



PO Box 1749  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
B3J 3A5

Halifax Regional Council  
November 9, 2004

**TO:** Mayor Kelly and Members of Halifax Regional Council

**SUBMITTED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Joe O'Brien, Chair, Regional Planning Committee

**DATE:** October 12, 2004

**SUBJECT:** Summary Report - Regional Planning Spring Consultation

---

### **Information Report**

#### **ORIGIN**

April 20, 2004 - Regional Council endorsed in principle the Concept Alternatives set forth in a staff report, "Regional Planning Concept Alternatives", dated April 13<sup>th</sup>.

April 20, 2004 - Regional Council approved public consultation program on draft Alternatives.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and project team used the approved Regional Planning goals and objectives to create three alternative land use concepts. On April 20<sup>th</sup> Regional Council endorsed three concept alternatives in principle and a program to consult the public.

During May and June 2004, through a series of open houses, the concept alternatives were used as a basis to stimulate public interest on possible future development patterns for open space, transportation, settlement, economic development and harbour related activities. Through the use of static displays presented in twelve communities across the region, the open houses provided an opportunity for residents to gather information and participate in informal discussion. Participants were free to pick up hard-copy documents on research, talk with the project team, and complete questionnaires on the Alternatives, Halifax Harbour, Open Space, and the draft criteria for evaluating the alternatives.

Later, in August, Regional Planning participated in a Metro Quarterly Survey to augment the findings of the Spring Consultation on a preferred alternative.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Regional Planning process, endorsed by Regional Council in June 2003, outlined the steps where public participation would occur. At each step, the project team in collaboration with the RPC, have developed a detailed information sharing/consultation program to provide opportunities for public input. The opportunities for input thus far, have employed a variety of techniques, ranging from tear-off surveys in Regional Planning newsletters, workbooks, questionnaires, focus groups, stakeholder meetings, informal discussion sessions, open houses, Regional Planning email and a WebSite. Recently, the project office added a series of interactive maps and “frequently asked questions” to its WebSite to aid in providing some of the more detailed information residents and stakeholder groups are seeking. Citizens continue to have access to the project team and the Regional Planning Committee. Numerous resource materials are available at the project office and online.

Beginning with a launch event at Mount Saint Vincent University on May 15, 2004, the concept alternatives were unveiled for public consumption. Over the five weeks which followed, over 700 residents attended public open houses, many engaging in informal discussion around the challenges of determining an approach for managing the region’s future growth. A key tool used in the spring consultation process was a colour illustrated document entitled “Guide to the Alternatives”. Over 14,000 copies of the guide were distributed in the region.

All comments expressed during the open houses were recorded and have been transcribed by members of the staff team. The comments received at each open houses are available on the Regional Planning WebSite, [www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning](http://www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning).

### **Support for the Foundation Strategy**

The three concept alternatives were based on a common foundation strategy. Comprised of a set of policy statements, it provides meaningful progress beyond the status quo.

The spring consultation presented wide support for the foundation strategy. The Regional Planning Committee and project team has taken this to mean we are generally on track towards fulfilling the Regional Planning goals and objectives and will find a solution in one of the alternatives or perhaps a combination or hybrid thereof.

When asked at the last public consultation session, about whether or not elements of the foundation strategy could be revisited, the project team responded they could not because the foundation strategy is a direct product of the Regional Planning Goals and Objectives approved by Regional Council.

The questions about the foundation strategy were raised at the Peninsula Halifax meeting. The challenge presented to the RPC and project team, was whether or not the Capital District should be the regional centre for employment or whether or not greater dispersion of employment would make more sense for the longer term; essentially a more dispersed versus centralized approach to employment.

The success of the Capital District, as a strong economic and cultural centre, is important to the region as a whole. As recent research indicated, growth in the region's main employment sectors of public administration, health, education, finance and insurance, and defence is expected.<sup>1</sup> These sectors are predominantly located in and around the Capital District. Additionally, the success of an effective and efficient transit system, which may include fast ferries and rapid and direct bus service, will depend on a substantial employment population in the Capital District. That being said, preliminary indications in new research also shows continued demand for expansion of business parks such as Burnside, to meet predicted suburban commercial and office growth. This would suggest expansion lands for each of the major business parks should continue to be identified.<sup>2</sup> Regardless of the alternative (or hybrid) selected, the foundation on which the Regional Plan will be based, will recognize the need for a healthy supply of land to meet the market demand for business opportunities and employment growth in the urban, suburban and rural economies. As well, encouraging mixed use centres in suburban and rural communities will create employment nodes to serve the needs of local residents.

