

Chapter 3. Settlement and Housing – written submissions up to July 5, 2013

PROPOSED POLICY CHANGE	SUBMISSION	REF #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	STAFF RESPONSE (Where no response indicated, Staff believe the proposed Regional Plan addresses this adequately or has previously been addressed)	CDAC Direction
3.0 Introduction	Creighton, M.		<p>Page 37 Has consideration been given to increasing the percentage target for growth in the Regional Centre? Multi-unit dwellings in already serviced areas (Halifax Regional Water Commission, Metro Transit, Nova Scotia Power) would tend to be more affordable while helping to rejuvenate the core.</p> <p>It is recommended that the percentage target for growth in the Regional Centre be increased.</p>	<p>Staff recommend that the current 25-year growth targets are maintained.</p> <p>Revised rural subdivision regulations will reduce the need for new roads in the rural commuter shed through clustering.</p> <p>Significant investment in Regional Centre infrastructure is required to realize growth related savings suggested in the Stantec report.</p>	
	Our HRM Alliance		<p>The Regional Plan [...] sets very modest goals for balancing growth at 25% urban, 50% suburban and 25% rural. It provides minimal guidance on how it will concentrate this growth in Centres where it could be more easily and cost-effectively serviced by the Municipality.</p>		
	Our HRM Alliance		<p>HRM must acknowledge that they are not achieving the desired residential growth target of 25 per cent urban growth. In order to correct the problem and get the plan back on track by year 10, 34 per cent of new growth must occur within the Regional Centre. The fact that the chapter of the Regional Centre is not yet complete is a huge barrier to meeting that target. [...] Could the “no new roads” policy be extended to the rural commuter area? Without this provision, developing in the rural commutershed is easy.</p>		
	Rhinelanders, A.		<p>I support the Stantec Consulting recommendation for the establishment of new growth targets for our Regional Plan to 50% urban, 25% suburban and 25% rural.</p>		
	Smith, S.H.		<p>I really think you should take into consideration the new study by Stantec. RP+5 needs to change targets to be 75% downtown, 15% suburban and 10% [sic] urban. Your current track record on the 25/50/25 formula has been a supreme failure, missing your downtown goal by a large margin. My question is: What has Planning HRM learned about the regional plan implementation that could help us reach the modest goals already in place, and how can we exceed them to ensure urban growth.</p>		

	Conter, A.		I encourage councilors whose constituencies who are outside the circumferential to take the time to explain to their constituents why this growth must stop, why services should cost money and why a viable densification of our core is to the benefit of everyone.		
	Spryfield Residents Association		SRA is generally in agreement with growth targets, but need to proceed in rural areas with caution. New communities need and want infrastructure which comes with costs.		
3.1 Objectives	Aikins, G.		<u>Affordability & Build Environment</u> Objective 3 does contain the phrase, “protect neighbourhood stability and support neighbourhood revitalization,” but this is not backed up by any policy. Since most residents will continue to live in existing housing, it is important that planning and zoning rules continue to protect existing housing including heritage houses. <u>Some positive policies about existing housing and neighbourhoods should be added to Chapter 3. Clause (f) should be deleted and should be replaced by a statement indicating the important role existing housing plays in housing affordability. Note: CMHC data shows that new housing is 50% more expensive and existing housing.</u>	An additional criteria related to stable and complete neighbourhoods will be included in policy S-9.	
	Conter, A.		I encourage councilors whose constituencies who are outside the circumferential to take the time to explain to their constituents why this growth must stop, why services should cost money and why a viable densification of our core is to the benefit of everyone.		

