

HALIFAX

Community Design Advisory Committee Feedback

Integration of Previously Provided
Comments

2018-04-13

CDAC Feedback - Site Specific Issues

	Comment	Action / Response
1	That PID # 00233551, 15 Prince Albert Road (St. James's Church), Dartmouth be considered for inclusion in the Shubie Canal Cultural District.	The Shubie Canal Cultural District does not exist currently but the area will be considered in the secondary planning strategy review for Downtown Dartmouth.
2	That 233 Portland Street, 32 and 34 Pleasant and 221 Portland be reclassified from Downtown to Established Residential. 221 Portland Street could be split with Established Residential on Pleasant and Downtown on Portland to protect the Five Corners Streetscape.	233 Portland St., 32–34 Pleasant St. are now Established Residential. 221 is a vacant lot and has been left as Downtown.

CDAC Feedback - Site Specific Issues

	Comment	Action / Response
3	That 3, 5, 7, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 26 Newcastle Street as well as 3 Albert Street, Dartmouth be reclassified as Established Residential as opposed to Downtown.	All but 3 Newcastle St. have been redesignated to Established Residential. 3 Newcastle St. is under common ownership with 28–34 Maitland St. and 212 Portland St. to the north, which are all designated as Downtown, and has therefore been kept as Downtown to match.
4	That 1 and 2 Renfrew Street, Dartmouth and 269 Pleasant Street, Dartmouth be considered as part of the Pleasant Street corridor. That further consideration be given to extending the Pleasant Street corridor to the Dartmouth Hospital where employment intensive uses begin.	1–2 Renfrew St. and 269 Pleasant St. are now designated Corridor. 271–277 Pleasant St. are now designated Higher-Order Residential which permits office and other commercial uses along with residential.

CDAC Feedback - Site Specific Issues

	Comment	Action / Response
5	That the Park Avenue Heritage District also include 18 North Street as well 22, 24 and 26 Edward Street, Dartmouth.	The Park Avenue Heritage District does not exist currently but the area will be considered in the secondary planning strategy review for Downtown Dartmouth.
6	That the Five Corners Heritage District include Pleasant Street from Erskine Street to St. George's Lane and Portland Street from Pleasant Street to Old Ferry Road or Portside Lane. Further, that the Five Corners Heritage District also include Albert Street as the section of houses within these areas encapsulates a wide array of historically significant residential architecture.	The Five Corners Heritage District does not exist currently but the area will be considered in the secondary planning strategy review for Downtown Dartmouth.

CDAC Feedback - Site Specific Issues

	Comment	Action / Response
7	That the parkland zoning and usage at Prescott Street and Massachusetts Avenue in Halifax be retained as is.	A parks and open space zone can be retained at this location in Package B.
8	That consideration to a policy that protects residential lots abutting the Agricola and Windsor Street Corridors.	Transition requirements have been drafted in the draft Land Use By-law to increase compatibility. Additionally, Many residential lots included within corridor boundaries are limited in their height and GFAR

CDAC Feedback - Site Specific Issues

	Comment	Action / Response
9	That consideration be given to removing Robie Street from Cherry to Binney Streets, Halifax from the proposed corridor for the area.	The Corridor designation has been retained, in order to permit a wider range of uses, but heights have been reduced to 11 metres (from a more typical 14–20 metres) between Bliss St. and Jubilee Rd.
10	That consideration be given to maintaining the Chebucto Road corridor as a low height commercial corridor.	Heights in the Chebucto Road corridor are proposed to range from 14 – 20 metres. All Package A zones contain a diverse complement of uses with no zones restricted to exclusively commercial uses.

CDAC Feedback - Places of Worship

	Comment	Action / Response
11	That consideration to a policy which regulates the re-development of former places of worship to ensure that building height is consistent with the proposed density and zoning for the area.	<p>Policies and regulations related to internal conversions of places of worship and similar institutional buildings in residential areas will be addressed in Package B given the Institutional use.</p> <p>Registered heritage properties will continue to have access to a development agreement.</p>

CDAC Feedback – Parking Infrastructure

	Comment	Action / Response
12	That further consideration to potential park and ride and parking infrastructure within the Centre Core area.	<p>Policy 99 of the draft MPS for the Regional Centre will phase out park and ride areas, with the intention to replace the service with other transportation initiatives, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ providing high ridership services by expanding mid-day, evening, and weekend service;▪ prioritizing transit service, including Transit Priority Measures, in areas with higher ridership potential (the Centres, Corridors, Higher-Order Residential, and Future Growth Node Designations);▪ improving mobility across the Halifax Harbour;▪ integrating future transit hubs, and terminals with on-site commercial and residential development to make transit more accessible, attractive, comfortable, and easy to use.

