

**HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
REGIONAL PLAN 5 YEAR REVIEW
TOWN HALL MEETING**

**6:30 p.m.
Monday, June 17, 2013
Holiday Inn Harbourview, Dartmouth**

STAFF: **Mr. Austin French – Manager, Planning
Ms. Susan Corser – Project Coordinator
Mr. David McKusker – Manager, Regional Transport
Ms. Patricia Hughes – Supervisor, Service Design & Projects, Metro Transit
Mr. Richard Harvey – Acting Urban Design Project Manager
Mr. Peter Bigelow – Manager, Real Property Planning
Ms. Leticia Smillie - Cultural Planner**

CDAC: **Ms. Dale Godsoe, Chair**

FACILITATORS: **Mr. Robert Ziegler
Ms. Jeanie Cockell**

**PUBLIC IN
ATTENDANCE:** Approximately 160

The meeting commenced at approximately 6:32 p.m.

1. Opening remarks – Mr. Robert Ziegler

Mr. Robert Ziegler called the meeting to order at 6:32pm in the Ballroom, of the Holiday Inn Harbourview, Dartmouth. He welcomed everyone for attending along with the councillors who were present. He advised this is the RP+5 open house and town hall. This is one of several opportunities for the members of the public, to contribute their knowledge, concern and creativity to the process of revising HRM's Regional Plan.

Mr. Robert Ziegler introduced himself along with his colleague Jeanie Cockell as being the moderators and facilitators for the evening and gave some background on the Regional Plan. He mentioned that the revising of the Regional Plan began in the fall of 2011. In explained, that in 2012 the Community Design Advisory Committee was established to guide the review process. That committee is comprised of volunteer citizens from diverse sectors and communities. It has met roughly twice a month for the past 15 months or so. In addition, in the spring of 2012 there were 7 regional public sessions and in the last few weeks CDAC and HRM Planning had three stake holder sessions and four open houses. He advised that this is the last open houses tonight. The open houses and stakeholder consultations saw thousands of citizens, citizens groups, business associations, and other branches of Government weigh-in on the latest version of the revised plan, the RP+5. He stated that tonight is one more step in this engagement of consultation process.

Mr. Ziegler discussed the agenda for the evening. First, there will be introductions and explanations about the plan, highlighting key changes. Second, we will open the floor to comments and questions, with the hope that we can hear from as many as possible. Third, there will be an opportunity to meet informally

with HRM staff, any Councillors that are present and members of the Community Design Advisory Committee.

Mr. Ziegler began his introduction for Ms. Dale Godsoe. He explained that she has served as the Chair of the CDAC and in that capacity has helped move the process along in the past 15 to 18 months. Ms. Godsoe was chair of HRM By Design and was on the hard core Committee of cities and communities in Canada. She is currently on the executive of University of Kings College and the QEII Foundation.

2. Introduction – Ms. Dale Godsoe, Chair, Community Design Advisory Committee

Ms. Godsoe welcomed everyone and thanks them for their presence tonight as we continue and conclude an important stage of the Regional Plan's first five year review. She states that the Committee hopes it will provide us with a good sense of how you, as members of our HRM Community, feel about the proposed changes and whether they reflect your feedback which many of you have provided feedback throughout the process.

Ms. Godsoe acknowledged a few people. The CDAC Committee is a 12 person Committee of volunteers and four Councillors. She is unsure of how many are in the room at the moment but states that most of them are coming tonight. They represent diverse areas of the city and diverse interests of the city from environment, business parks, health etc. She explains that the people who are on the Committee are Geoff LeBoutillier, Bill Book, Eric Burchill, Joanne Macrae, Fred Morley who was also the former Chair, Dr. Gaynor Watson Creed and Peter Moorhouse. The four Councillors are Lorelei Nicoll – District 4, Gloria McClusky-District 5, Wayne Mason-District 7 and Jennifer Watts-District 8. Ms. Godsoe advised that there were other council members present and asked that they stand. She explained that the mayor was coming but just wasn't there yet.

Ms. Godsoe pointed out that the review process has been extensive and tonight they are pleased that they can share the revised plan, which she believes is clearer in what we want to achieve as a Regional Centre and a vibrant Municipality. She states that she thinks that the vision is a vibrant livable community that is economically, environmentally and culturally sustainable. They call themselves CDAC and they have debated fiercely and broadly and won and lost their views across the floor. There are still probably different opinions across the committee and so we need your comments and advice, we do welcome it. Even if you have presented before or have sent in your comments, we welcome if you want to speak on your passion tonight. This plan will not be complete without your wise input. Please tell us clearly and strongly what your views are. Please remember there may be someone on the other side telling us clearly and strongly the opposite view, so in some cases it's a balance and in some cases it's a tough decision but that is hopefully what we are here hopefully to advise on.

Ms. Godsoe explains that the decisions are not made by CDAC, they are not made by staff they are made by Council, as they should be. From here they go to Community Planning and the Development Committee and Heritage Advisory Committee and then to Council. She advises that she is not going to explain that process because she knows other people will. We do need a strong living document that allows us to meet our vision. The population targets that we set out are 25% for the Regional Centre, our suburbs are 50% and in the rural areas 25%. In the first five or six years both the rural and suburban areas met and in fact exceeded their goals. But the Regional Centre which includes the Peninsula and Dartmouth to the Circumferential, those have not yet been fulfilled and we need to do that. A strong centre means a strong city which means an economically viable city so we can pay for everything right across the whole municipality.

Ms. Godsoe advises that one of the chapters is far from complete which is chapter 6, the Regional Centre which is Phase 2 of HRM by design and includes the rest of Provincial Centre. She states that she

mentions this because CDAC will be working very soon on that and there will be further consultation as part of that process. She thanks everyone for coming.

Ms. Jeanie Cockell thanked Ms. Godsoe for the introductory words. Ms. Cockell introduces herself and added that we will move into the next section of the meeting. She then introduces Austin French who is the Manager of Planning and also the Project Manager. She advises that he will discuss the details and what the plan is all about and any changes.

3. Overview of the Presentation - Austin French, Manager, Planning

Mr. French thanks everyone for coming this evening for the presentation on the Draft Regional Plan.

Mr. French explains that in 2006 Council approved the first Regional Plan for the municipality, following a process of research and consultation that the municipality is still proud of.

Mr. French states that the first five year review is very important time in the 25-year lifespan of the Plan because this is when we take the first comprehensive look at how the Plan is working, and what we can improve on. He also states that he is grateful for the opportunity to provide the community with an update on the process and proposed changes to the Plan as part of our consultation.

Mr. French states that he will begin with a few fundamentals of why it is important that we have a Regional Plan and review it at regular intervals. He will then also talk about the review process and what we have done to date. This is also a time to talk about some of our accomplishments as well as our challenges and then provide an overview of the proposed changes.

One of the fundamental responsibilities of local government is planning and the preparation of plans. Planning is about how a community wants to shape and guide future growth and development. Effective planning ensures that future development will occur where, when, and how the community determines it should.

There are several important benefits to the entire community that result from the planning process such as improved quality of life and more certainty about future development. A plan belongs to the whole community. Planning is all about balance among competing interests and almost always involves difficult trade-offs. We need to strike a balance to meet the needs of all who live, work, play, and visit our community. An effective plan reflects those trade-off decisions.

Mr. French explains that the Regional Plan is Council's key policy document, guiding regional land use planning. The Plan is implemented through the regional subdivision by-law, local community plans and land-use by-laws. It is important to see the Regional Plan as an umbrella document which directs numerous other initiatives and investments. While more than a land use document, the Regional Plan doesn't delve into all the details of local implementation. At the same time, a key part of the first review process was to ensure that the Plan is clearer, crisper and better integrated with implementation initiatives and performance measures.

Mr. French states that all planning documents in Nova Scotia are required to undergo regular review and where this is HRM this is a particular requirement of the Halifax Charter and this is also an important condition because it ensures that the plan addresses changing conditions and is meeting policy goals.

Mr. French advises that Council approved a specific scope for the review under four broad themes which included specific issues and we will be talking about those. The focus has been on Sustainable Solutions, the Regional Centre, Community Design and Transportation and Land Use.

Mr. French states that the Community Design Advisory Committee has been guiding the process and has provided an ongoing oversight to the process and provided opportunity for community engagement. CDAC has reviewed in detail feedback from communities that they received during the earlier phases of consultations and Mr. French adds that they are looking forward to talking and hearing feedback tonight and then they can reflect and refer to the last couple of weeks.

Mr. French would now like to talk a bit about the process.

4. Process – Austin French, Manager, Planning

The process was organized around four distinct phases:

- Where are we now?
- Where do we want to go?
- What do we need to refine?
- And final approval.

Mr. French advises that we are currently in phase 3 of the review, which includes this consultation on the draft Plan.

Mr. French refers to the slide which outlines where we go from here.

So what has happened in six years? HRM believes that we have much to be proud of and celebrate as a region. We have completed several plan reviews, including the HRM By Design also known as the Halifax Downtown Plan. The Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District, which was adopted as part of HRM By Design has been in operation now for over three years. Major investments in the Regional Centre includes the Central Library, this is one of the first projects to go through the new regulatory process by HRM By Design. HRM is also investing in major streetscape improvements in the vicinity of the Library. The Cultural Plan, which came out of the Regional Plan, provides the long term goals for enhancing HRM's culture and heritage.

A number of successful initiatives were implemented by HRM, including:

- the Public Art Policy and hiring of Public and Community Arts Facilitators,
- cultural funding programs such as the Poet Laureate Program and
- community arts program such which included a number of projects such as the one in the picture here (Mr. French referring to a picture in the slideshow) Black Street place making project.