It was only at the final public session where limited criticism of the foundation strategy was raised. Overall, there was support for the foundation strategy throughout the consultation process.

#### Presenting the Concept Alternatives for Public Review

The alternatives themselves were a source of much discussion at the open houses as citizens and stakeholder groups sought to better understand the differences between the alternatives, and the implications of the different settlement patterns and transportation links.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gardner Pinfold Consulting Economists Limited, Marinova Consulting Limited and Cantwell & Company Consulting Limited

<sup>2</sup> CBCL Engineering and Cantwell & Company Consulting Limited

The concept alternatives represented a range of options compatible with the Regional Planning Principles, Goal and Objectives. Members of the public attending the open houses were encouraged to comment on each of the alternatives, make suggestions for changes, and/or propose new alternatives meeting the goals and objectives.

The settlement patterns associated with each alternative, created through a hierarchy of community types in both urban and rural settings, were displayed on large maps at the open houses. A visual Power Point show highlighted the main features of each concept and explained how each differed from the other. A series of 3-D drawings helped to illustrate how the concepts might look on the ground, and detailed cost of servicing information demonstrated the varying costs of services based on different forms and densities of development.

Considerable interest was expressed in the possibility of increased levels of municipal services in and around the suburban and rural “centres”. The pattern and form of development within the centre types and the potential for settlement “between” the centres was also of particular interest during consultation. Participants grappled not only with the level of growth necessary, or acceptable, in their communities to make the provision of municipal services viable, but the effects this growth could have in shaping and changing their communities over the longer term.

In addition to visual displays and informal discussion sessions, a series of questionnaires were used during the spring consultation. While the results of the questionnaires are not statistically representative, the responses provide useful feedback on different policy directions that might be implemented to achieve alternative growth patterns. A summary of the results of these questionnaires is included in Attachment “A”. A full listing of comments received through the questionnaires and during discussion sessions at the open houses is available on the Regional Planning WebSite.

#### Halifax Metro Quarterly Survey

Regional Planning commissioned the Halifax Metro Quarterly Survey to design and execute two questions to augment the findings of the Spring Consultation on a preferred alternative. Conducted by telephone from August 3<sup>rd</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup>, the survey sample was drawn from a list of randomly selected households compiled from listed telephone numbers in the Halifax Regional Municipality. The sample was selected to match the geographical distribution of the population within the region and designed to complete interviews with a representative sample of 400 adult residents. A sample of 400 respondents would be expected to provide results accurate to within plus or minus 4.9 percent in 95 out of 100 samples.

‘ Preferred Alternative

Support for elements associated with Alternative A was the strongest, at 46%. This support was strongest in the rural and urban areas. A preference towards either Alternative B or C was evenly split; 24% and 23% respectively.

' Preferred Transit Service Option

Corporate Research Associates also asked respondents to indicate a preference for a transit service option. Overall, 29% preferred Option A - park and ride locations established in only a few major centres in HRM allowing direct, non-stop transit service from these major centres to downtown Halifax; 31% preferred Option B - transit service from a moderate number of regional centres to downtown Halifax, but with stops en route at other communities; and 32% preferred Option C - a mix of direct and non-direct service covering HRM requiring many feeder buses and transfer points among various communities.

46% of HRM residents prefer Alternative A - development in a limited number of areas, preserving rural land and open space, and restricting the location of housing.

(Metro Quarterly Aug. 2004)

' What Conclusions Can be Drawn from the Survey?

As a settlement pattern, there is a clear preference for Alternative A. This is really key in terms of development options. In terms of transit options resulting from the development choices presented in the first question, the public is evenly split across the transit options presented. The clear preference for a particular settlement pattern in concert with no strong public preference for a particular transit option, suggests that in the public's eye, transit options do not preclude the selection of a development model.