3.2 Urban Reserve Designation	Plache, B.		Put a moratorium in place to prevent suburban development in areas designated as urban reserve. (Those areas were designated with a reason.) Keep those areas as reserves, and review at the end of the 25 year plan. Let's not squander our lands haphazardly, but leave space for the coming generation to use as will be deemed wise at that point in time.	Urban Reserve lands are subject to comprehensive community planning processes and are identified for growth beyond the life of the regional Plan. Limited edge development may take place under policy G-16.	
	Boggild, L.		The Regional Plan does not provide strict guidance as to which areas should receive growth, and which areas should not. HRM currently has a significant overabundance of plots approved for development in the suburban areas, which puts us already at a disadvantage to meeting the stated goals of a balance of urban, suburban, and rural development. [...] The current draft's vagueness and willingness to devolve firm commitments to future documents provides too much space for development to proceed in contradiction to our aspirations and for our municipality to slowly fail, plot by plot. [...] The plan must demonstrate that it will be enforced. We must be willing to employ the levers at our disposal, such as the pricing of development charges, so as to influence market behavior.		
	Spryfield Residents Association		#5 Kidston Lake Lands and #6 Purcell's Cove backlands were considered untouchable in the original Halifax Municipal Development Plan developed in 1980's. These lands were held back from development by requiring the 2 things: construction of a NorthWest Arm bridge and secondary sewage treatment. Council of the day, based on intense input from the public, felt that development of these lands should be held for future generations to decide. Within a decade, the Plan was amended and the planning for an Arm bridge was discarded. Now development is happening on both these parcels. We have a small window of opportunity to reacquire the remains of the Kidston Lands. It is unsure if we have any chance to secure future Arm bridge approach land behind Williams Lake. Yet we are talking about a 3rd Harbour crossing. This needs a second look.		

	Wanzel, G.		After a very shallow dive into the Housing Affordability item, I find myself feeling quite disappointed. You must understand that I had read the Stantec Report a few weeks back and was very impressed with their assessment of how badly we've been missing the very modest targets for growth in our current plan - 25% to the Centre, 50% to the suburbs and 25% to the rural areas of the HRM. [...] So you must appreciate my disappointment and concern when I read the introduction to CHAPTER 3: SETTLEMENT AND HOUSING of the 23 May 2013, 2nd DRAFT RMPS, which says that we 'citizens have indicated our preference for the 'balanced' growth model of our current plan - 25% to the Centre, 50% to the suburbs and 25% to the rural areas of the HRM'. I realize that the Stantec Report is a recent arrival on the scene. Unfortunately, it not only illuminates our short-sightedness, without a shadow of a doubt, it also exposes our collective inability/unwillingness to come to terms with an ugly and urgently pressing reality. There is far more at stake here than housing affordability, although that's a part of it. It's about environmental sustainability and the present and future costs of the ways in which we choose to live.		
	Emodi, T.		The revised Plan will not be strong enough to address the drift away from the original growth targets. HRM needs a serious mid-course correction to achieve the targets in relation to 2006 figures and patterns of growth. Targets in alternatives A or B outlined in the Stantec Report would address the challenge, current targets would not.	See response in 1.1 for initiative to increase Regional Centre's share of growth.	
	Emodi, T.		To identify over 30 Growth Centres and allow urban growth to occur in every one of them without setting priorities about WHERE growth should occur is really not a planned approach. Additionally we hear that about half the growth is occurring between Growth Centres, not within them. RP+5 must identify those Growth Centres which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have existing physical infrastructure with capacity • have adequate health, social and other services with capacity • are at or near areas of employment 		
	Southwest Properties		Letter related to Motherhouse lands citing example of Mt. Pleasant		
	Plache, B.		I am in support of directing growth to the urban areas, but would even go so far as suggesting to increase the growth there (Scenario A or B) to catch up with the developing deficit. Worldwide there is a correlation of density of population with innovation and wealth. Cities are motors for growth, and a well-tuned infrastructure is key. The concept of the regional center is important with this regard		
			I also like the concept of growth centers, which will provide local points for employment and services. Maybe consider permitting high density residential units close to growth centers, placing many people in their vicinity, making active transportation a natural choice.		