Investment in transit is a major focus of the Regional Plan with improvements in infrastructure and the frequency and reliability of service.

Communities of Bedford South and West Bedford and also Russell Lake West in Dartmouth are master plan communities under construction as planned growth centres under the Regional Plan.

Land use regulations on the location and siting of the wind turbines were added to the plan in 2011. HRM also increased investment in active transportation with 80 km of new bike lanes and 70 km of new trails built. Transit has been extended to some rural communities such as Tantallon, Fall River and soon Porters Lake.

New rural subdivision regulations contribute to the protection of open space and address water quality concerns. Investment in rural communities also includes development of new community facilities, such as the Prospect Community Centre.

Mr. French explained that they have also completed a number of important studies which guides the review process including a Business Location Analysis which was completed this year, several Watershed studies and the Stantec Quantification and benefits of Alternative Growth Scenarios which estimated that \$670 Million dollars in public and private costs can be saved if we can meet our current growth targets. All of these studies are important because they will guide us in the most efficient way of providing new growth.

He states that in addition to research, during the first 2 phases of the review an extensive public consultation across the region was conducted. We were in regular contact with various regional stakeholder groups.

Working through CDAC as a Committee of Council, all studies and draft policies have been available publicly on-line.

Mr. French gives a quick look at the meetings that Ms. Godsoe had mentioned. He states that there were seven of them, including a kick-off that was held across the region. The first phase of engagement was focused on broad policy directions. They heard a range of comments and CDAC dedicated several of its meetings to review all public input received.

The current phase of community engagement includes an information campaign, as well as the stakeholder consultation and public consultation. In early June 3 stakeholder sessions with about 75 members of the environment, culture and heritage community and the business and development community as well were completed. He advised that they held three open houses across the municipality last week. This regional town hall meeting as Mr. Zeigler stated, concludes the public participation process that we are undergoing right now.

Mr. French noted that now he is going to talk about what is not changing in the Plan and then he will get into the proposed changes.

The Regional Plan estimated that HRM's households would increase by about 60,000 households in the lifespan of the plan over the next 25 years. Mr. French showed some diagrams on a slideshow and explained:

It created settlement targets:

- 25% would be located in the urban core or Regional Centre (Peninsula Halifax and downtown Dartmouth), shown in the dark colour
- 50% of growth would be in the surrounding suburbs, shown in white; this includes areas to be serviced by central water and sewer.
- 25% of growth would be in the rural, the large area shown in pink.

Despite many successes, after the first 6 years we are not currently tracking to meet our growth targets, particularly in the urban core, where about 17% of all new growth took place.

The RP+5 review has an opportunity to strengthen policies to attract more residential growth in the Regional Centre.

He states that we are not proposing to change these targets at this time because it is more important to meet the current targets and to allow the current policies to work. We need a Centre Plan to make that happen.

Another area that is not changing, this is Map 2 of the Plan and it is called the Generalized Future Land Use Map. It establishes the foundation land use designations for all of HRM. All community plans and by-laws must conform to this we feel that it is a good type basis for planning in the Municipality.

We are not proposing to amend the Land Use Designations and growth targets because that would represent a major departure from the Plan. He states that fundamentally the plan is working rather well. We will rather focus on how to meet these current growth targets with a clearly outlined program of implementation.

So what is changing? Our key policy goals are focused on those listed here. These five areas contain a number of detailed policy directions and Mr. French adds that he will review those now.

4.1 Greenbelting

Mr. French explains that protecting the environment is both a core principle of the Regional Plan, and a core value for Halifax citizens. There has been an interest in the community to introduce the idea of Greenbelting to help manage growth and develop a connected network of open space. Mr. French advises that HRM staff feel that our current growth management tools are working well, but that Greenbelting as a concept can be used to help shape our communities.

The first proposal is to create a Greenbelting and Public Spaces Priorities Plan to define a network of natural spaces but also emphasize urban spaces, streets and roads which act as pathways for active transportation. All these spaces will function as a network, both shaping communities and affording them access to recreation and cultural opportunities.

Second, HRM will create a comprehensive planning framework, requiring that parks and open spaces in new developments connect to greenways and active-transportation routes. Planners will consider open space as a first step in community design, locating public spaces to connect with natural corridors.

4.2 Watercourse Buffer

Vegetation immediately around watercourses and along shorelines also known as ‘riparian’ growth is particularly important to the overall integrity of our natural open space network.

The new Urban Forest Master Plan accepted by council last fall presents a unique opportunity to build on stewardship efforts by enhancing our environmental policies and regulations.

Mr. French states that unfortunately, treed buffers along watercourses are sometimes removed prior to development. When that happens, water quality generally suffers and wildlife habitat is lost. With the Regional Plan’s adoption in 2006, land use regulations were amended to include a 20 m buffer for new developments adjacent to watercourses. Thanks to recent changes to the HRM Charter, we can now regulate the removal of vegetation within a riparian buffer before any development takes place. An HRM watercourse buffer protection by-law will be an effective policy tool but it will require a “made in HRM” approach that considers local urban forest conditions as well as the cultural values of residents.

Work is currently underway to develop a draft by-law to be presented to Regional Council. Mr. French explains that they heard from some members of the community throughout the consultation that the idea of this buffer should be increased, up to as much as 30 m. The view of the current draft of the Regional Plan is that this flexibility may be provided through future community planning. The current draft is to maintain the 20m buffer with the idea of the by-law to protect the vegetation and anything larger would be up to the community planning processes.

4.3 Growth Centres

Mr. French noted that there are also changes proposed in protecting growth centres. Mr. French refers to Map 1. If you see on Map 1 of the Regional Plan there are about 50 and these are one of the bigger elements of the Regional Plan. They identify where we want to focus our growth.

Mr. French states that proposed changes will help them address the cost of providing municipal services,

respond to shifts in development, streamline the planning process, and improve the character and appearance of our streets.

As part of RP+5 we are proposing to change some of these growth centres, based on recent population changes what we have learned in the first five years of the Regional Plan about costs and the practicality of providing services to rural communities.

Mr. French refers to a revised Map 1 of future Settlement and Transportation program. He states that you will notice a scaled-back expansion of transit services to rural communities among other changes. We have had to modify our intention to establish a large a suburban centre at Morris Lake, because the land had been dedicated back to Military staff, this could shift suburban growth away from Dartmouth, although a smaller centre is recommended on the north side of Morris Lake in the vicinity of Caldwell Road.

Council earlier provided direction to move forward with a community plan for the Port Wallace area in Dartmouth to provide more options for growth in Dartmouth. Similarly, HRM will re-classify the Fall River growth centre to reflect its role as serving an entire district, together with the Upper Tantallon centre. A separate Tantallon Crossroads Local Growth Centre will be recognized to the south. HRM will carry out additional planning work for a number of community areas such as Middle Sackville, Porters Lake–Lake Echo, Birch Cove, the Bedford Waterfront and others.

Based on completed watershed studies and community visions we now better appreciate the environmental constraints and costs of providing urban-type services to rural communities. This is reflected in the number of growth and classification of rural centres.

There are also changes in the plan in regards to rural design development.

4.4 Rural Development

Mr. French explained that in 2006, HRM introduced policies to allow consideration of Open Space Design Development in two basic forms. One was the Hybrid Open Space Design Development which allowed the development of one residential unit per hectare, on large lots, covering the entire site. The second was a Classic Open Space Design which allowed for clustered development on smaller lots so that the development 60% of the site could be preserved as open space. These forms of development are now called Hybrid and Classic Conservation Design. Changes to the Classic and Hybrid Design policies are proposed in response to the need to control impact on ground and surface water, to encourage growth within Rural Growth Centres and to allow more options for subdivisions that may be serviced with on-site septic and well systems.

Mr. French advised that we are introducing two options for Classic Conservation design, which will protect between 40% and 50% open space. Development between centres will be limited to 100 lots. The hybrid design will protect 80% of open space and be limited to 30 lots. (Mr. French refers to diagram on slideshow) Although the size of the conservation area is proposed to be smaller, there is another change which excludes environmentally sensitive areas from the density calculation of a parcel.

4.5 Housing Affordability

Mr. French explained that housing that is affordable is key to the sustainable growth in the region and that is envisioned by the Regional Plan. We need a variety of housing options close to jobs, amenities, and institutions. To meet this challenge, HRM will support the Province's new Housing Strategy, and update its planning policies and community design standards to make affordable housing easier to create and sustain. Starting with the Regional Centre Plan, and continuing with other upcoming community plans, we'll explore all the tools available to make it easier to develop housing that is affordable such as density bonusing in the Regional Centre, mix of housing units and promotion of secondary units.

4.6 Active transportation

Mr. French explained that to make active transportation an easier choice for more people, HRM will focus on practicality and connections.

Within the Regional Centre, there are more amenities within reasonable walking and cycling distances, and we can expect more people to use active transportation for the bulk of their daily activities. Here we'll focus on connecting up existing facilities into convenient networks. In less dense areas, we'll invest in connections to local destinations such as schools, shopping centres, and especially transit. We'll emphasize greenways, trails that serve both local travel and recreational uses.

The Active Transportation Plan review which is nearing completion will provide us with a list of priority projects for the next 5 years. A new network of greenways will also intersect with our Greenbelting and Public Spaces Priorities Plan.

4.7 Transit

Mr. French states that transit is a significant topic and there is always interest in extending transit in the municipality. Trying to meet all these expectations at once can result in fragmented service that satisfies no one, spreading resources too thinly.