The Metro Quarterly survey results add to our body of knowledge around public preference, but it is important to note that on such a complex project as the creation of a regional plan, many issues and options must be considered.

Summary of Feedback from the Spring Open Houses

Public comments were recorded at each open house session in several ways. In addition to voluntarily completing questionnaires, participants were asked to jot down their thoughts on large sheets of paper draped over each display table as they moved about the open house. The written comments were later transcribed from these sheets. Additionally, staff recorded comments and questions voiced during the informal discussion sessions. A synopsis of the comments is presented below.

In reviewing the three alternatives for settlement and the possible location of “centres”, some concern was expressed about the need to be sure the areas selected as centres are truly the areas in which people want to live in the future. Specifically, residents wanted to know what will motivate people to live in the centres, and what will happen to the lands in between the centres. It was stated, consideration must be given to how municipal government and land owners will work together to make the centres truly viable and appealing places to live and work.

Staff responded strategic investment will be one of the motivators for people to live in the centres. As well, past trends indicate to some degree, where people want to settle geographically. By using tools such as urban / neighbourhood design, zoning, central services, transportation links, etc., the regional plan will facilitate the future development pattern. The regional plan is intended to be reviewed every five years, so if location preferences differ over time from the identified centres, a level of flexibility is built in.

There was considerable interest in the clustered septic system approach. Comments ranged from where we could best apply this technology as a means to site development in areas best suited for onsite well and septic, to concern whether this approach can truly achieve the rural character people are seeking when they move to rural areas.

There is strong support for better design of subdivisions and the need to address open space and recreation, habitat and lake protection, and water access as a part of all new development. Rural land owners, however, continue to have concerns about possible changes in regulations which could effect their ability to subdivide or develop inheritance lands, and want to be a part of any land use decisions made in relation to natural resources and rural lands. It was also stressed, the regional plan must be flexible enough to respond to the changes in the marketplace and local economy.

Some of the feedback received, concluded residents are quite happy with aspects of their existing community plans and fear this could get lost in a regional plan. Specifically, they wanted to ensure current community based policies, which are working, can be recognized and carried forward into a regional plan.

Many participants at the open houses gravitated to one alternative over another, and the preferences varied from open house to open house. The next Regional Planning newsletter will address the questions raised at the open houses and staff will continue to work with stakeholder groups to build understanding and awareness.

Overall, residents understood and supported the concept of fewer people and less development in the more environmentally sensitive areas of the region, and the location of new development in areas where the natural environment could best sustain it. It was also understood this could mean certain areas would be completely unsuitable for any development. It was recognized a good base of information is critical on which to make these decisions for the future and prior to any development, an assessment of the environment and transportation capabilities should be necessary.

There were many comments and questions about the issue of density, including what the density of new centres might be, and what ultimate densities would be needed to make the provision of services such as water and sewer and transit feasible. In the more urban areas, in particular the peninsula of Halifax, there were concerns about over-intensification of existing residential areas and the impact on neighbourhoods. Some in the rural and commutershed areas expressed concern about becoming sterile bedroom communities and expressed a desire for local amenities and services to meet daily needs and greater self sufficiency. It was agreed, communities must be products of good design, creativity and innovation. Many areas have vacant properties and brownfield sites which offer opportunities for new development incorporating good design and mixed uses.

Questions were raised about changing demographics and its impact on the level of growth and types of services needed in certain areas. Some, in existing rural centres, expressed interest in seeing more services and recognized more people are needed to sustain these services. Some of the rural centres identified within the alternatives are existing centres, and there is a desire by the local people, to build on what exists there now.

The necessity to meet diverse housing needs was recognized throughout the region whether rural, suburban or urban. Overall, residents expressed a desire to choose where they live and to have the ability to remain in their communities through all stages of life and as their needs for housing and other services change.

In response to the level of growth taking place in the rural commutershed areas in recent years, many residents expressed concern about too much growth, and the threat to things like water quality and open space, should it continue. Areas once viewed as rural are feeling threatened by continuing growth, and quality of life is being impacted by increasing traffic, deforestation, loss of open space, and changes to water supply.