	Fillmore, P.		More needs to be done to meet growth targets for the core. For example, the full cost of servicing undeveloped land could/should be borne by developer/purchaser.		
	Craig, E.		Why is there so much focus on enabling suburban and rural development? HRM has not met its growth targets, so why do you seek to make it easier to do rural subdivisions? Greater restrictions should be introduced! Instead I sense you are caving to the development industry.		
			And why on earth, after a very good study that demonstrates the real cost of sprawl, is HRM not looking to adopt a 50% growth target in the Regional Centre? Again I feel you are listening to the big developers instead of to common sense and hard facts. Have you considered repealing approval of all those lots approved during the original plan process? if they haven't been built by now, take away the grandfathering!		
3.4.1 Conservation Design Developments	Macaulay, C.		My main concern is regarding the changes to both the maximum number of lots allowed and the calculation required for “net developable lands” found under RP+5 Policy S-12 through S-17. Given that HRM, should council approve these changes, would require a phosphorus export coefficient study, I can see absolutely no reason to reduce the number of lots to be developed by either applying a cap of 100 units or reducing the numbers based upon wetlands/riparian buffer area. [...] It should also be noted, when developing through “as of right”, the land mass found within the riparian buffer and/or wetlands is actually included in the calculation of minimum lot size under DOE provincial guidelines. These lands would also undoubtedly be included in the calculations of any Phosphorus Export Coefficient Study. To remove them from the calculable developable area does not make sense to me. [...] only economics, along with mandatory environmental and traffic studies should govern development, not policies that can only drive costs upward. [...] As a representative for Miller Development Ltd (Case No. 01007) and as a personal owner/co-developer/representative of 500 + acres of land in the Fall River area, I believe it is important to go on record, that I do not agree with these changes to policies mentioned above. Having said that, I would like to become more involved in this process of policy review, changes and implementation. Please let me know if and how I might do that.	Policy S-12(r) will be deleted. The upcoming Storm Water Management By-law is to address stormwater quality and quantity. The net density calculation is balanced by reducing conservation areas required under the Plan.	

	Creighton, M.		<p>3.4.1 Conservation Design Developments - Pages 48/49</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy S-12 (g) The promotion of “forestry” in this policy and in policy EC-13 is questioned. Table 3-4 offers alternate design development concepts and promotes open space and non-disturbance practices. It is suggested that permitting “forestry” in these policies runs contrary to professed goals. 2. Policy S-12 (p) The policy of requiring a hydrogeological assessment conducted by a qualified professional is strongly supported. 3. Policy S-12 (q) Is there a scientific or engineering argument for excluding cisterns as a primary source for potable water? It is suggested that current technology and designs make cisterns a viable potable water source. The Island of Bermuda has been using this method of domestic water supply for over 300 years and recent studies show that approximately two thirds of the Bermudian domestic water supply comes from rainwater capture systems. 4. Policy S-13 (e) Are not “open space” and “forestry” mutually exclusive items? <p>It is recommended that: The permission for the practice of “forestry” be removed from policy S-12; Policy S-12 (q) be removed; and Policy S-12 (p) be retained.</p>	<p>1 Forestry will be removed from policy S-12.</p> <p>3. Cistern technology may be explored in the future.</p> <p>4 See response to point #1 above. .</p>	
	Plache, B.		<p>Rural development with flexible Conservation Design are a laudable concept. I would go even further, allowing e.g., a high density complex with integrated waste-water treatment on maybe 10-20% of the land, with the remainder left for recreational use of the residents. Dense rural development may be more cost effective in the long run, and also allow for the establishment of a village structure more typical of (for example) Europe, where even villages are walkable.</p>		