Mr. French explains that in areas with a relatively high population density, transit has the potential to carry many passengers and have the greatest economic and environmental benefits. By contrast, in low-density rural areas transit is more expensive because there just aren't enough riders to justify the cost in most cases, and the resultant service is often unsatisfactory. Hence, HRM will concentrate transit investments in higher-density areas to achieve the greatest possible benefits while favouring alternatives to conventional public transit in rural communities. To implement this strategic focus on higher density areas, HRM proposes to establish an urban transit service boundary. This will mean that:

- All future Metro Transit investments in service expansion and improvement will occur within this boundary
- HRM will, however, continue to support some strategically located rural commuter express services, the MetroX.
- Also, HRM will propose a funding program to assist rural areas with developing tailored community-based transit systems.
- Existing routes outside the boundary will remain, so long as like all other routes in the system, they continue to meet Council approved performance standards.
- In addition, to improve transit service within the boundary, bylaws will be amended to permit transit terminals and facilities along minor and major collector roads.
- There is also a strong policy support in the Draft Plan for transit-oriented development, by appropriately integrating transit facilities within communities.

We feel that these changes will significantly improve over time the quality and reliability of service. Specific operational investments will be developed through the 5-year Transit Priority Plan scheduled to commence this fall.

4.8 Regional Road Works

Mr. French explains that the Regional Plan aims to increase the use of public transit and active transportation, by shaping development around compact, complete communities. Nonetheless automobiles will remain an important option for the foreseeable future, and the Plan includes some investment in increased roadway capacity. As far as possible, road works may be designed to minimize the impact on the communities they run through and the cost of building them. We must also consider the

environmental impact of any increase in the volume of automobiles.

Mr. French noted that the revised Plan explains the reasoning behind investment in increased road capacity. The original plan's recommendations remain sound despite some changes to assumptions about growth and the use of transit and active transportation.

Map 8 of the Plan is HRM's Road Hierarchy Classification.

Street classification is generally used to reflect general existing traffic patterns of the various streets in the network. It is applied in several approved policies and documents including the Neighbourhood Short-cutting Policy, Municipal Service Standards, and Municipal Operational Standards. Street classification is also referenced in the new policy on the permitted location of transit uses.

As part of the review, we updated the map to reflect what planners have been already using for administrative purposes.

Road expansion projects are listed in Table 4-1 of the Plan. Community consultation will be part of any of these major road improvement projects going forward. Mr. French shows an abbreviated version of Table 4-1.

Programmed projects are anticipated to occur within a 3 year budget timeframe, planned projects are within the 25 year lifespan and future potential projects are long term projects beyond the horizon of the current Plan.

4.9 Regional Centre

Mr. French notes that as mentioned earlier, the Regional Centre was a major focus of this review. There are extensive community expectations related to meeting urban growth targets and investing in the Regional Centre for the benefit of the entire region and it requires community engagement, detailed planning, and coordination.

The Altus Study which Mr. French adds that he referred to earlier, on business location decisions told us that taxes have a relatively minor role in influencing business location decisions. Attracting new residents as a Regional Planner is more important.

The draft Regional Plan includes a new Regional Centre chapter and places priority on the completion of the Centre Plan which will introduce planning policies consistent with the guiding principles endorsed by Council under HRM By Design. The Centre Plan will also develop heritage plans and programs that preserve and enhance the viability of heritage properties, streetscapes, and districts; and prepare capital and operating expenditure programs that strategically leverage other public and private investment.

4.10 Culture and Heritage

Mr. French explains that HRM has a distinct culture, which contributes to our economic and social vitality and our sense of place. This heritage includes shared community values that drive many HRM decisions and policies, including the existing Regional Plan. The revised plan will establish strong measures to protect and enhance culture and heritage resources, and better integrate culture and heritage considerations in municipal planning.

HRM will develop a Culture and Heritage Priorities Plan outlining priorities for strategic investment in culture and heritage based on a detailed inventory and identification of needs and opportunities.

Using authority granted in recent legislation, HRM now has the opportunity to protect cultural landscapes, in addition to heritage conservation districts and individually registered heritage buildings.

Finally, HRM will also adopt the 2010 Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, which provides richer guidance for decisions on alterations to heritage buildings and places, while protecting their heritage value.

4.11 Undergrounding and Utility Services

Overhead power lines and telecommunications cables are vulnerable to damage from weather and accidents. They also obstruct workers trimming street trees, and in some cases considered unattractive.

Mr. French explains that moving them underground makes for more attractive streetscapes, allows more urban forest cover, and improves the reliability of service. HRM currently has several successful communities where the developer voluntarily implemented underground wiring. Of course it's not possible to change the whole region's utility lines overnight, and it is not the goal of the plan to do so. Also, different approaches are needed in existing and new communities to minimize costs while ensuring maximum benefits.

Mr. French explains what is being proposed. First, new streets proposed in subdivisions will be required to place utility lines underground. This will slow the increase of overhead wires as the municipality grows and will enable the urban forest to flourish. Second, the HRM will develop incentives for moving utilities underground in downtown areas. Finally, whenever streetscape improvements are proposed within commercial and heritage districts, planners must give consideration to undergrounding the utilities.

He states that they have heard a lot of comments on this and he would expect a very active consideration of these issues with the Community Design Advisory Committee.

4.12 Industrial Lands

Halifax depends on the industrial and commercial-services sectors as major drivers of its economy. The Regional Plan recognizes the importance of industry and of the working Halifax Harbour around which the region has grown. Compared to residential, office or retail, industrial land uses have tighter constraints on where they can locate yet projects such as the Shipbuilding contract will place additional demand on these lands.

We have challenges with land supply in existing parks. With less than 10 years of inventory remaining the municipality must aim to maintain an inventory of short and long-term industrial land available for development, representing at least a twenty-year supply. This will require a combination of approaches. First, HRM will plan to finance the acquisition and preparation of new land for industrial development. Second, HRM will amend zoning in the Burnside Expansion area, and protect Harbour land, to provide for future industrial use. Finally, HRM will seek to maintain the lands particularly in the expansion areas where there is retail and office development and focus on more traditional industrial development.

These changes will ensure that the Halifax region maintains and expands its industrial base into the future. Mr. French shows an illustration of the Burnside Business park expansion area which will propose to re-zone for primarily industrial and related uses.

4.13 Servicing and Utilities

Mr. French notes that during their recent stakeholder consultations they heard, particularly from the business and development community that they do a much better job as a municipality planning for the infrastructure needs of new development. Having clear service boundaries and staging growth benefits the entire community.

The chapter on servicing and utilities it is important to ensure a sustainable and fiscally responsible

development. Mr. French points out some of the changes:

- The relationship with Halifax Water is explained, and HRM is committed to coordinating land development with the delivery of water, wastewater and storm-water services.
- The revised Plan describes how infrastructure charges will be handled, which are needed to pay for those services
- The revised Plan calls for a new storm-water management by-law, which would apply to private property.
- The Plan also calls for investment in retrofitting existing storm-water systems, to reduce flooding, improve water quality, and re-open watercourses now confined in culverts.
- HRM and Halifax Water will have to work together not only achieve cost-efficiency, but improvement in environmental water-quality and prevention of harm as a result of development.

4.14 Plan Performance

Mr. French states that planning never stops. This is true of HRM's Regional Plan as it is of any plan. We all need to continually evaluate how we're doing, and not only adjust our goals and policies, but refine the way we make our projections.

It is important for:

- Effective community engagement
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan's success
- Conducting periodic reviews

Ultimately this monitoring will help us achieve the broad goals of sustainability, mobility, cost effectiveness and livability in the Halifax Regional Municipality. Several new monitoring measures are included in the draft.

Mr. French concludes his presentation with some of the key initiatives coming out of the RP+5 review and he advises that there will be on-going implementation of already completed priorities plans. Some of the new things that will happen with the Regional Plan once it's approved, the proposed revised plan, will be the Centre Plan, Secondary Planning worked in a number of areas, Greenbelting and Public Spaces Priorities Plan, Culture and Heritage Priorities Plan and the Transportation Priorities Plan. As I mentioned, following the Regional Plan there is the Watercourse Buffer Protection By-law, there will be a creation of Industrial Lands Strategy and the Storm-water management by-law.

Mr. French thanks everyone for their attention and presence there today. The high turn-out we are seeing is indicative of the importance of the Plan to the broad community and we are encouraged by the level of engagement.

Ms. Cockell thanks Mr. French and asks the members to come up to the table to be able to answer questions. Ms. Cockell gave the ground rules and opened the floor for questions and comments.

5. Questions/Comments

Mr. Terry Casavechia, Lawrencetown - Mr. Casavechia states that he has been following the review since first hearing about it on March 11th. He added that he found out about this meeting not through the media but half hazardedly because he bumped into Councillor David Hendsbee at a school function. He then asked if there was a meeting in Eastern Shore area and he was told that there is only one more. He states that he hopes this is not the last of them because if anyone looks at these maps they will see that Eastern Shore is a great chunk of HRM. He would like to see more meetings and see them in the Eastern Shore area which will affect a lot of us. He then mentions Greenbelting, Mr. Casavechia mentions that he

looked up on the HRM website this morning after talking his Councillors assistant and through a lot of scrolling found a settlement of housing as space requirement of models from 30 to 40 to 60 % of land that can be taken to open space or Greenbelting.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French explains that the questions refer to the change. The conservation open space design subdivision, under the current rules the requirements is that 60% of the site is for ongoing conservation. The overall purpose of the design is to make sure we have compact rural communities that reduces roadways, reduces cost of both construction and maintenance of the subdivision. This adds to the environment protection for the space that is retained. For the proposed draft, that changes, and the 50% is reduced to 40% for some and then 50% for the most compact quantities. There is actually a reduction in the amount of open space that would be retained and that would be a requirement. However, there is a trade off in addition to reducing the size of the conservation area we would also be not including environmentally sensitive areas. Those are areas like steep sloped lands which wouldn't be included in the density calculation. We have significant interest in this type of design and people that are doing it are pleased with the results. We see this as something we want to continue with.