Public comments on transportation generally supported solutions to achieve increased transit use and alternatives to motorized transport including bicycling and walking. At most open houses, citizens stressed the need for more buses, more frequent service and better access to service in outlying areas

of the region. The supporters of alternative non-motorized modes advocated better infrastructure - bike lanes and trails. Safety was of prime concern.

There was considerable interest too in additional ferries and commuter rail as options for the region to consider. Many offered their ideas and opinions on possible routes and locations for terminals, park and ride facilities and schedules. There was no definitive preference for one transit alternative over another; communities were most-often drawn to the one option which best met its own needs. In the urban areas, Option A had the greatest appeal as it offered fast frequent service between the larger residential areas and the urban core, while the less urban communities supported a more dispersed approach with improved service into suburban and commutershed areas. Option C, which provided for transit to rural centres, was the preferred transit model at open houses held in these communities.

While investment in transit would serve to alleviate vehicular pressure on roads, many attending the open houses reiterated the need to continue to upgrade and invest in our existing road network. Some supported ongoing and increased investment in new road corridors and ring roads, although it was recognized a significant increase in the use of transit could relieve congestion and wait times on most major corridors.

Incentives towards increased transit ridership seemed like a good idea to some whose thoughts on the subject included free parking at bus terminals and free or subsidized transit passes. Burnside was mentioned numerous times for improvements to transit services and safety for pedestrians. As one of the region's largest employment centres, many identified Burnside as a huge opportunity for increasing transit use and reducing vehicular traffic.

The feedback on Halifax Harbour supported a mix of land uses, public access to water, public transport, a cleaner harbour, and the protection of coastal habitat, although there were differences of opinion as to what should take priority (i.e. marine industry verses residential). In rural areas, residents were less interested in providing specific comments on Halifax Harbour, but wanted assurances the working harbours, coastal areas, and waterways in rural communities, would receive the attention they deserve in a regional plan. Many cited examples from other regions throughout North America as good resources for helping to determine future opportunities for harbourfront redevelopment, harbour transit, conservation, and public use. *(A comprehensive background/discussion paper is available on Halifax Harbour at [www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning](http://www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning) )*

Overall, citizens recognized the importance of a strong urban centre, not only for the region, but for the province. The need for good urban design was emphasized over and over. Some agreed increased density in the Capital District was a good way to address transportation issues, while those living in existing neighbourhoods were cautious, and in some cases, opposed to increasing densities at all. The

necessity for public open space was identified as a necessary component of any redevelopment in the Capital District. Like Halifax Harbour, the Capital District was not discussed in detail at the open houses outside the urban and suburban areas. In rural areas, some concern was expressed the Capital District was being over-emphasized in the regional planning process.

While many of the comments from the May and June open houses were focused on one or more of the main themes of regional planning, there were many which were more general in nature. Some of the comments heard most often speak to the issue of inter-municipal planning (with Lunenburg, East Hants and Guysborough Counties), the need to ensure broad-based and inclusive community participation in creation of the plan, the need to continue consulting the public throughout the process, the need to promote physical activity as a component of healthy communities, the need to consider “existing residents” in decisions about new development, and the need to continue examining best practices and experiences in other places.

#### What’s Next? - Technical Evaluation of the Alternatives and Recommendation of a Preferred Alternative to Regional Council

With the completion of the spring consultation, a detailed technical evaluation of each of the alternatives began, with consideration of infrastructure and municipal service costs, options for transit modes and technologies, opportunities for environmental and heritage conservation, and land and infrastructure needs for economic activity. The results of this evaluation, combined with quantitative input from the spring consultation, will ultimately lead to the Regional Planning Committee’s recommended approach for growth in the region. It is expected this recommendation will be presented to Regional Council in December 2004.

The evaluation criteria were provided for public information and feedback at the spring open houses. The amended criteria are attached (see Attachment “B”).

#### Information Sharing - “Keeping Citizens and Stakeholders in the Loop”

Ongoing efforts to share information will help to ensure citizens and stakeholder groups remain informed about the evaluation process and the recommendation of a preferred alternative to Regional Council. Using the many stakeholder contacts, a newsletter was distributed in late October to update everyone on progress to date. Members of the project team will continue to meet with stakeholder groups, including committees of Council and Residents’ and Ratepayers’ Associations, and respond to requests for information. The Regional Planning WebSite and media will also be relied upon to communicate information about the evaluation process.