	Lake Echo Watershed Association		<p>Map 15 D from the HRM 5 year review draft presentation (attached – Figure 1) and section 3.4 (Settlement and Housing) of the Draft RMPS incorrectly indicates that the critical watershed immediately adjacent the lake is the only property where development should be severely restricted due to poor water quality. Map 5.2.4 from the Lake Echo Watershed study (attached - Figure 2) illustrates that the area included in the study at the head (North) end of the lake is included in the highlighted area with “no assimilative capacity for additional development”.</p> <p>The Lake Echo Watershed Association respectfully requests that the protection offered to selected areas of the lake be extended to the complete watershed as per the recommendations of the HRM commissioned Lake Echo watershed study, until such time as we are able to demonstrate that the watershed is well on the way to recovery and possesses the required assimilative capacity to allow sustainable development. We believe that our plan of a community run program aggressively focused on increased awareness, education, sampling and stewardship, will result in improvements in the watershed that will ensure that the community can grow and enjoy the benefits of our beautiful lake for generations to come. If successful, we envision the elimination of restrictions on sustainable development in our watershed at the next HRM 5 year review.</p>	In light of the conditions of Lake Echo and the current difficulties that HRM is having with respect to regulations for the treatment of stormwater, Staff recommends that the request of the Lake Echo Watershed Association be considered and fully addressed through the secondary planning process.	
3.5 Housing Diversity and Affordability	Conter, A. CBRE		I would like to see a heavier push for density in the downtown. I think this can be addressed by not only moving forward on the plan as it stands now, but assessing the R1 and R2 zones to allow for greater as of right unit density. Any building which can have units added to it without augmenting the exterior envelope should be entitled to do so. I think this is an addition worthy of making as it would show results very quickly and give a quick influx in the construction business while those in the r2 start to hire to make the new units.	Secondary suites will be fully considered in the Centre Plan and other secondary planning processes.	
	Mensink, A.		In relation to housing in metro, what about a mixed focus on affordability with quality: such as ensuring that there are green areas (parks, playgrounds, gathering areas) available within a context of mixed housing; apartment buildings that have a green area surrounding them, proportionate to the density of housing in them, like Vancouver downtown; single family homes; duplexes and low-rise multi-plexes, etc.	This comment is addressed through policy S-33 (p. 56 of Draft 2).	
	Bennett, E.		Some positive policies about existing housing and neighbourhoods should be added to Chapter 3. Clause (f) should be deleted and should be replaced by a statement indicating the important role existing housing plays in housing affordability. Note: CMHC data shows that new housing is 50% more expensive than existing housing. Families with average incomes can only afford to rent existing housing. Existing buildings contain 35% embodied energy –its wasteful and bad for ghg emissions to destroy them.	Principles V of HRMbyDesign included in Chapter 6 speaks to complete neighbourhoods, including affordable housing and a variety of tenures.	

	Miller, B.	<p>Affordability: in spite of the assurances that density bonusing can result in affordable units/housing this is virtually impossible since new construction standards and costs dictate higher prices/rents. The most affordable housing is the housing that is already built. And that is true for commercial spaces as well, the arts organizations and small business that are thriving in this part of town and making it a lively place. Where will they go? And even if this were possible, HRM has no code of 'conduct' for developers...What constitutes affordable? Who will monitor these units to make sure they stay 'affordable'? What will be the mix? All bachelors? [...] they have a huge backlog of developers looking for permits this means the developers are running the show. This is a bit like the idea that bigger roads will solve traffic problems when, in fact, they simply attract more cars. Loosening municipal planning strategies that were carefully developed block by block by the people who live in these areas will only result in the demand for more loosening (as is now happening with HRM x Design. It is a fools game. It should be stopped now.</p>	<p>This will be addressed in detail through Centre Plan.</p>	
	Lloyd, M.	<p>permitting auxiliary dwelling units or secondary suites within single unit dwellings; I think this could be useful in increasing the density of housing in some of our serviced low density residential areas without compromising the quality of the areas. This could be done by adding a small apartment as well as through creating a two unit condominium.</p>		
	Plache, B.	<p>The growth targets urban / sub-urban / rural are measured by the number of new housing units. Do these numbers account for housing units torn down for new development? Replacement of buildings is likely more prevalent in urban than in other areas, and may skew the numbers.</p>	<p>HRM is currently focusing on new housing units, which may include replacements and additions to existing units</p>	
	Wanzel, J.G.	<p>Quite disappointed after a very shallow dive into the Housing Affordability item. They project future costs to our children, their children and the environment. There is far more at stake here than housing affordability, although that's part of it. It's about environmental sustainability and the present and future costs of the ways in which we choose to live. Address Stantec's findings and demonstrate, how via Draft 2, we will hit our targets much less ever achieve Stantec's preferred distribution of 50% of growth to the Centre, 30% to the suburbs and 20% to HRM's rural areas. Pages 20 and 21 first deferring to senior levels of government, doing the absolute minimum possible. Municipalities across Canada re coming to the realization that they must become leaders and initiator and in doing so, must be proactive in shaping their destinies. We applaud density bonusing, but on its own has little power to influence the shape of the City towards sustainability and housing affordability.</p>	<p>See Policies S-33 through to S-37. Other tools will include mixed housing, reduced lot frontage, lot size and parking, secondary units; licensed homes; infill development; reduced or waived permit fees.</p>	