CDAC Feedback – Urban Agriculture

	Comment	Action / Response
13	That further consideration be given to the usage of roadside market stalls in community garden sites.	The draft Land Use By-Law for the Regional Centre will allow Urban Farms broadly within the area, with a few zones exclusions.

CDAC Feedback – Floor Area Ratio

	Comment	Action / Response
14	<p>It is the view of the committee that the FAR concept should be more broadly communicated and discussed in future stages of review and consultation, including discussions at CPED and Regional Council. This powerful and important regulation requires more discussion.</p>	<p>A public forum on the GFAR concept was held in on June 1st, 2017. The refinement of GFAR as a density and built form control will be a major focus of Package A public consultations.</p> <p>Staff conducted extensive testing of GFAR based on the initial height framework ranges provided by the Centre Plan document and lot parcels, and tested it with applications. Staff are working with the design and development industry to ensure the regulations will result in the expected building forms.</p>

CDAC Feedback – Key Objectives

	Comment	Action / Response
15	Confirm compliance with objectives in the Centre Plan Document. It is the understanding of the committee that objective 1 is more or less reflected in the Draft Centre Plan.	A compliance check has been conducted and many policies have been cross-referenced.
16	Identify and deal with gaps between the intention of the Regional plan and the Centre Plan Draft.	Staff believe that most gaps have been addressed. Planning documents cannot commit Council to financial expenditures or incentives but the SMPS does provide policy support for such programs.

CDAC Feedback – Expectations

	Comment	Action / Response
17	<p>The Centre Plan document should control expectations. Where complex issues like heritage and affordable housing are addressed... these issues usually require far more than planning changes or by-law adjustment for successful outcomes to be achieved. Centre Plan measures should always be put in the proper context.</p>	<p>Both the introduction and specific preambles set the context for the scope of planning documents and indicate the need to work with other levels of government, community partners, and where appropriate the need for additional studies.</p>

CDAC Feedback – Completeness

	Comment	Action / Response
18	The Centre Plan must include greater definition of development guidelines, including bylaw changes and potential new bylaws.	The draft Plan and By-law provide greater detail and clearer policy statements.
19	The Centre Plan must establish how we intend to administer new applications.	The draft Plan and By-law set out the administration mechanisms for new applications (as-of-right, site plan approval, and development agreements).
20	It is the understanding of the committee that the next draft will contain greater detail and clear policy statements (the shalls and shall-nots) required of a complete plan.	Both the draft Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy and the draft Land Use By-law contain greater detail than was found in the Centre Plan 2017 document.

CDAC Feedback – Regulatory Impact

	Comment	Action / Response
21	<p>The cost to business and the cost to government of administering new regulations related to the centre plan should be estimated in some way. Council should know the rough cost of the plan and its impact on business climate before it can be considered for approval. One option would be to use the “Standard Cost Model” developed by the Office of Regulatory Affairs and now in use across the provincial government.</p>	<p>Given the complexity of the development context such analysis has not been conducted. The impact of setting clear development rights and land use regulations administered through a development permit as opposed to discretionally planning approval is anticipated to be significant.</p>
22	<p>A fiscal analysis that estimates the impact of the centre plan on future municipal revenues should be developed.</p>	<p>This may be considered at a future time.</p>

CDAC Feedback –Regulatory Impact

	Comment	Action / Response
23	HRM's approach to regulation should be consistent with new Provincial Principles on regulation.	The current framework is simplified as well as modernized to reflect to community values and a desire for community outcomes indicated in the Core Principles.
24	The Centre Plan should be fully consistent with the Red Tape Reduction approach established by HRM Council in October.	Staff reviewed the approach and believe the proposed regulations support the Red Tape Reduction initiative.
25	While the Centre Plan provides a conceptual background for moving forward, its full impact cannot be assessed before new land use regulations are developed. In the committee's view, the Plan is not complete until these regulations have been developed and then debated by the committee, developers and the public.	Package "A" includes draft land use regulations (see draft Regional Centre Land Use By-law).

CDAC Feedback – Development Impact

	Comment	Action / Response
26	Clearly articulate how the centre plan will be a substantial improvement on the current approach within the Centre Plan document.	This will be articulated in all communications materials including today's presentation.
27	Provide bylaws changes and additions as part of the plan approval process to allow for the development community to adequately predict chances of project approval and from city staff to adequately anticipate the economic impact of the plan.	Package "A" includes draft land use regulations (see draft Regional Centre Land Use By-law).