In addition to the aforementioned communication tools and activities, the Regional Planning Committee and project team will use a new Implementation Working Group as a means to provide hands-on involvement to the many sectors - environment, social, health, industry, heritage, natural resources, business - interested in and directly impacted upon by a regional plan. The working group will be directly involved in the review and design of tools (i.e. regulations) needed to implement the policy of the plan and will be expected to work through to solutions to best meet the diverse needs of all sectors.

With Regional Council's endorsement of a preferred alternative at year's end, a series of public information meetings will convene in the New Year to carefully explain the implications of the growth alternative and the policy direction needed to make it happen.

Ultimately, the RPC and project team expect to deliver a regional plan to Council in the Spring of 2005, following which the formal adoption process would begin. This is consistent with the process and time frame approved by Council in June 2003 (see Attachment "C").

### **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS**

This report is provided for information purposes. Any ongoing costs associated with the implementation of the components of the consultation process will be allocated from the resources of the Governance and Strategic Initiatives business unit.

### **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT POLICIES/BUSINESS PLAN**

This report complies with the Municipality's Multi-Year Financial Strategy, the approved Operating, Capital and Reserve budgets, policies and procedures regarding withdrawals from the utilization of Capital and Operating reserves, as well as any relevant legislation.

### **ALTERNATIVES**

This report is provided for information purposes. The report contains no recommendations for Council's consideration.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

**Regional Planning Alternatives**

11

**Regional  
Council  
November 9,  
2004**

---

**Summary of Spring Consultation**

Attachment "A" - Summary of Questionnaires

Attachment "B" - Evaluation Criteria

Attachment "C" - Regional Planning Process Phase II

Additional copies of this report, and information on its status, can be obtained by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 490-4210, or Fax 490-4208.

Report Prepared by: Susan Corser, Planner II, Regional Planning

Report Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Betty MacDonald, Director of Governance and Strategic Initiatives

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Macomber, Project Manager, Regional Planning

**Attachment "A"**  
**Summary of the Questionnaires from May-June Open Houses**

Questionnaire #1: The Preferred Alternative

Citizens completed 145 questionnaires on the alternatives. On the question of overall preference for an alternative, 122 responses were received. As the figure indicates, 47% of respondents indicated an overall preference for Alternative A, while 40% preferred Alternative B. Nine percent preferred Alternative C overall.

***The Overall Preferred Alternative...***

57 (46.7%) preferred **Alternative A**  
47 (38.5%) preferred **Alternative B**  
11 (9.0%) preferred **Alternative C**  
4 (3.3%) preferred **No Preference**

On the question of which alternative they preferred relative to a regional settlement pattern, 48% responded Alternative A; 38% responded B. On the question of which alternative they preferred relative to the provision of services, 46% responded Alternative A; 43% responded B. The preferred alternative for the provision of transit service (43%) was Alternative B, while Alternative A received 34% of responses. Twenty percent of respondents preferred Alternative C for transit service.

Questionnaire #2: Halifax Harbour

Citizens completed 129 questionnaires on Halifax Harbour. A majority (82%) indicated it was important to continue to promote the harbour as a global seaport; 13% indicated it was somewhat important. Less than 5% responded it was not important. On the question of whether we should reserve sufficient land around the harbour for future marine-dependent industries, 50% responded it was important; 37% somewhat important. Several respondents (13.5%) indicated reserving land for this purpose was not important. Citizens were also asked to identify sites appropriate for marine-industrial development. The responses heard most often included Woodside, Fairview Cove, Eastern Passage, Shannon Park, Wright's Cove and Shearwater. A number of respondents indicated marine-industrial development should be accommodated by expanding current industrial sites.

Another activity affecting the harbour which received considerable support, was that of better controlling infilling of the harbour. A majority of respondents (86%) indicated this was important; another 12% indicated it was somewhat important. Less than 2% indicated better control on infilling was not important.