	Spryfield Residents Association		<p>(Pg.56) S-33 c) permitting auxiliary dwelling units or secondary suites within single unit dwellings and eliminating additional requirements beyond use as a dwelling.</p> <p>This is going to be a very contentious issue. The Spryfield Residents' Association is reluctant to approve the concept of permitting secondary suites in R-1 neighbourhoods. People have paid a premium to own an R-1 dwelling. How will they be compensated for higher taxes paid over the life of the dwelling? This matter should be the subject of town hall meetings throughout the Municipality. Any change should be accompanied by stringent regulations overseen by a regulatory body issuing permits. The County of Halifax was moving to secondary units in R-1 neighbourhoods in the 1980's. Two important regulations at that time were 1) Dwelling must be owner-occupied and 2) the secondary unit should be confined to ½ floor area of main dwelling. Again, this should only move forward after public consultation. Question: What does "eliminating additional requirements beyond use as a dwelling" mean? What does this allow or prevent?</p>	Public consultation will be part any future policy changes related to auxiliary units, such as Centre Plan.	
	Dalhousie Student Union		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Putting forth a formal request to the provincial government to improve tenants' rights 2. Supporting zoning for student co-ops 3. Focusing on density in the Halifax peninsula rather than supporting sprawl 4. Taking inclusion, diversity, gentrification, and social justice into account when making council decisions. 		

<p>Housing – Special Needs</p>	<p>Metro Housing Community Association (MCHA)</p>		<p>MCHA is the only fully independent non-profit organization within HRM with the mission to support people with mental health issues. A detailed submission by CMHA cites major changes in <u>provincial funding programs, long waiting list of individuals requiring supported housing, zoning restrictions in HRM as barriers to meeting human rights legislation</u> (Article 19 of the United Nations Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to which Canada is a signatory nation, states criteria to facilitate “Living independently and being included in the community”). The submission states: “The current framework of zoning restrictions within HRM presents a barrier to the human rights of individuals who require supported housing. The zoning restrictions also interfere with the efficient delivery of supported housing services. Given the violation of human rights and the pressing need for increased capacity of supported housing services in HRM, the Regional Plan needs to ensure that the current zoning restrictions are removed”. The submission includes detailed analysis of zoning restrictions in local land use by-laws. The Board of Directors of Metro Community Housing Association is in agreement with the direction that Draft 2 of the Regional Plan has taken with respect to S-33 in Section 3.5 on Housing Diversity and Affordability, specifically: “(d) permitting licensed homes for special care of more than three residents; (e) permitting small scale homes for special care as single unit dwellings and eliminating additional requirements beyond the use of as a dwelling.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board of MCHA recommends the immediate removal of restrictions related to Homes for Special Care within land use by-laws to ensure that the human rights of people with disabilities are respected within all areas of HRM. 2. The Board of MCHA also supports the intent of the sentence that was in Draft 1 of the Regional Plan, which stated in S-31C on Page 38: “The number of residents permitted should be compatible with the prevailing land use.” This statement is consistent with the principles of inclusion and social integration. <u>However, it is important that the mechanism for making determinations of appropriate size and scale be delegated to the Development Officer level of decision-making.</u> It would be tragic if this type of decision would involve either a) a lengthy process, or b) a process that requires a public meeting, as this would enable discrimination of people with disabilities due to the persistence of prejudice and NIMBY attitudes. 3. The MCHA Board recommends that HRM give consideration to the further reduction of property taxes for non-profit housing organizations from the current 75%, and a mechanism to eliminate the administrative burden of making an application on an annual basis. 4. MCHA is also very interested in beginning a discussion with HRM on collaboration and partnership on the implementation of our Property Development Plan to replace or enhance the six supported housing properties that we own. 	<p>Staff are considering changes to policy S-33 concerning the preparation of secondary planning strategies.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Draft July 9, 2013</p>				