CDAC Feedback – Urban Structure: Affordability

	Comment	Action / Response
28	Incorporate the recommendations of the density bonusing plan into the Centre Plan	<p>The recommendations have been incorporated with the following adjustments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Affordable housing units 1 bedroom or greater will be accepted based on feedback from stakeholders that smaller units are required;- One level of affordability has been proposed (40% average HRM market rent reduction) as opposed to two levels to simplify the program and achieve lower rent units;- The minimum affordability period has been set at 15 years, from initial proposal of 25 years. This was changed to achieve a greater number of units

CDAC Feedback – Urban Structure: Affordability

	Comment	Action / Response
29	That the limits of planning alone to effectively manage affordable housing issues be addressed in the plan.	Staff believe this has been addressed.
30	The potential exists for market forces to constrain supply of new apartments given density bonusing restrictions. In this case, a few people may pay less for apartments in new building but the effect on supply may increase prices for everyone else. In other words, the DB policy has the potential to backfire.	The proposed density bonusing program will be a major focus of upcoming public consultations.

CDAC Feedback - Monitoring

	Comment	Action / Response
31	The monitoring of the Centre Plan should take a page from the Halifax Index and state for each indicator.... why it is important.	Agreed. The Monitoring Framework may need to be further refined and possibly aligned with Regional Plan Key Performance Indicators.
32	A yearly monitoring document should be accompanied by an effective narrative to tell the story of Centre Plan progress.	
33	Consider integration of an annual Regional Centre report with the Halifax Index...staff effort and publication, The Jobs & Economic Development Section of Centre Plan should be very complementary in its approach to the economic strategy.	

CDAC Feedback - Monitoring

	Comment	Action / Response
34	Indicators should be benchmarked against other comparable jurisdictions where possible as a measure of Centre Plan Performance.	Agreed. The Monitoring Framework may need to be further refined and possibly aligned with Regional Plan Key Performance Indicators.
35	Indicators should be presented in a time series and not a snapshot to better articulate trends.	
36	HRM should consider undertaking an independent review of Centre Plan progress at appropriate intervals.	
37	The Centre Plan should set targets for each indicator so that the extent of progress can be demonstrated.	
38	The number of indicators should be reduced with a focus on including key and easily measurable indicators.	

CDAC Feedback - Monitoring

	Comment	Action / Response
39	The Monitoring section should be called Monitoring and Reporting... reflecting that is more than just monitoring but also communicating the results.	Agreed. The Monitoring Framework may need to be further refined and possibly aligned with Regional Plan Key Performance Indicators.
40	Review of the plan should start earlier than 5 years out. 5 years will come very quick and really means getting things started on the review after 3.5-4.5 years.	The draft document does not prescribe yearly targets for reviews but reviews can be initiated by Council at any time, including when strategic opportunities or challenges arise.
41	Monitoring should begin in year 1.	

CDAC Feedback – Jobs & Economic Development

	Comment	Action / Response
42	Connection of the Centre plan to the economic strategy must be strengthened.	Clear connection has been established, but we will continue to work with GREA & the Halifax Partnership to attempt to achieve the desired level of connection
43	There needs to be a significant effort in the industry retention and expansion efforts targeting the Regional Centre. This should be addressed in the Centre Plan and is a potential connection to the economic strategy.	Greater permissions for commercial activity, including shared economy and the establishment is part of the proposed regulations as is the establishment of a Commercial Development District. This can be used to retain and attract various industries as part of the Economic Strategy.

CDAC Feedback - Jobs & Economic Development

	Comment	Action / Response
44	Update the Priorities Plan section on page 6 to reflect the current economic strategy.	Priority Plans are referenced in various parts of the Plan, but do not form an official part of the Plan.
45	There should be more language that features ideas of economic clusters...and efforts to retain and enhance these. In this respect, the language around incubators is important and represents an opportunity to add context and language around industry clusters.	Noted.

CDAC Feedback - Vision

	Comment	Action / Response
46	Find a way to frame the vision in a more inspiring way.	A revised wording for Vision has been provided and if accepted by CDAC, community and Council it can be used to amend the Regional Plan when the Plan is presented for adoption.

