Higher growth targets for urban core		
	2050 Targets: Regional Centre – issue is downtown core – no residential development, why? o Make specific targets o What is value proposition for people to live there? o Talk with urban core developers o Cost?		
	How do we hit 25% for urban core? o No development in greenbelt o Initiate centre plan core asap o No residential development in business parks o Clear and prescriptive for affordable housing o Identify challenges o Strong measurement practice	Providing appropriate incentives in the Regional Centre through the Centre Plan is the recommended approach.	
	Change market conditions – how? Focus plan review on that		
	Downtown should not be at expense of rural area.		
	BOLD objectives, GREAT opportunities		
	ACTION plan! With a Community		
	Public good @ developers cost: greenbelts, tree plan		
	Map 2 Conrad lands need to be included as part of Port Wallis Masterplan	Sufficient lands to meet HRM’s needs for settlement in Dartmouth are available within the currently defined Urban Settlement designation.	
	Parkland is a cash grab: Why exclude HRM		
	Revise map to include Port Wallis per what Council passed		
	Public Parklands should be used as part of the parkland requirement for subdivision		
	Gross versus net density is wrong. Promotes in-filling		
Affordable Housing	Rent to own program desired		
	Public housing projects not desired	Provincial Housing Strategy addresses this issue	
	Plan refined to include housing affordability		
	Waive fees for affordable housing		
	Access to affordable mortgage financing desired		
	Financial support for inter-generational familial co-habitation (seniors)		
	Eliminate discrimination in zoning by-laws for housing for people with disabilities		
	Bonusing for affordable multi-unit single storey units for seniors		
	Plan refined to address principles of housing affordability		
	What is the impact on industry (10% of economy)		
	Not looking at cumulative costs; what can people afford?		
	S-33(d) – add “the number of residents permitted should be compatible with the prevailing land use” to S-33(d) permitting licensed homes for special care of more than three. <b>Benefits:</b> Removes discrimination in current by-laws and is consistent with principles of inclusion. People who need affordable housing will be able to access healthy food.		
	Do not make changes that will increase cost. Need economic study (i.e.: underground wiring)	A market assessment of the economic impact of the costs associated with underground wiring and waste water infrastructure charges in underway in collaboration with Halifax Water.	
	Include “Housing Affordability” as a guiding principle. Benefit: important to local economy		

	density calculation – gross VS net average. Benefit: no reason to change; will increase home cost		
Conservation Design Developments	Policy S-12(r) No net phosphorous increase performance standard too onerous. Study process of stormwater management may be unattainable (see also Ch.2)	Staff agree; Policy S-12(r) deleted. The upcoming Storm Water Management By-law is to address stormwater quality and quantity.	
	Open Space requirements (60 & 80%) too high	Conservation areas required under the Plan have been reduced.	
	Lots abutting parkland should be credited for open space requirement		
	Use of net density calculation reduces density too much	The proposed options provide more flexibility for open space developments by reducing the conservation land required and balance out the density calculation.	
	10% parkland dedication requirement in addition to the open space conserved per lot is onerous	Development agreement criteria should be added to create the potential for a reduction to 5%.	
	Parkland at 10% is a cash grab! We don't see it accruing to the benefit of development. No parkland dedication in your HRM business parks?		
	You don't have jurisdiction over wetlands		
	Maximum number (caps) of lots permitted appear to be arbitrary		
	Maximum of 3 dwelling units per private driveway too restrictive	Agreed. Staff propose to increase the maximum permitted to 8 dwelling units per private driveway.	
	Density (gross acreage) Take out wetlands (30%) and then parkland you are leaving the developer with less the 60%		
Limits like 100 lots and numbers of lots on a driveway. Where did this come from? This is arbitrary			
Why limit to 100 units?			
Need to link greenbelting to parkland. Assumption is that the developer will continue to hold the land. This is a cost developers are unwilling to take on. If land is important enough to be included in greenbelting it should automatically be included in parkland dedication.	The Greenbelting Priorities Plan will address a variety of property ownership options required to protect Open Space.		
Keep as is. Change in Density Calculation should not happen. Benefit: increase density & reduce cost			
Need for clear and consistent development timelines and around the SPS process (watershed, greenbelting, etc)			
Need recognition that services can expand beyond current boundaries			
Focus on real, genuine targets achievable within a 5 year timeline			
General	More growth and density in the urban core		
Island Development	Save all islands (Crosby Island; Bedford/Mill Cove)		
Successful implementation	Fair development boundaries		
	Numerous requests to "grandfather" rural subdivision projects in progress. Active Stage II Open Space Design Subdivision Applications include: - Case 001278 Lake Echo Modular Home Park (on hold by applicant) - Case 01290 Glendale Avenue, Westphal (106 units - classic) - Case 17061 Cole Harbour, Bisset Road (4 lots - classic) - Case 17575 Paul Norwood, Lake Echo (215 units - hybrid) - Case 17736 Oakfield, Brookhill Drive (31 lots - Hybrid) - Case 18084 Aerotech Village, Holland Road (153.5 hectares - classic/hybrid)	Agreed. This has been standard practice in HRM.	