Food security	Metro Housing Community Association (MCHA)		<p>As of July 1, 2013, the food allowance that is provided by DCS to MCHA clients who live in their own apartments is \$254 a month, which averages to \$8.35 per day. The amount that is actually spent on food is likely to be less because all personal hygiene and household items must be paid for from the food allowance. The Settlement and Housing Chapter in Draft 1 of the Regional Plan included the following statement on Page 50 within the Section 3.9 on Healthy Communities: “Food security, including access to healthy food within proximity to residential areas, is also paramount to good land use planning and community design. Food stores, markets and community gardens should be included within new and existing neighbourhoods and communities. S-40D HRM shall, through the secondary planning process, consider health impacts and food security” This statement is not included in Draft 2 of the Regional Plan and it was one of the only areas in Draft 1 that acknowledged the need for food security. <u>Affordable housing is misplaced unless there is also access to affordable, accessible, and healthy food. People who need affordable housing rarely own a private car or can afford the cost of a taxi to obtain their groceries.</u> The aging population, as well as parents with small children, needs to be able to walk to a local store to buy small quantities of food, as carrying heavy bags of groceries by foot or by public transit is not possible. Corner markets in residential areas that provide staple non-perishable foods as well as fresh fruits and vegetables are commonplace in other large cities but not in the areas of HRM delineated for the Regional Center. The Board of MCHA strongly recommends that the Regional Plan include the intention to support the availability of healthy and affordable food, which is accessible to local residents without requiring the use of a car or taxi.</p>	<p>Staff recommend, based on earlier CDAC direction, to include a definition of food security in Chapter 3.</p>	
Aging in place	Harrison, D.		<p>The new regional plan should contain an objective and policy statement concerning the planning and development of Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) as a healthy community. It should include a process and commitment for establishing proactive health-planning partnerships. Significant changes are underway in American cities where planning is increasingly focused on considering health outcomes. The newly established Healthy Canada By Design initiative in HRM will hopefully help connect planning with health; however, it would be unfortunate to miss an opportunity to include a healthy community objective in the Regional Plan at this time, along with some associated action steps. To be sure, the draft RP addresses many healthy community determinants but there are some notable exceptions. For example, there are no aging-in-place or age-friendly community policies. Attached are some typical planning parameters that might be considered.</p>	<p>Staff recommend to include aging in place in the objectives as well as definition.</p>	