Mr. Terry Casavechia, Lawrencetown – Mr. Casavechia questions if this is a done deal or will there be some sort of an appeal? He states that he is a person that will be affected by this. There are lands in families that are woodlots that have been in families for years and that they have paid taxes on for generations that are going to be deemed almost worthless. He states that it is extremely discouraging to see it brought in this way and is very upset.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French informs that the plan has had rural conservation in place for quite some time now, over seven years and they are proposing a change. This is not a new program it has been around for a long time and in terms of, "Is this a done deal?" No, the changes are not a done deal. That doesn't happen until there is a public hearing at Regional Council. He adds that this is the last of our public consultation of this type of what is currently proposed. This will be the last one unless council directs otherwise. The schedule will call for council to call a public hearing in early fall and that would be another chance to speak. You wouldn't be talking to staff at that time but directly to Regional Council.

Mr. Terry Casavechia, Lawrencetown – Mr. Casavechia states that he has been down that road for parkland donation which is really a tax and that's a pretty cruel process. He states "let's be honest here, it's a done deal." He mentions he is very discouraged by this and this is the first time he has heard of this 60% open space.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French reiterates that it has been in place for seven years.

Mr. Dan Regan, Lake Echo – Mr. Regan advised that he has read through the RP+5 review and is generally pleased with what he saw. He mentions it reads a lot about protecting the environment which is good. On page 15 is a section on environment which states that the water shed studies will be designed to determine the amount of development and maximum input in receiving lakes without exceeding water quality objectives from the lakes and rivers within the water shed. He advises that when he looked at the maps he noticed something peculiar on the Lake Echo map in particular which is number, 15D. Unlike all the other maps the Lake Echo map includes a highlighted area that is incorrectly labeled Lake Echo sub-watershed area. He states that this has obviously been added late in the game to reflect the resent presentation of the Lake Echo watershed study that says that our lake is in big trouble. The study states that "Lake Echo has no assimilative capacity for additional development until such time as the existing problems from the lake are corrected." He adds that they must have taken this seriously because in the five year review the watershed area is highlighted and forbids certain types of this classic development in the highlighted area. The problem is that the map does not reflect the findings of the study. The map has been modified to exclude three parcels of land in the most sensitive area of the Lake Echo watershed. These parcels of land are associated with a controversial development the community has been fighting against for over four years and is the development that our Councillor has been trying to jam through council regardless of the impact on our community. Mr. Regan asks, "How can you say your interest is in

protecting the environment and then modify a map so that some people do not have to be held to the same high standards as everybody else?” Is our watershed for sale? Mr. Regan states that he would really like to know how they expect people to take the HRM five year review seriously when this type of manipulation is evident. It is wrong, and it’s unethical and may even be illegal. Mr. Regan advises that his question is, “who’s responsible for modifying this map that came out of a commissioned watershed study and under whose direction?”

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French states that at this stage the staff that he is responsible for, are responsible for this map. He mentions that Mr. Regan is going into a bit more detail than he is personally familiar with but that he can tell him this. In the watershed study there was a specific edition to the proposed development that are actively under investigation in the Lake Echo area. From our perspective we have a detailed set of recommendations of how development could proceed on those lands and it does call for a very high standard of waste water, storm water protection in order to make those developments actually feasible and as you notice there has been no approval yet so I guess the justification is that there was a specific study done around that and we feel that before the approvals are made we can adhere to the high standards that we are recommending.

Mr. Grant MacDonald, Dartmouth – Mr. MacDonald mentions that he works at Dalhousie and drives a bicycle to work most days. He states that being 62 years old, bicycling around this community is not an easy chore for someone his age and probably not for children but that he manages pretty well. He mentions that he pays a lot of attention to what is going on in traffic. He notes that the Regional Plan isn’t driven by staff although he is a little uneasy for all staff to be sitting up there at the table, and that it’s staff we are talking to and not elected officials, especially at this level of the plan. Mr. MacDonald states that his question is, “Why can’t we change the urban growth targets given that we’ve been so unsuccessful in meeting the ones we originally set and try to make a major shift in our direction of our municipality?”

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French advises that staff are not recommending in the draft plan that there be a change in the targets so we have a 25% growth target for the regional centre. So we believe that the Committee, Community Development Advisory Committee and Council give accurate consideration to the recommendation that is being made to go forward with the new Centre Plan and enhance activity in the Regional Centre, draw new investment particularly in residential growth. So the idea of changing the targets is not on the table in this draft. The idea of meeting the targets is what we are really focusing on. We are at 17% of growth where we projected 25, now this is over the lifespan of the plan so the fact that we are not tracking toward that target as closely as we would like is a significant matter but it is not a failure because that was a 25 year target not a 5 or 6 year target. However, I think that everyone working on this project is concerned about this and eager to move on from this stage so we can get underway with the centre plan and hopefully with streamlining the development regulations, clear on what projected roles are, environment for investment, we’ll see that growth increase and get close and may even exceed our 25% mark.

Mr. David Barrett, Beaver Bank – Mr. Barrett advises that he was on the Sackville plan in the late 70’s; Beaver Bank, Upper Sackville and Hammonds Plains from ’82 to ’86 and from ’92 to ’96. Mr. Barrett comments that in the 2006 plan, it’s in his opinion it was a planners thing, that they put it forth with really no impute from the rural areas. Over 50 years ago his father told him; “nothing happens in the suburbs unless they bring them downtown.” And in his opinion they’ve gone another step further and now there is planners to regulate everything and the fact they do it to him is an illegalized dealing because they zone it without input from the people and then they put lots of spin to make them feel good. Mr. Barrett states that it is his observation that the people who don’t have to pay for it are the ones that push the hardest. It is also his observation and he states that they may not agree with it, HRM is lining itself up for bankruptcy.

Mr. Barrett comments on active transportation. He states that his daughter in-law who is a nurse says that motorcycles are organ donations because the young people are using them to drive. The cars and bicycles

just don't go and you keep on pushing this. You are going to have a whole lot of deaths. Mr. Barrett states his other comment is about Culture and heritage. Yes it is good and great but from what he understands it is all put down on the landowners, again knowing something like that, you're the one who suffers.

Mr. Barrett comments on Greenbelting. He advises he is in forestry and they built down in Forest Hills and the Housing Commission left some Greenbelts. He states he got a call from the land owners all upset because the kids are using that for drugs and parties and everything else. Mr. Barrett also states that there was that fire in Porters Lake, and you're just setting it up.

Mr. Barrett mentions about forestry in Nova Scotia. He advises that after a tree gets 50years old, that high in Nova Scotia it's going to come down. The forester said that Point Pleasant Park had to be harvested, nobody agreed with him but Hurricane Juan did it for them. Mr. Barrett states that he is not saying that all these things are wrong but they put the spin only the one way.

Mr. Barrett speaks on transit. He states it should be privatized. HRM can't afford to run it. He says he doesn't understand how a responsible government could work with a monopolistic service, bonus for striking. First thing they did was they found that they would lower the ferry service because they just did too much, it's unaffordable. There is one thing here now, in Beaver Bank about the traffic problem, HRM is going to be surpassed by Moncton if they don't watch out. Moncton has circum the highway. HRM does it in that Beaver Bank had a bypass in '86 all passed by council, downtown they took it out.

Mr. Barrett mentions affordable house. He states that he understands that things have to go to the Regional Committee, its zoning and regulation by the Municipality makes people go in affordable housing. He states that this here, putting underground cables, that's \$8500 dollars get 25 more, 2000 more added onto a mortgage, that's another 20,000 dollars and then they up the taxes because its worth more. So it is just not affordable. You are basically leading up to bankruptcy.

Mr. Adam Conter, Halifax- Mr. Conter comments that a plan is only as good as the paper it is written on if we don't have the staff and the support to implement it. He states that what we've seen over the past several years as we're working through this process is an inability for our conceptual plan to be made to be caught up to our functional plan. We are on target across HRM in a lot of the smaller plans we have accomplished, but in terms of our visioning we are falling short. As we mentioned we have only 17% of our vital targets. If we are going to go through, everyone has different feelings on aspects of this plan as they all touch on our lands of ownership differently. Mr. Conter asks, if we are going to go through with pushing through this more visionary, more progressive plan; is HRM stepping up also to make sure we have the staff, the time, the dedication in the organization to actually green light what we're saying and start to get this city moving?

Mr. Austin French – As it has been brought up a couple of times tonight, as you are talking to the Municipal staff. Clearly we are dedicated to trying to make this work. I think that every conversation we've had up to this point with the Community Advisory Committee and Regional Council indicates that there is a strong commitment to making this all happen. The first step, or the step we are so keen to over mind, is getting the plan approved so that the implementation can begin.

Mr. Tom Emodi, Halifax – Mr. Emodi mentions that he would first like to commend everybody for doing this because it is difficult and challenging and you'll never get that its right. Mr. Emodi states that he just wants to make sure they get some compliments as well.