CDAC Feedback – Future Proofing

	Comment	Action / Response
47	Clarify the current population, the base on which growth is based, and year by year population growth expectations.	Noted and included.
48	Provide an estimate of the population of the regional centre in 2016....to be used as a starting point for the plan.	Updated data included.
49	While the future is difficult to predict, there are trends and developments that should be anticipated and addressed in the plan. This issue could be addressed through a more extensive “futures” section of the Centre Plan. This is an opportunity for leadership.	Preambles speak to Regional Centre as an innovation hub, shared economy, home occupations and work/live units, reduced need for parking, autonomous and automated parking, the future potential of district energy, urban agriculture, climate change, and sea level rise etc.

CDAC Feedback – Future Proofing

	Comment	Action / Response
50	Rework section 1.3.2 “The Regional Centre in 2031” into a more complete over the horizon review.	Noted.
51	Review of the plan should start earlier than 5 years out. The committee would recommend that review should begin in year 1.	Council can initiate a review at any time.
52	Climate change should be a policy consideration in the Draft Centre Plan.	Noted and incorporated in Introduction. The LUB implements Regional Plan policy on coastal and watercourse setbacks, storm surge protection etc.

CDAC Feedback – HRM Culture & Resources

	Comment	Action / Response
53	There should be a more comprehensive accounting of resource requirements....more like a business plan costing. This could occur as part of the Centre Plan or as part of a Centre Plan Implementation Document.	Noted.
54	Connections to other plans and to existing programs should be made clear.	Noted and implemented.

CDAC Feedback - Pedestrian First & Services Standards

	Comment	Action / Response
55	<p>The pedestrian first theme is a powerful differentiator for the plan and is uniquely suited to the Centre Plan. Given the current and likely growing prominence of pedestrian modes of active transportation in the regional centre, this should be featured in the centre plan through specific strategies and best practice as it occurs in other centres potentially including the development of a pedestrian master plan.</p>	<p>CDAC may recommend that a Pedestrian Priority Plan be included as an amendment to the Regional Plan, but the Integrated Mobility Plan (IMP) addresses pedestrian movement.</p> <p>The SMPS Implementation Chapter provides policy support for future investments in streets, streetscapes, maintenance, and other features but can be articulated with more specifics as we approach adoption. However an SMPS cannot commit Regional Council to any capital expenditure.</p>

CDAC Feedback - Pedestrian First & Services Standards

	Comment	Action / Response
56	Service standards need to be addressed by some language in the Centre Plan. This is supported by the Regional Plan's third objective addressing the development of a Centre Plan. P76 <i>"Prepare capital and operating expenditure programs that enhance development within the Regional Centre"</i> .	Planning documents cannot commit Council to financial expenditures or incentives but a central goal of the SMPS is to encourage growth and development within the Regional Centre
57	Look to elements of Halifax's current pedestrian safety strategy to fill out the pedestrian section of the centre plan with more policy detail.	Centre Plan needs to align with but not duplicate directions of other Priority Plans, such as the IMP or pedestrian safety strategy.

CDAC Feedback – Government Coordination

	Comment	Action / Response
58	The Centre Plan should better articulate the approach to coordinating with other levels of government on social and physical infrastructure investment. The Centre Plan should articulate an intergovernmental strategy around this issue.	Noted and incorporated in policy direction on affordable housing and place-based neighbourhood action plans.
59	This should be an identified responsibility in corporate business plans at HRM.	Noted.

CDAC Feedback – CDAC Committee

	Comment	Action / Response
60	A timeline and process be established that allows CDAC to report to CPED as required by the committee mandate. Representatives of CDAC to be part of this presentation.	CDAC Chair presented the Centre Plan Direction to CPED. A similar report may be provided at future milestones.
61	Written recommendations from the CDAC committee should be developed and approved at key times.	Noted and staff agree.

CDAC Feedback – CDAC Committee

	Comment	Action / Response
62	A list of committee members, past and present, should be included in the preamble of the Centre Plan.	The draft Plan includes an Acknowledgement section. This can be expanded in future versions.
63	A signoff letter from the Chair and Vice Chair representing all committee members should be developed for inclusion in the final Centre Plan document.	Noted for further discussion.
64	The Committee should be involved in and present at all presentations to the Community Planning and Economic Development Committee, and Regional Council.	Noted and agreed.

CDAC Feedback – CDAC Committee

	Comment	Action / Response
65	Staff continue to display a high level of preparation for all meetings of CDAC.	Noted.
66	Perspectives of Committee members should continue to be treated with appropriate respect and consideration.	Noted.