On the question of protecting certain lands around the harbour from being developed, 97 respondents identified many key areas. While some respondents identified more than one key area for protection, the areas identified most often included Bedford Basin, Point Pleasant Park, and the islands within the harbour. Many respondents answered the question more generally to include areas where recreation could take place and all open spaces and habitat on the harbour's edge.

A majority of respondents (68.5%) indicated it was important to define projects to restore or create new plant and animal habitat in/around the harbour. Another 27% indicated it was somewhat important; 5% indicated it was not important.

Eighty percent (80%) indicated it was important to plan for more parks and trails around the harbour; 20% indicated it was somewhat important; less than 1% indicated it was not. When asked about locations for parks and trails, many supported a linked, contiguous trail system along the harbour. Respondents also identified the western area of Bedford Basin, Shannon Park and the North West Arm, among others.

When asked about setting aside certain harbourfront lands for future residential development, 49% responded this was not important; 26% indicated it was somewhat important, while 25% responded it was important. Locations identified for future residential included Downtown Dartmouth, Shannon Park, Downtown Halifax, and Bedford. Others suggested harbour lands already zoned for residential should be optimized for higher density residential.

Planning for more ferry routes and ferry terminals rated important with 63% of respondents and somewhat important with another 30.5%. Only 7% indicated this was not important. Some of the locations identified as appropriate included Bedford (62 of 93 respondents), North West Arm (20 of 93 respondents), Purcell's Cove and Shannon Park.

A final question in the harbour questionnaire asked for other views and suggestions regarding the future of Halifax Harbour. Of the 79 respondents answering this question, 18 indicated sewage treatment should be first on the agenda. Other responses included providing more recreation, preservation/expansion of public access and the need to keep the harbour as a working harbour.

### Questionnaire #3: Natural Resources and Open Space

One hundred and thirty-four (134) resource and open space questionnaires were completed. When asked to indicate the top five priorities for natural resource and environmental protection from the list contained in the questionnaire, respondents most often identified (in descending order) wetlands, old growth forests, significant habitat, large mammal habitat, potential areas for regional parks and outdoor

recreation areas. Beyond the top five, other priorities for protection included agricultural lands, local heritage sites, unprotected trails, archaeological sites, vegetative buffers, heritage corridors, and lighthouses. When asked to list other important natural resource and open space areas, a wide range of responses were received. Specific sites such as the Conrad Beach dunes and Colpitt Lake Barrens, to entire ecosystems such as coastline and beaches were identified as important resources.

Respondents were asked to comment on several specific areas for potential regional parks and open space corridors, including the Birch Cove Lakes, Jacks Lake, Porters Lake, Second Lake, and the Western Commons. Many noted the proximity to the urban areas of HRM as key, and stressed the importance of having large open spaces, natural recreation and wilderness areas close by. Respondents were also asked if there are other locations where new regional parks could be developed. An extensive listing of both urban and rural locations were identified including Morris Lake, Woodens River watershed and the wildlands north of Musquodoboit Harbour.

The open space questionnaire asked for specific comments around open space corridors - areas providing connections from one place to another. When asked what they thought the region's immediate top five priorities should be for corridor protection, respondents indicated 1) protecting Pennant, Herring Cove and the Purcells Cove Backland corridors, 2) maintaining and/or re-establishing links along the Shubenacadie Canal, 3) maintaining links between the Terence Bay Wilderness Area and Long Lake Provincial Park, 4) maintaining the river corridor between Musquodoboit Harbour and Musquodoboit Valley, and 5) maintaining forest links with Lunenburg and West Hants Counties. Numerous comments were provided on the potential open space corridors (go to [www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning](http://www.halifax.ca/regionalplanning)).

#### Questionnaire #4: Evaluating the Alternatives

While a number of open house participants picked up a copy of the draft evaluation criteria, only a few choose to comment in writing. Consistently, participants commented criteria on the environment are essential. Additionally, respondents indicated it was essential to have criteria to measure which alternative best supports integrated transit use. It was also suggested the alternatives be measured against rural sector employment, opportunities for ecotourism, residential land consumption and income spent on housing.