Mr. Emodi remarks that in reading to the plan that he doesn't see a lot of assessment about why we have missed the target? We know that we have missed them, but there is nothing in the document that says why. Mr. Emodi states that the number one thing for him is priorities. We have eight types of growth centres and over 30 growth centres and there is no discussion in the plan about priorities. Which growth centres should we focus on and which growth centres should we perhaps not focus on? The word priority

is mentioned eleven times in the document and never in relation to, “where to build”? So he really thinks this is one of the Why’s.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French states that they think that by adding the Centre Plan chapter, chapter 6, which they are indicating very significantly that that’s where the priority lies. And the answer to your question about “why”; that’s correct, what we are really focused on is “what’s the solution” and we believe that’s a big help towards getting tracked closer to our growth targets is the identification of more clear and predictable development rules. Mr. French states that we say this, we think this is a good idea because we believe that the new development rules is part of the reason you see so many cranes in downtown Halifax. So we think that by emulating that kind of approach, a design basis approach, more driven by architects than planners is going to bring about that clarity that will help that investment happen. Mr. French advises that the other point he wants to make is that even though we are not hitting that or tracking toward that in the way we would, we have seen a consistent significant change. We are seeing 17% of our growth, not what we wanted but hopefully we will track closer in the next 5 years. Prior to the Regional Plan what we saw for many decades was decline in the Regional Centre. He advises that they are hopeful. We seek some momentum and obviously looking forward to more success in the future.

Ms. Dee Dwyer, Musquidoboit Harbour and Area Community Association Chair- Ms. Dwyer states that her question is about the community process and feedback. She states that there have been four meetings and only one town hall and the four meetings have taken place closer to the Urban Centres. There are many people here tonight who are from the rural areas, which is a big chunk of HRM. She states that she is wondering if we can get in the future, more meetings in the rural areas. Secondly, she would like to have more public hearings before it goes to council. If some of those meetings could be held in each district perhaps and meet with each Councillor and can the deadline for feedback be extended on this process past June 28th?

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French states that he’d first like to thank Ms. Dwyer for reminding him in something that he was supposed to mention in his remarks and that is the deadline for written submissions is June 28th. This is the only Town Hall style meeting that is included in this current run of consultations. He mentions they did do a series of public meetings last spring. That is when we first gather the input to help us shape how we would revise the plan. There was a meeting in Oyster Pond which is very close to Musquidoboit Harbour which was part of that. Mr. French states, ultimately, to answer your question, “will there be more?” Certainly from the staff, we are recommending that we move forward from this section, from the committee process and ultimately the next chance that the community to speak would be at the Public Hearing, that would be speaking directly to council. The Regional Council may determine to do more consultation but it is the recommendation coming forward right now that we would take the input that we got last week and the previous week and tonight and go forward after the committees have a chance to make a vote and then go to a public hearing.

Ms. Deborah Snow, Dartmouth - Ms. Snow cited that it says in a quote that “affordable housing is 30% of your income”. She states her income is only \$1000 a month. She added that she is a cancer survivor living in financial poverty and needing assistance. So if that is the case, where would I live for \$300 a month? As it is community services are infamous of \$535 a month for housing and that is suppose to include our electricity, so we need more housing for people that are living in poverty because a community is built with many different people from many walks of life. Ms. Snow states that to her a community is where we take care of one another and we don’t leave anybody behind because it is just not acceptable. So we really need more housing for those in poverty. Not to be just secluded all in one group because that’s the poor people in that community because that is just not acceptable anymore. So when people are planning these apartment complexes, we need at least one or two units in every ten units for people that are living in financial poverty. Especially for our seniors, we have many seniors that are at the food bank lineups and they can’t afford to live and they are just getting left behind. Ms. Snow added that she just wants to open people’s eyes to the conditions of people living in poverty because we are not just poor at Christmas time there are another eleven months that we are living in poverty so she just

wanted to plant that seed in your hearts and your minds so that we don't leave anybody behind especially people living with different disabilities.

Mr. Brian Palmer, Dartmouth – Mr. Palmer advises that he is a member of the Ecology Action Centre. He states that the plan and proposal for amendments contains a vast number of initiatives or activities that would significantly enhance the environment if they are carried through. It is not that it's a perfect plan but he advises that they could offer them many more ways to enhance the environmental impacts of the plan. He noted particularly that their desire is to have performance measurements as part of the plan. He states that one of the gaps in your plan is in the construction of buildings and major renovations. Mr. Palmer asks whether it would be considered to adopting standards that would enhance the environment like the leadership in energy and environmental design that would enhance over the period of time the environmental capabilities of our buildings and provide measures of which the performance could be measured.

Mr. Austin French- So the issue raised environmentally sound construction that is something HRM has a strong interest in. Mr. French states that the actual environmental standards he thinks he is referring to is more a matter of National Building Code than the Regional Land Use, however, he wants to emphasize that this is something we will need input on an ongoing basis because planning never stops. The key element is good community design and that is substantially about protecting the environment. It was mentioned that you live in Montebello, so there will be a planning program in your area, Port Wallis area and we will be looking at significant environment protection in relation to the Greenbelting priorities plan that we talked about and placing a strong emphasis on transit oriented development. To have a mix of uses, lots of neighborhood facilities that you could walk to. This plan speaks to those kinds of environmental protection features.

Unknown Speaker – The speaker expresses that he feels the current building codes are out of date in terms of their environmental impact. What is being asked is whether or not standards that are proposed by either this likely leadership in energy and environmental design lead; which is a substantially increased standard for environmental protection and enhancement; why you would not consider adopting those in the city and making them a priority for approval for construction and significant renovations?

Mr. Austin French - HRM is actively engaged in that, to its involvement in the development of national building standards. It is not an issue addressed in our LUBs but HRM is very active in that area through our Manager of Building Inspections who has been a part of that for several years and I'm sure we will continue.

Ms. Anne Gillies, Purcell's Cove – Ms. Gillies states that she would like to raise a comment and question concerning the Greenbelt issue. She would like to find out if it is going to be possible to open discussion at some point around some lands that are currently designated as Urban Reserve into Greenbelt designation. She states that the reason she is raising this point is because right now there is a lot of concern in the Williams Lake/Purcell's Cove area about a block of land that is Urban Reserve. There has been discussion lately around the possibility of extending sewage and water services in Purcell's Cove which has been turned down by many of the people and communities in that area. Ms. Gillies states that she sees on the planning maps the Urban Reserve designation is remaining for that chunk of land that is currently referred to as the Williams Lake Purcell's Cove back land and in her opinion and the opinion of many people in that area is that it should be part of the Greenbelt designation. So during this upcoming Greenbelt planning process will there be the possibility to put that up for discussion to re-designate that area?

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French answers that what he would like to make clear is that under the draft plan there would not be a recommendation to acquire for that or any other Urban Reserve area but what there is, is a recommendation that we would be putting forward in a couple of areas. One of those, being a Greenbelt and Open Space Priority Plan. This plan, the planning and design of the community, that would exist on that reserve lands would not happen for quite some time and would be beyond 2031, until

beyond the life of the current plan. The second thing though, when the planning does happen that it is not to say “there would be no growth within that Urban Reserve”, there would be some but there would be a strong emphasis on the Greenbelting concept which involves interconnectivity of the green space that’s there and the green spaces of the adjoining areas. What we are proposing here is that there would be good planning and communities designed around the Greenbelting concept as opposed to wholesale acquisition of lands. That’s basically what it would involve. If we were to simply say it would never be developed it would basically under the HRM Charter involve HRM having to acquire those lands or any other lands to create regional parks.

Mr. Andrew Murphy, Purcell’s Cove – Mr. Murphy states that he would like to talk about the Stantec report. What Stantec has identified is about a 3 billion dollar savings. So a quick comment on how much is 3 billion over 18 years. It is 167 million dollars a year. It’s 42% of every dollar of residential tax that is collected every year. To put some context to this, in March 2012, Council had decided it could not afford one stadium it was 52 million dollars. So 3 billion in savings could give you 3 per year for 18 years or 53 stadiums if that’s what you wanted. There wouldn’t be any fight over which Councillor got the stadium because they could all have one of the three. So then I want to talk about Stantec, in relation to the staggering increase in suburban lot approval that I’ve noted over the years. So I noted with interest that when we were talking about spending 3 to 4 million dollars in upsizing the Sandy Lake hike that staff said that as of June 2010 it was estimated that the supply of suburban land available was sufficient to meet suburban requirements for 30 or 40 years. Without any consideration given to potential redevelopment of existing areas, now that is with a 50% goal so what does that mean? Well, how many dwellings do we build in HRM. Over the last ten years it’s been 2500 per year, is our ten year average. So with a 50% goal we are expecting 1250 starts per year. If we go for the 3 billion in savings then the ability to build three stadiums per year go on and then it doubles our supply. We instantly have the 25% goal and no savings of 70-80 year supply. It’s simple math. So, what this means is that the baby born today at the grace we have a suburban lock for their grandchild when that grandchild is 25. So why would HRM spend 150 million dollars a year to build subdivisions we don’t need for generations?

Mr. Murphy states that he would urge his fellow citizens of HRM especially the property tax payers to take notice of the ways that this planning strategy. What it does is it describes the clout of 3 billion dollar savings this way: significant additional cost savings could be achieved by increasing growth in the regional centre there is no mention of the 3 billion dollars. And then it says the regional plan will adhere to the growth targets established in 2006 so in two sentences we spent 3 billion dollars and we create all those bumps. Mr. Murphy states that his conclusion would be, and the start of his question is to why this would be ignored? Is that this strategy if not looking at 3 billion in savings is maybe just a bit more than a little bit crazy. Maybe we should let HRM staff and let our councils know what we think that our great grandchildren can make our own choices of where they want to live. And then maybe 70 to 80 years from now when we run out of lots they can build there own roads and we could probably reasonably expect for them to pay for all them too. Why would you spend 3 billion dollars creating more suburban lots for what we don’t need for generations?