CDAC Feedback – Heritage Preservation

	Comment	Action / Response
67	That the limits of planning to effectively manage historic preservation objectives be addressed in the plan. Expectations need to be managed in the document.	Noted.
68	An international best practice analysis of heritage preservation approaches be developed.	This will be part of the Culture and Heritage Priority Plan and future heritage conservation district and cultural landscape studies.
69	Without significant new incentives from each level of government as in the United States and Community Design Advisory Committee other jurisdictions...it is likely that the loss of heritage resources will not be deterred by regulatory policy alone.	Noted. Incentives may be introduced as part of future heritage conservation districts such as Schmidville and Old South Suburb.

CDAC Feedback - Heritage Preservation

	Comment	Action / Response
70	That further consideration be given to ensuring that Registered Heritage properties are appropriately zoned to the envelope of existing surrounding structures and that a similar policy is implemented for the proposed Dartmouth Heritage Districts.	Heights have been reduced on registered heritage properties. Additions and redevelopment of a registered heritage property are to be considered by development agreement under the draft Regional Centre Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy.
71	In our discussion of the Centre Plan, CDAC continues to be concerned that Heritage protection may require more attention. No consensus emerged in CDAC's discussion on heritage in the context of the Centre Plan other than a conviction that it needs more attention and greater investment of financial and human resources than now proposed.	See above. A staff report has been requested by CPED regarding options and financial implications to enhanced support for protection of heritage buildings in HRM, that shall include consultation with the Heritage Advisory Committee as appropriate, and include but not be limited to: tax relief; tax lift; grants , a holding bylaw and other tools.

CDAC Feedback - Harbour

	Comment	Action / Response
72	The Harbour should be a central feature of the Centre Plan not just contextual.	Noted. Implemented through protected surveyed view corridors and use specific Harbour Related Industrial Zoning.
73	Add the requirement of a long-term economic impact analysis to the conversion of harbour industrial lands to other purposes.	Not incorporated at this time but would be part of a plan amendment process that would need to consider objectives of the Plan.
74	Add in language around the vital importance of retaining a working harbour.	Noted and implemented.
75	Link to working harbour provisions of the regional plan.	Noted and implemented.

CDAC Feedback - Corridors

	Comment	Action / Response
76	Rename “corridors” or combine corridors with higher order residential	The Corridor Designation has been maintained. The difference between the COR, HR-2 and HR-1 zones are the greater range of permitted commercial uses.
77	Where streets are narrow and flowing through low to medium density residential neighbourhoods consideration should be given lower density development than “corridors”drop the Chebucto Rd. corridor.	Densities and heights have been adjusted to reflect the local context and lot sizes.
78	Corridors reflect the character of a city in the same way downtowns do. Some consideration should be given to the perseveration of elements with historic significance along corridors and in higher order residential neighbourhoods.	GFAR and heights have been lowered on sites with registered heritage properties.

CDAC Feedback - Corridors

	Comment	Action / Response
79	<p>The Committee expressed a view that Corridors in the Centre Plan were different from the typical definition used in other jurisdictions. Indeed, the committee did not see much difference between Corridors and Higher Order Residential designations within the plan. More importantly, the Committee expressed concerns, as did many in the community that the Chebucto Road Corridor may not lead to an appropriate form of development in that area.</p>	<p>See 76 above.</p>

CDAC Feedback – Uniformity of Heights

	Comment	Action / Response
80	Provide greater clarity on the administration of the plan...particularly heights.	Greater detail is provided in the draft Plan and LUB.
81	Local circumstances should be a consideration in the approval process. Strict height precincts could lead to very unattractive form and considerable uniformity of development over time.	While Max GFAR is included in the Plan, the heights are included in the LUB and can be relaxed as long as maximum GFAR is not exceeded.
82	Building design is far more important to residents of the regional centre than height. The Centre plan should reflect this concern with design in both the plan and its implementation.	The extensive application of site plan approval, which allows for the regulation of the external appearance of structures reflects the importance of design to residents.

CDAC Feedback – Urban Structure

	Comment	Action / Response
83	Modify the language and the definitions of urban structures so that there is greater differentiation.	Completed, along with establishment of land use zones and built form regulations.

CDAC Feedback – Discussion

Engagement to Date

- **7 (out of 10) Weeks** of Storefront Staff Availability
- **274** Storefront Visits
- **18** Hours of Public Open Houses
- **3** Presentations to Community Councils
- **25+** Roadshow Presentations
- **18** Hours of Industry Stakeholder Workshops
- **3** Hours of Community Stakeholder Workshops
- **5K** visits on SYC & **7K** document downloads
- **400+** participants at Open Houses & Workshops
- **1** Week of Community Stakeholder Days
- **8** Full Time Staff Dedicated to the Project

65 Total Days of Engagement Activities Following Plan and By-law Release