

**Chapter 9. Governance and Implementation – written submissions up to July 5, 2013**

PROPOSED POLICY CHANGE	SUBMISSION BY	REF #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	STAFF RESPONSE (Where no response indicated means Staff believe the proposed Regional Plan addresses this adequately or has been previously adressed)	CDAC Direction
9.1 Objectives	Spryfield Residents Association		(Pg. 96) 9.1.1 Objectives SRA agrees with objectives. Need better followup to ensure plans (eg. Visioning) are carried out and considered in future decisions. SRA recommends the style of meetings meant to inform or engage public opinion should take the form of town hall meetings. Sessions that divide public into issues-related tables means that public neither hears or is heard on the whole spectrum of the discussion. In a town hall style meeting, everyone in the room can hear the scope of the issue, presented by staff, and then can ask questions of staff. Everyone hears everyone’s concerns and the staff hears and records the same. This system works for Council at public meetings, it should also be used to engage the public.		
9.2 Community Engagement	Cameron, C.		I am appalled that yet again rural HRM is not included in your meeting schedule. May I remind you that we comprise 90% of the landmass invaded by amalgamation.	Meetings in rural communities in phase 2 of RP+5 1 included St. Margaret’s Bay, Cherry Brook and Oyster Pond. In phase 2, meetings were held in fall River and North Preston. Two additional meetings were added in Gaetz Brook and Sheet Harbour based on community request.	

	Kerr , K.W.R.		I am dismayed that meetings will not be available for 75% of the geographic area. Why are we so consistently, in all matters relating to HRM, overlooked, excluded, neglected and ignored? If direct consultation and making our voices heard in person is nearly as always made more difficult, time consuming and expensive than the majority of citizens of HRM, it is likely that you will hear less from us and therefore come to incorrect conclusions about us thereby compounding the negative impacts of and our already unacceptable minority position.		
	Nevo, A.		I want to start off by saying that revising the Regional Plan is long overdue. Frankly I think planning for 5 years is unrealistic in this day and age when countries can rise or fall in a day, so perhaps the fact that reviews are only done every 5 years is something that should be reconsidered and part of the problem.		
9.3 Measuring Success	Our HRM Alliance		In the revised RMPS, <b>HRM has removed the provisions for an annual check on the RMPS</b> (ch.9, pg. 3). Only a five-year check remains. To use Chapter 4 as an example, the transportation section identified no real measurable targets nor does it set any timelines. The usefulness of such a “plan” is minimal. If a plan does not tell you where you want to be and by when, it is a vision statement. HRM needs to define deliverables with measurable targets and include these within the RMPS. At present, as with the original plan, many good intentions are mentioned in the plan but without an implementation schedule, it is difficult to evaluate progress. See attachment for a proposed re-write of Appendix A. The Alliance recognizes the amount of work that has already gone into the revision of the RMPS but if the document is to guide growth and development within HRM for the next 20 years, the Alliance is committed to ensuring that that growth is focused toward the most liveable and most sustainable places.	Councilmay at any time review and amend the Regional Plan. The five year review is deemed as an appropriat timefame for more significan evaluation and review of regional policies.  Perfromance measures will be included in one of the Appendices of the Plan.	
	Our HRM Alliance		Deliverables identified & monitored should include but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· All new &amp; existing Secondary Plans plus phased implementation timelines</li> <li>· All new &amp; existing Functional/Priorities plus phased implementation timelines</li> <li>· All Plans new &amp; existing Land Use By-Laws to be developed/amended</li> <li>· Implementation of various new &amp; existing Master Plans (broken down into Phases)</li> <li>· Number of new housing units needed per year to reached proposed density goals 25-50-25</li> <li>· Number of kilometres of new bicycle lanes to be created per year (set a goal)</li> <li>· Number of kilometers of new AT trails to be built per year (set a goal)</li> <li>· Number of kilometers of new municipal roads to be built per year (set a goal)</li> <li>· Number of new Park &amp; Ride locations to be created per year (set a goal)</li> <li>· Add additional deliverables as they are identified</li> </ul> Next to real-time tracking of the costs to implementing the Regional Plan would not be difficult either.	Perfromance measures will be included in one of the Appendices of the Plan.	