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French states that clearly the plan as it’s drafted supports maintaining the existing growth targets. The Stantec study indicates that you could achieve a substantial savings for the entire community, not just for the HRM Municipal tax base but to the entire Community and you could potentially save more money with exceeding those targets as much as 50%. The reason why, clearly we are wanting to move to the 25%, that’s the goal to get back on track to that. If that’s achieved then obviously council could look at going beyond that. Right now, it seems more realistic try to get back on to our actual target, just seems more like a realistic objective.

Ms. Charlotte Butcher, Alliance Coordinator – Ms. Butcher states that the Alliance has been told time and time again that targets were 25% in the new residential and it starts in the urban, 50% of the suburban area and 25% in the rural area was the 25 year target. We shouldn’t be concerned at this point and that it is something that we should be worried about later. The problem is that we seem to be moving in the wrong direction. Suburban starts with 56% to 59.5% between 2011 and 2013. Staff has downplayed the

concern about urban growth by combining with suburban by saying that it's those two categories against rural. The fact is that you can't combine the numbers in that way. HRM's growth in the suburbs hasn't happened by intensifying existing development or filling in already serviced lands. HRM suburban growth has been meaning to build more sewer and water pipes and extend growths. We understand the developers now pay for a portion of the expense through Capital Cost Contribution but the key word there is Capital Cost. The developer is not charged the ongoing operating cost nor are they charged replacement cost. The taxpayer is charged for these. Ms. Butcher added that we are not meeting our growth targets now and waiting to reach them in 18 years means that the Municipality is going to incur 670 million dollars of expenses and that is 670 million that HRM can not afford. Should we be worried about reaching these growth targets earlier and we are thinking yes.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French explains that there is one important point he wants to make. So obviously we agree that it is a significant move forward to move the Centre Plan and encourage more growth in the Regional Centre. Mr. French states that he frankly does not know anyone who disagrees with that. We are all looking forward to the opportunity to try and make that happen. But he also wants to point out that this is fundamental to this plan and has been for a long time. The growth that is happening in the suburban areas, under the plan, the 50% and right now it is tracking at 59%, that is seen as good growth. Under this plan, these are complete transit oriented developments that are within quite a close proximity to the Regional Centre. Our region is actually quite blessed that it's quite compact in its current form, having been shaped around Halifax harbour.

Mr. French adds that we see the growth that is happening in Bedford, Russell Lake West as hopefully we will have happen in Port Wallis as a good form of growth and important to the regions economy. This plan in no way is to discourage the suburban growth that is happening, it's seen as fundamental to the success of the region.

Ms. Kathleen Hall, Williams Lake Conservation Company – Ms. Hall states that they are very disturbed with the plan. It does not move perspective planning in their area one iota ahead. She states that essentially they had written a page letter to the Planning Advisory Committee talking about the concern they have about the implementation of policy 18 which allows development to move into an Urban Reserve area because a land might abut. In the case of the Williams Lake Purcell's Cove area they are talking about the Harbour designation on the Purcell's Cove Road and Urban Settlement on the Herring Cove Road. Ms. Hall adds that she guesses reading the plan not only has this still been put into the plan, it is 9.7 discretionary approvals. The word discretionary, it is very clear that what is intended is that council would have the power to approve any development of that area, whether it made sense or not because there is still no identification of environmental sensitive areas, setbacks of 20m is not enough. We still have no secondary plan for that area which we have been asking for since 1998 and we are very discouraged. Now given the sewer and water and what that brought out with respect to the community and their needs, wants, and desires, it was clearly stated at the charette held by CBCL on October 29th. People don't want anything developed out there, they like it the way it is. We don't need anymore sprawl. The whole Stantec report is keeping this to a minimum. So where are the safe guards? Ms. Hall states that she thinks they are going to have to go back to the drawing board in a few respects here and says that she could go on and on. The G16 has got to go.

Mr. Austin French- Policy G16 speaks to the abutting lands. The basis of it is it relates to the generalized future map. It is a requirement in all planning strategies that you have this flexibility because you are operating on a regional plan at such a broad scale. The designations of urban settlement, rural development and so on, are not done right down to the property line. So policies like that speak to the minor flexibility related to the abutting designations. As far as the Urban Reserve designation, that is good designation, nothing will happen there without a significant planning effort without the approval of Regional Council.

Mr. Kim Conrad, Dartmouth –Mr. Conrad states he has been a resident for 56 years. He has property in a number of places as a number of people do. The 60 and 80 percent that is going to be set aside in

what is suppose to be Open Space, can it be combined? Mr. Conrad states that he had land expropriated by the government of NS, so now he is expected to put another 60 percent, 8% without buildings on it and he guesses that's revised tonight. Is there any vehicle from go forward for HRM to give us some kind of credit even if it's a few percent, since the property they took from us. He states that he started out with 48 acres and left with 4 and a half or 5 and he was only young when this happened around 1980. He said he was told that you can pay taxes on it but you will never be able to do anything with it because we want it for parkland. He points out that they bought most of it but they said they didn't want the land by the road, so he kept 340' of it for development hopefully in the future, so you could get some half decent money out of it like an RSP. And now it comes along, could we have instances like this when it borders a parkland that they do not need 60 or 80% of our land set aside?

Mr. Austin French- Mr. French explained that the design rules proposed for rural areas, they do not have that adjustment at this time. They are reducing the amount of land that you can keep in conservation area from 60 to 40 percent. There is no special provision made if you're abutting parkland. These lands are meant to be held as conservation lands and perpetuity. The density calculation for that site includes the entire piece. Now it is true that we are also amending environmentally sensitive areas. The density of one unit per hectare is based on the entire site not just the 40%. You can build the same number of units just in a more compact way.

Mr. Kim Conrad, Dartmouth- Mr. Conrad stated that he looked at map 2 and he has properties that they are trying to transform as they finish up quarrying operation to a mixture of light industrial, residential and retail and design parkland into that and a trail system. He asks Mr. French if he can tell him if this map on page 2, Exit 14, 107 bypass north east, is there an opportunity to have this included? He adds that they have been working on this for 4 and a half years and also on both sides of the highway and put a highway down through the middle of his property?

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French states that it is obviously difficult to talk about specific properties with an audience of this scale. He mentions that he talked about this before to Mr. Conrad and is open to talking about it again. He advises the audience that Mr. Conrad is referring to that they are going to do a major master plan in Port Wallis and it has a boundary. It has a boundary of the Urban Settlement designation and there are lands outside the boundary. As told before, the current proposal unless council directs otherwise is to do the study and do the planning within the Urban Settlement designation. Mr. French adds that he would be happy to explore that with Mr. Conrad and certainly raise it with the Community Design Advisory Committee and Council to make sure that they are aware of it.

Ms. Pam Cooley, Halifax – Ms. Cooley explains that she has a company called Car Share Halifax so she has invested interest in her question. She states that she is referring to the transportation section. She is wondering since the objective is to implement a sustainable transportation strategy and it says promote land settlement patterns that support fiscally, environmentally and sustainable transportation modes. How do you reconcile those objectives with the widening of Bayers Road, and is it still in the plan as a planned strategy? She is wondering how that those two are reconciled and also wants to know when Bayers Road is being planned and does it include confiscating land along Connaught Avenue?

Mr. David McKusker – Mr. McKusker advises that the Regional Plan does set objectives for encouraging more sustainable transportation. The modeling does include a hierarchy of capturing more of our demand through demand management programs, active transportation and transit. We do set expectations for that based on how much we anticipate investing in those ways of capturing trips and through the modeling we do determine how much residual demand there is for road capacity. That demand is then translated into projects within the road network that are needed to accommodate that demand. So certainly there is a balance and there is an attempt to promote more sustainable modes but there is some residual need to manage increased demand.

Ms. Pam Cooley- Ms. Cooley asked, “When is it planned and when are you starting to do the Bayers Road project and when and if are you going to confiscate the land on Connaught Avenue?”

Mr. David McKusker - The addition of lands for general traffic is not in our current capital plan. We are doing a study on developing transit only lanes on Bayers Road. That study will be going to some public consultation in the fall. There is a potential that, that project if we can develop a good strategy for that, could happen within the next five years.

Ms. Pam Cooley - How do you evaluate success in terms of the integrated travel mode, or multi modem? How are you evaluating decrease in personal used vehicles?

Mr. David McKusker - We set targets for shifting of more trips to other modes.

Ms. Pam Cooley - How do you determine and evaluate that?

Mr. David McKusker – Mr. McKusker explained that they evaluate it by seeing how close we get to our targets based on our measurements.

Ms. Pam Cooley - How do you evaluate the reduction of personal used vehicles?

Mr. David McKusker – Mr. McKusker advised that they determine a target for shifting of modes based on our ability to our expectation of being able to invest in methods that will make that shift.

Ms. Pam Cooley - Where can I see what you are starting with and what you plan to end with in the next five years, a reduction of that? Where are those numbers? Where can I find those numbers?

Mr. David McKusker – Mr. McKusker advises that the original targets are in the 2006 plan. We will be releasing soon the data from our streamline counts to show where we are with those.

Ms. Pam Cooley - But they are not ready for this review?

Mr. David McKusker – Mr. McKusker advises no.

Ms. Pam Cooley – Ms. Cooley states that the targets for the development plan went over the 50% to 59%. How are those evaluated? How do you keep track with evaluating where it's being developed? You must have known it was going over the 50%? If you didn't know it was going over 50% why didn't you, and how do we have the confidence that in another 5 years that it is not going to be over the amount that it is supposed to be in the plan?