Suggestions for other criteria included minimizing the cost of infrastructure per capita, providing free parking, reducing commuting times, protecting cultural heritage and the character and integrity of existing neighbourhoods, reducing pollution from vehicles, supporting community agriculture, and not precluding or preventing basic development to meet need.

**Attachment “B”**  
**Evaluation Criteria**

Evaluation Criteria <i>DRAFT</i>		Regional Planning Goals
<b>Environment</b>		
4. # of watershed affected > 10%	Low is Best	<b>1.1, 1.2, 1.2.A, 1.2.B, 1.5, 1.5.B</b>
5. Hectares used for natural resource uses.	High is Best	<b>1.2.C, 1.4, 4.7</b>
6. Hectares protected as open space.	High is Best	<b>1.3, 1.3.C, 1.6.C, 1.7.C, 1.8, 1.10</b>
7. Total net residential land (outside of core) consumed in acres	Low is Best	<b>1.3, 1.3.A, 5.2.C</b>
8. Hectares (less than 2ha in size) of wetlands consumed	Low is Best	<b>1.6</b>
6. Hectares designated for riparian buffers.	High is Best	1.6.A, 1.7.C
7. # and type of park land	High is Best	<b>1.8</b>
8. Sq Kms of connected open space. (Not fragmented by Major roads)	High is Best	1.8.F
9. Cost of park land acquisition.	N/A	1.9.D
<b>Economy</b>		
10. Population <u>added</u> within existing service areas.	High is Best	<b>4.2, 4.6</b>
11. Hectares of land allocated for harbour/marine industrial uses.	High is Best	<b>4.4</b>
12. <i>Increased</i> acres designated for mixed use.	High is Best	<b>4.6, 5.6, 5.6.A</b>
13. Cost of new infrastructure per capita.(S&W)	N/A	4.2, 4.2.A
<b>Settlement</b>		
14. es of developable land in a designated centre.(gross)	Low is Best	
15. f future rural development in compact nodes (clustered and small lots & includes commutershed)	High is Best	<b>2.2</b>
16. #of People “in-fill” development in the urban core	High is Best	1.3.B
17. Average units per acre per settlement area (net density)	High is Best	
18. Kms of piped services added.	Low is best	<b>5.2</b>
19. Kms Lanes added.	Low is best	<b>5.2</b>

Evaluation Criteria <i>DRAFT</i>		Regional Planning Goals
20. Kilotonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> generated for travel by residents.	Low is best	<b>5.2, 5.8, 5.8.C, 5.9</b>
21. # of dwelling units <u>added</u> within urban core.	High is best	5.4.B
22. Annual vehicle emissions.	Low is best	<b>5.9</b>
23. Cost of servicing per capita.	N/A	1.1.C, 5.2.B, <b>7.1</b>
<b>Transportation</b>		
24. Estimated reduction in GHG per capita and total.	High is best	<b>6.1, 6.1.A, 6.1.B</b>
25. Average vehicle commute distance to work.	Low is best	<b>6.1</b>
26. Population within 500 metres of public transportation.	High is best	<b>5.3, 5.3.C, 6.6, 6.9.A</b>
27. Population within 1 km of high capacity transit service.	High is best	<b>6.6</b>
28. Vehicle emissions per capita.	Low is Best	<b>1.2, 6.1, 6.1.A</b>
29. High capacity transit ridership.	High is best	<b>6.7</b>
30. Public transportation route kms added.	Low is best	<b>6.8</b>
33. Total transit route kilometres operating in reserved right-of-way.	High is best	<b>6.8</b>
34. Point-to-point travel times.	<b>Low is best</b>	<b>6.1</b>
35. Lane kms of new roads.	Low is best	<b>6.11</b>
36. Kms of road with v/c ratios > 1.0.	Low is best	<b>6.12</b>
37. # of HOV lane kms added.	High is best	<b>6.12</b>
38. Travel costs per capita.	N/A	<b>6.1</b>
39. Transportation cost per capita.	N/A	<b>6.9</b>

**Regional Planning Alternatives**

18

**Summary of Spring Consultation**

**Regional  
Council  
November 9,  
2004**

---

Attachment "C"  
Regional Planning  
Process Phase II  
(Approved June 2003)

Pro  
(ap