	Emodi, T.		The performance criteria as stated in the current draft, are insufficient to understand whether growth is occurring in the desired way. The criteria must measure whether growth is occurring in Centres where the three factors mentioned in item 2 coexist.		
9.4 Secondary Planning Strategies	Emodi, T.		<p>There are short term actions which could assist in the reversal of HRM's serious target drift. Among them are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>serious attention to R2 zone:</b> relaxing just a few rules, applying simple urban design principles, and providing incentives would likely result in several thousand new residents (some in affordable housing) in the Regional Centre</li> <li>• <b>a serious overview and critical examination of projects currently caught in the approvals process.</b></li> </ul> <p>It is likely that prioritising these would release significant development in the places where development should occur according to item 2 above.</p>	This will be addressed in Centre Plan.	
9.7 Discretionary Approvals )	Hall, K.J.		We support the proposed plan amendments focusing on Greenbelting, which promote the intent of the plan by encouraging development in areas where services already exist.		
	Jones, D.		Regarding the exceptions allowed in clause G-16 that would allow development in the "Backlands" between Herring and Purcell's Cove Roads and bordering the far side of Williams Lake: These exceptions would destroy any protection as Urban Reserve for this particular area. I am strongly in favor of establishing that land as an official Greenbelt Area.	<p>Policy G-16 will clarify that only limited development may be considered using the adjacency clause.</p> <p>Policy G-9 will be deleted.</p>	
	Pilsworth, E.G.		<p>The Regional Plan must establish and enforce the protection or urban wild spaces everywhere and lock in the concept of greenbelting</p> <p>Designating Purcell's Cove Williams Lake Backlands as a Greenbelt would make the Backlands completely off-limits to development and preserve the land in its current bucolic, historic splendor for generations to come.</p>	The Greenbelting Priorities Plan will delineate natural corridors, which will include the Chebucto Peninsula.	
	Pilsworth, E.G.		Purcell's Cove/Williams Lake has backlands now under threat by Clayton Developers. It's vital that Clause G-16 be deleted. The Urban Reserve designation offers no firm protection at all against early and extensive development.		

	Hall, K.J.	Our concern pertains to the Urban Reserve Designation, which contemplates development in 20 to 25 years when the supply of serviceable land has been significantly diminished and the existing number of serviceable lots (in excess of 30,000) is fully developed. Therefore, we suggest that the committee consider amendments to ensure that <u>Policy G-9 shall not apply to the Urban Reserve until such time as it can be demonstrated that no more developable land within the existing service boundary is available.</u>		
	Leary, T.	As an example of the bad planning that is proposed, I point out that <b>the clause G-16 on p. 99 of the revision leaves absolutely no protection for the Williams Lake backlands.</b> The sordid history of the attempt by some council members, their favoured developers, and yacht owners (most of whom are non-resident) to push an unwanted water and sewer scheme into the area must be seen for what it is: a selfish and undemocratic ploy. <b>The backlands must be preserved.</b> Halifax deserves no less. The history of development in the region is a sad story. It is time to correct that reality, to do the right thing and plan for a dense core, walkable communities, preservation of green spaces, limited suburban sprawl, decreased dependence upon the automobile and better public transit.		
	Jones, D.	There must be protected open land within HRM as well a growth of housing and business, it makes economic sense for the long term.	Urban Reserve Designation protects lands under the designation.	
	Purcell, V.	The current draft is not acceptable as written because <b>clause G-16 on page 99 does not appear to offer any protection for urban reserve lands if they abut serviced land.</b> I feel strongly that we need an abundance of wilderness area for urban (and sub-urban) recreation. In example, the <b>Purcell's Cove/William's Lake Backlands</b> are an ideal area to preserve for current and future non-motorized recreational purposes. They seem to be currently designated as urban reserve. The area would be ideal for a Greenbelt type of designation. It is close to the urban core and is accessible by public transit. The area is an invaluable resource because of the multitude of unique natural features and widely varied recreational opportunities.		
	Plache, E.	Section 9.7, clause G-16 was mentioned at the town-hall as a way to allow extension of landuse designations to neighboring designations. It was indicated that the intent was to restrict this extension to bring small parcels in line with larger surrounding/neighboring parcels. No-where does clause G-16 make this clear. <b>Either G-16 should be removed from the document</b> (as it allows in principle arbitrary re-designation contrary to the regional plan) <b>or clause G-16 should be rephrased to guarantee that a re-designation is only possible under a set of very specific conditions</b> (i.e., the re-designated parcel's area must be less than 25% of the area of the abutting parcel, so as to guarantee the continued integrity of the regional plan.		
	Rhineland, A.	I believe that clause G-16 is unacceptable as it opens way too much land to development. Lands abutting serviced land and Harbour lands must not be able to be re-designated!		

General Comments	Cascadden, J.		Draft 2 document is not near ready for publishing.		
	Aikin, G.		HRM should stop devoting staff resources to site-specific plan amendments requested by property owners and developers. A policy should be adopted stating that plan amendments shall only be considered during five-year reviews.		
	Bennett, E.		<p>HRM should stop devoting staff resources to site specific plan amendments requested by property owners and developers. Note: The existing rules allow for 35,000 new housing units in the urban core, according to the Stantec study. That’s enough to supply the demand for housing units in the urban core for 63 years. There is no need to change the zoning rules for decades.</p> <p><b>Clause G-16 (page 99) must be deleted.</b> While the working draft of the Regional Plan embraces the concept of “Greenbelt”, it is not defined and no specific areas have been designated to be contained in a Greenbelt.</p>	<p>Policy G-16 will be clarified to ensure that only limited development may be considered as part of the Plan. The Greenbeltnng Priorities Plan will delineate natural corridors, which will include the Chebucto Peninsula.</p>	