Mr. Austin French- Mr. French states that it is known that it is basically counting the number of houses that are built in the different areas and that is done for us by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. We have been aware for a few years and in the report that went to council as far back as 2011, it was saying we are concerned that we would like to see HRM tracking more closely to its target and set out not only to do a Regional Plan but also to get going with the back bone study related to the Centre Plan. We have been aware for sometime and working towards that goal through the Centre Plan work. Mr. French adds that they can talk more about the Centre Plan if you like.

Ms. Pam Cooley – Ms. Cooley stressed that she is not talking about Centre Plan but talking about being accountable to going over the amount in the Suburban Plan which she states they keep avoiding the question. She states that he just blamed council for the 59% as apposed to just saying 50%, so council is the determinant of the 59?

Mr. Austin French- Mr. French states no, it was a question of the market. Mr. French advises that they have been aware for some time the trending was occurring the way that it is. The solution is to try to make development in the regional centre. He says that he is sorry that he is not addressing the question but the fact that the development is tracking a little higher than anticipated in the suburban areas does not cause

the plan to break, it doesn't indicate its failure. We are in the first five years of a 25 year plan. We are looking toward more growth in the regional centre and to get back on track.

Ms. Sharon Murphy- Ms. Murphy advises she is a Community Activist, interested in poverty. The first issue is the increase in water rates and NS Power rates. She mentions that this puts a lot of people in a terrible position and will result in homelessness in HRM. She asks if they can expand a little on the agreement you will have with Halifax Water. She states her second issue is rent control. Now, landlords are able to raise the rent however much they want with a stipulation that they only need 6 months notice. She states she sees a lot of people every day rent poor. They are at food banks, outreach programs, this is worsened by the above mentioned rate increases and lack of rent control. Ms. Murphy asks what difference the plan will make in the lives of the person living in one room and trying to feed themselves at food banks and church feeding programs. She asks for them to please include the excluded and the marginalized in the Regional Plan and make them part of our Halifax family.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French advised that in regards to Halifax Water rates, there are policies in the plan that speak to development charges so that new growth that are talked about in the plan are funded by new growth. So if someone is building new development, the costs are not billed to the existing water consumer they are in fact charged to the development. Mr. French mentions the second part of the issue in relation to affordable housing. The approach that is advocated here is for HRM to be an active part in the provincial government housing strategy which does speak to development of affordable housing and integration mixed market housing. Not creating blocks of low cost housing but in fact integrating the low cost housing in larger developments.

Unknown Speaker:

How much will the rent be?

Mr. Austin French-Mr. French states that he does not know how much the rent would be instantly here tonight but the program involves low income housing, integrating in a mixed market way into ongoing developments. He also advises that there is also a reference in the going forward Centre Plan of density bonusing or providing credits to developers in exchange for the provision of housing costs but he can not answer tonight as to what that housing cost will actually be.

Ms. Sandra Banfield, Bedford - Ms. Banfield notes that she was a resident of Dartmouth, now lives in Bedford so has lived all over HRM. She states there is really big concerns out in Bedford about the infilling and the development that is coming there. She says they are losing a lot of the Basin to that development and they have some concerns about the buffer zones. She would like to mention that the 20m wide buffer zone they are going with, she would have liked to see it be more like 30m, but on a positive note they are pleased to see the section about removal of vegetation. However, their concern is policy E17. So they just want to make that note that they have some pretty big concerns about a city in where you can infill the harbour and our water systems and take that away from the people and make that for development. She states that it is not right and we need to set down some laws immediately.

Unknown speaker – He congratulates the panel on the Region Plan and states that a lot of time and effort has gone into draft number two. The speaker states that they would like to start by confessing that they are not anti-development as long as it's well conceived and well executed in Downtown Dartmouth. The speaker states that they have been drawn to particularity in the Regional Plan sections 7.5.1, significant use which mandates HRM to support and to protect views and view planes in downtown Dartmouth. He states he also has in his hands a document that was forwarded to council last week that contains a decision from February 2011 eliminating the view plane from the Brightwood Golf Course and furthermore it has a recommendation in it to amend the planning policies to facilitate the elimination of the Brightwood view plane. He is wondering if they can reconcile for him how they can have a document that speaks to the elimination of the view plane and another document that mandates HRM to protect the view planes and further more he would like them to explain what benefit can eliminating a long standing view plane deliver to achieving our urban growth targets?

Mr. Richard Harvey – Mr. Harvey explains that the topic is a specialized one that is being considered through a recommendation from Harbour East Community Council to Regional Council. It has been a few years reviewing the view plane allowances that exist within Dartmouth. The main thing that differentiates the Brightwood view plane instead of provides protection of the view from private land. So it is a matter that is going to be considered by Regional Council. Mr. Harvey acknowledges that he has raised a number of issues that he thinks many members of the public would have interest in. There will be a full opportunity should Regional Council decide to even consider changing that view plane, it will be holding a public hearing. Those are really the matters that are specialized for that particular review. That view has also gone through quite a bit of public consultation and that will be something that will be considered fully by the Regional Council and again if they decide to hold further deliberations about that, they would hold a public consultation through a formal public hearing.

Unknown Speaker – The speaker states that for the record, Brightwood is not a totally public entity. Brightwood lands are accessible by the public on a restricted access basis though the playing season and on an unrestricted basis. Outside of the regular playing season you suggested prior to the session that you can go up there at noon and walk down on to the golf course and enjoy the view. He states that he can not access council chambers at three either but that doesn't mean that they are not part of public property.

Philip Saunders, Purcell's Cove Road – Mr. Saunders states that in the big picture one of the questions that we focused on was why are we not meeting our targets so we are not back here in another five years and again at 15? One thing wrong and it goes back to Mr. French's comment, is that you don't fix what is happening in the suburban areas just by improving the policy to the Regional Centre. I think that is an important part of it but it's not the only one. And on that front, is the question of discretionary approvals at the Community Council level? Mr. Saunders advises that for those who live in his area who have witnessed this over many years, he can only call it the farce of the Governor's Brook process, the debacle sewage process recently on Purcell's Cove Road. He states that the notion that you can protect or maintain planning targets and criteria in the hands of Regional Council is based on discretionary approvals which are written in such a vague way that appeals to the URB development. It is virtually impossible that that process will guarantee continued violation of the precepts of the overall Regional Plan and guarantee that again we will be back here in five years wondering why these things happened. Mr. Saunders states that the example that Mr. French responded to on Urban Reserve was a good one. Its not just minor little bits and pieces that get adjusted but it's a significantly large piece of property that is obtained as part of an Urban Reserve. He mentions that there is nothing to stop it from being brought within that discretion of approval. He thinks that is exactly what we are facing now and that is something that really needs to be fixed in this round of Regional Planning.

Unknown Speaker – The speaker mentions that she would like to go back to the first question of the evening which is about Lake Echo, there was some criteria said. But then some changes were made and yellow patches were squeezed into the design. The speaker states that the response was that, that may be true, then the standards were really high and that the water shed would not suffer. The speaker questions, "Why not simply stick with the criteria in the first place?" The speaker thinks that is true for the Williams Lake area. She states that it was said that there is a need for some minor flexibility and that nothing will happen without careful consideration. But why not stick to the criteria and there should be no flexibility when it comes down to Lakes in HRM. This is one of the few cities on our planet that has these lakes. Why not observe the criteria in first place? This also applies to the height of buildings in terms of Community Design. She states there is a sentence in the plan saying density bonus has cost the Municipality nothing. It does cost the Municipality by moving away from the plan that has been set up in the past under very careful consideration. She feels that from what he hears we are going to move again in a few years and these criteria are going to change again and again. Some things should stay as they are.

Mr. Austin French- Mr. French states that he should clarify the point he was making earlier. He mentions he was trying to draw the distinction between the Regional Plan and the Community. That for development to happen in any of the Urban Reserve areas the Community Planning Process would be

required. So the Regional Plan adoptions would not permit development to happen there. There has to be a Community Plan Process as well. It would be based on the Regional Plan but it would have to have its own public hearing. The density bonus and stuff would only apply to the Regional Centre and that is part of one of the new jewels that we have to encourage growth in the Regional Centre.

Mr. Derek Simon, Dartmouth – Mr. Simon mentions growth targets and where we are relative to those targets. He realizes those are 25 year targets but we are actually over seven years into the plan at this point and we are almost a third of the way into the plan and we are a third of the way below our growth target for the urban core. Mr. Simon doesn't think we should be downplaying that in any way. That is a very significant deviation and we are going to need a very significant course correction to get that back on track. He states that he has heard a lot of mention on concentrated growth in the designated Regional Growth Centres, and he would be interested if there was any information or statistics on how much of growth that we have been experiencing has actually taken place in those Growth Centres because there is certainly a feeling that a lot of it is taking place outside of Growth Centres? There is mention of the Stantec Report. The fact that if we continue on the path we're on as apposed to meeting our growth targets that's going to cost us 670 million dollars or somewhere thereabouts. It is close to 3 billion compared to a higher urban density standard, as well as negative impacts on the environment and health. He states those are very significant costs and he would be very concerned that the draft plan is not going to get us back on track and that we are going to experience those costs. There seems to be a sense that the Centre Plan is somehow going to save us and it is going to resolve all of our issues. Mr. Simon states that while he thinks the Centre Plan is a step in right direction, he also feels it is not going to address where and how that growth is taking place in the suburban and rural areas. These need to be addressed.