Specific requests – Service boundary extensions & re- zonings	GENIVAR Inc.	<p>On behalf of our client, Conrad Brothers Ltd., GENIVAR Inc. is pleased to present you with the attached letter requesting confirmation that our client’s lands will be included in the upcoming Port Wallis Secondary Planning Process.</p> <p>Based on our understanding of historic policy intent and various directed studies, we are of the opinion that the entire Port Wallis area, including those lands identified as owned as operated by Conrad Brothers Ltd., are to be included in the upcoming Secondary Planning Strategy Process. We would also like to clarify our client’s short term intent with regards to the SPS process: as per Appendix H, Conrad Brothers Ltd. is requesting confirmation that their lands bordering Lake Charles and Highway 107 will be included in the upcoming and immediate Port Wallis Area Secondary Master Planning Process. We recognize that a majority of our client’s rear lands will continue to function as a quarry operation for several years. For the time being, it is our client’s intention to retain these lands as ‘future development’.</p>	Staff are not recommending any changes to the Urban Settlement Designation.	
	Frizzell, J. Alcatel- Lucent	Request by Stone-Ridge Fellowship Baptist Church Board of Deacons/Trustees to re-designate the back portion of the church boundary from Rural Commuter R-6 to Urban Settlement Master Plan (PID 00355065) – approximately 50 acres of land.	Staff are not recommending any changes to the Urban Settlement Designation.	
	Ekistics Planning & Design	Request an amendment to the Regional Plan draft to consider the inclusion of mixed use residential development on a portion of land in the area of the Bedford Common Industrial Park. The land is currently zoned as ILI (Light Industrial Zone) which permits industrial uses, restaurants, commercial uses consistent with the Shopping Centre Zone (CSC), and uses permitted in the General Business District (CGB) Zone (excluding office buildings). 550 units.	<p>This request can already be considered under the local municipal planning strategy.</p> <p>Staff recommend that Policy E-9 include a provision that any residential development within existing business parks must be compatible, addressed in a comprehensive manner, and satisfy general principles of complete communities.</p>	

Specific requests – rural subdivisions	GENIVAR Inc		Grandfathering the property located between 2268 and 2376 Sackville Drive (PID 41164039) under existing regional planning policy and bylaw framework regarding development of Open Space communities.	Staff recommend that this request be granted subject to meeting existing criteria.	
	Macaulay, C.		Request to grandfather a Stage II Development Agreement Application for Charleswood Subdivision (Case No. 01007), by Miller Development Ltd. We have invested a significant amount of time and money by entering into this process (which began in 2006) and we only did so, after having taken full consideration of the present development policies.	Staff recommend that this request be granted subject to meeting existing criteria.	
	Armco Capital		Request that Sandy Lake lands (PIDs 00423772, 41127739, 00421982, 00646000) be explicitly recognized in the RMPS as being appropriate for development. The RMPS should clearly facilitate and direct the preparations of amendments to the secondary Planning strategies that apply to these lands. Enable development through Comprehensive Development Districts. Recognizing that wastewater servicing is required, detailed development approvals can be tied to the extension of wastewater services.	Staff recommend Sandy Lake to be included in the growth centre table 3-1 and Map 1 as a Suburban District Centre. Sandy lake was included in the 2005 RMPS as a potential site for new urban growth subject to the completion of secondary planning processes.	
SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS FROM FALL RIVER OPENHOUSE					
9.2.2 Community Visioning and Rural communities			Rural communities have lost a great deal when it comes to their ability to move ahead with local community development initiatives. Many items that have formed a part of the Community Visioning Plan that a community has indicated as a High Priority often does not move ahead because HRM Council and staff do not place it as High Priority when considering other HRM initiatives.	The community visioning program will continue to be recognized as section 9.2.2. and policy G-2.	
			Previous amalgamation these communities could deal more directly with the Province and Federal entities when pursuing funds for projects. This flexibility needs to be made available to HRMs Rural Communities and they should be encouraged to seek outside funding and project solutions when direct HRM support is lacking.		
3.5 Housing Affordability (Secondary Units)			Would like to see a realistic approach to the use of basement apartments in the Fall River/Waverly/Wellington area.		