Mr. Simon states that a few great suggestions have come out. He feels we need to see a Greenbelt with clear definition of Greenbelt made and hard lines on a map in the plan. He feels we need to eliminate wiggle room in 15 and 16 which potentially opens up the Urban Reserve for development. He states that there is a need to re-enroll mobility plan. He mentions that when he looks at the transportation chapter that is there right now there are lots of great statements about what we are going to do about transportation but there is a lack of specifics. It is very specific about what roads we are going to widen, and where we are going to put another bridge, those kinds of things. On transit we get "more reliable transit". He states that this is all very well and good, but wants to know how we going to do that? A lot is being left to the secondary plans. There is no target, no timelines as to when those are going to be delivered. He states that he is worried those things are going to slip and we are going to be back here in five years and we are still going to have no targets.

Mr. Simon refers back to his question that he advises was about concentration growth in the Regional Centres. "How are we going to pay for these things?" Greenbelting, public transit, those things. How are we going to pay for the pattern of growth that we are on and who is going to pay for that because it is adding to every single person in this rooms tax bill the path that we are on? So if we want to tack another thousand dollars or two on to our property tax bills, by all means keep going on the path that we are on. A lot of studies have shown us that densification is going to save us money then lets move toward more densification, lets save that money. Mr. Simon states that he would love to hear from staff about how much of our growth is actually taking place within the regional growth centres.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French advises that they have talked about how much of our growth is occurring in our Regional Centre and so he questions, "you are asking how much is occurring in other urban centres?" He states that he doesn't have the data at his fingertips. But the rural communities we have Growth Centres like Tantallon, Porters Lake, Lake Echo, Musquodoboit Harbour. And within those rural communities the type of growth that is encouraged and permitted is actually is the Open Space Conservation Design. The new plan is designed to get more of that growth in those centres. Up to this point it would be not a significant amount. Mr. French advises that he doesn't have the exact number but states that if we are talking about what is happening significantly in those Growth Centres it is relatively on balance. The idea of the plan on a go forward basis is to encourage more growth there.

Mr. Randy Price, Lake Echo – Mr. Price mentions that he has come on behalf of his grand children and also for future Olympians. He mentions he has a canoe club which has produced Olympians in the lake. He would like to commend on the watershed study. It was well done and pleased to see that they listened to the people however the current map does not represent the watershed. He states that parts of it do, but where it crosses watercourses; that doesn't work. Mr. Price states that studying it a lot closer it also involves the pyritic slate that goes through the middle of the Lake Echo area. He says it made a lot more sense when we talked about constraints when he had discovered a presentation online to the Harbour East Community Council. Specifically commenting on how to make the development case # 01278 go forward. He mentioned it said that the constraints would have to try and capture the pyritic slate because of an impact it would have on each lake would cause acidic run off, change atrophic status. The bright side though is it said it would be preceded by reduction in existing gluten loads, which is good and that is what we are all after. Except tonight we were told that was probably not going to happen, so the next thing is, "what is going to be preceded by that or by reduction in the expectations for lake waterfront quality"? Mr. Price states, "Now, when I am paying taxes in a city where I am suppose to reduce expectations for lake water quality so my grandkids don't have to catch fish and can't swim in the lake then I think there is something wrong, I think we need to go back to the standards". He states that they were established, the study was there, the study came up as clear guidelines but when the presentation is, "how can we make this work, make this developer work?" there is something wrong.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French advises that they have heard this comment before and obviously it will be taken into consideration. He advises that it was known to them when the watershed study began that there was development proposed and there was a specific part of the study dedicated to that development and as he said, there was specific recommendations related to it and its staffs view on, for the go forward that as long as we follow those guidelines and follow those standards that development should work.

Unknown Speaker- The speaker expressed that there needs to be more meetings in the Eastern Shore. The speaker states that there is a difference in his mind that doesn't seem clear that it is going to be impossible and just even expensive to even try to do any development in the rural areas. He states that the 60% claw back on Greenbelt is going to make that happen. He states that he is not against parks, he embraces nature and he lives in nature, and is not a developer. He asks if there is any consideration for family lands to be divided, not subdivided, so the next generation can wait out without these harsh parkland fees, and 60% of Greenbelt? He states that we can't hold these lands indefinitely. He mentions that in his wife's family that there is five generations of woodland that they can't sell now because who wants to buy them. It is not in the Urban Centre, so who really wants them. Is there going to be a provision, that we can actually divide the ancestral land up without it being called a subdivision and it being a land division so it can be given to the children so they can wait it out?

Mr. Austin French- Mr. French advised that yes, small scale subdivisions can't proceed without the rural consultation design standards that have to be met.

Mr. Sam Austin, Dartmouth - Mr. Austin would like to speak about the transit chapter. He states that in this chapter it says that, new investments in transit, and this is in reference to growth, may be required. He thinks we are well past may be required and that we will need to spend on transit and the plan should say so. He advises that there are a lot of nice things about transit, such as the principles and priorities for going forward but it kind of reads unsteadily in that we have a list of road projects, but we have no specific transit projects. He feels that we have actually taken a step back because back in 2006 we had at least one specific transit project in our plan to have a fast ferry to Bedford which is out. He mentions that he had a conversation during one of the panels with Mrs. Hughes and he paraphrases, "but that there is some advantages in not having everything in because it allows us to be flexible", and I thought more on it and as a suggestion for going forward, surely there are at least a few transit projects that we know we want to do that are high on the priority list that we could include on the Regional Plan. Right now it comes across as a road document with a transit afterthought. Mr. Austin states that he would like to see some transit projects actually set out.

Ms. Theresa Scratch, Sackville – Ms. Scratch states that the main issue has to do with Open Space Conservation Design developments. She mentions that she does like the change regarding the riparian buffer being excluded from the net developable area as well as the developments requiring a public road as opposed to a private driveway which is allowed only three units or less. She states that her concern with regard to these developments is that the plan states that HRM's priority is to establish or promote these types of developments with communal septic systems? She states that she is not quite sure if the priority is going to be to service them with Municipal water. The policies with regard to extending the water service areas and establishing new ones as well as communal systems within the Conservation Design Development all refer to HRM considering, not establishing Waste Water Management Districts which require a by-law. Ms. Scratch states that her concern is that the Waste Water Management District by-law has not been established and that these developments could proceed without the required monitoring and maintenance that HRM has identified as necessary. What is the status of the Waste Water Management by-law?

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French explains that the idea has been with most of the rural based developments that they would be owned by a Condominium Corporation and they would have the common well and septic and they would be responsible for ongoing maintenance of that. We have not established any Waste Water Management Districts. That option remains open but it would only be applied where you have Municipal ownership of the system and there are no immediate plans for that to occur.

Mr. Peter Lund, Tantallon- Mr. Lund expressed that his issues are related to rural and when we look at trying to define where people will move to. The growth within HRM is 1% per year, year over year. So that equates to 4000 new people moving in to HRM. It is his understanding that in order to accommodate this many more people we need to have about 2500 units built per year. Obviously most of the growth is focused in suburban area, we are trying to get people to move downtown. In the rural areas, the plan does not recognize aged demographics. So what you have in rural areas is subdivisions built, large houses and then they have no choice to stay in their community as people are aging. So what we have in suburban areas is townhouses being built that are three level and they are still building large houses. Mr. Lund states that he thinks there still needs to be incentives for housing that is affordable and directed at seniors. He feels that housing that is affordable should be put in the plan as well and should be encouraged so that folks can stay in rural areas rather than have to move into suburban.

Mr. Lund suggested that in addition to creating incentives such as density bonusing, secondary suites, there needs to be some kind of incentive program to dissuade developers from building townhouses and sticking to building smaller one level units, no basements, drive up to the door, without having to live into a 2500 – 6000 sq. ft. home. Mr. Lund feels that will contribute to suburban growth by rural people moving. He advises that he is glad to see that in rural areas, that you could in pre-2006 have 5 lots, 10 lots, 15 lots approved more than double and triple that. So, now all of a sudden you create an environment where you have suburban type development in rural areas. In that respect which is a bit different than housing that's affordable, I really like what you're seeing in terms of using that developable area as it pertains to rural areas. Mr. Lund states that he is encouraged by that and asks for them to please stick to that. He states that he can't comment as much using that developable area in suburban areas where you have water and sewer. He makes note that he is only talking about rural areas in order to keep compact dense development and bring the pendulum back to something that is reasonable.

Mr. Austin French – Mr. French explains that the Provincial Housing Strategy doesn't just speak to urban areas, the idea of mixed market housing could be employed in the rural areas as well. We don't regulate on the basis of age under land use planning, it is just not permitted but certainly there is lots of interest in development for seniors in the region.

Mr. Peter Lund- Mr. Lund states he just wants to add that he feels we need more park and rides and to please use the term multi model transportation as he heard earlier tonight.

Ms. Paulette Forham, Halifax- Ms. Forham advises that she would like to talk about what goes on land. She states her question is for Richard Harvey. She would like to know what urban livestock means and how it is to be handled in this plan.

Mr. Richard Harvey – Mr. Harvey explained that essentially what the outcome is, the Halifax and West Community Council has directed us within the Centre Plan through Community Consultation, to address that particular issue which is generally specific to the keeping of laying hens within low density residential areas. So that is something that is to be considered as we move forward to Community consultation in the Centre Plan. He states that he does not have a direct answer about whether that is a yes or a no about the permission of it. It would be nice to be done through Community consultation.

Ms. Paulette Forham, Halifax - Ms. Forham asks if that will come up again.

Mr. Richard Harvey - Mr. Harvey advised, yes it is.

Mr. Austin French - Mr. French advises that they will stay around for discussion for a short while if there are any questions.

6. Closing comments

Ms. Cockell thanked everyone for coming.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:06 p.m.