



**West Hants**  
something inspiring awaits

**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**  
**Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC) Agenda**  
**November 14, 2024 – 6:00pm**  
**Sanford Council Chambers and Zoom / YouTube Live**

- 1.0 Call to Order and Attendance**
- 2.0 Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**
- 3.0 Announcements**
- 4.0 Approval of Agenda and Additions**
- 5.0 Declaration of Conflict of Interest**
- 6.0 Approval of Minutes (October 10, 2024)**
- 7.0 New Business**
  - 7.1 Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee Orientation Presentation (Sara Poirier, Kari Fougere)
  - 7.2 File #24-21 Development Agreement: 439 Clifton Avenue, Windsor (Alex Dunphy) - Pg. 3
  - 7.3 What We Heard Report: Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives 1-3 (Will Hong) - Pg. 35
  - 7.4 Heritage Grant Application: 281 King Street, Windsor PID 45056058 (Kari Fougere) - Pg. 155
- 8.0 Business Arising from the Public Information Meetings (November 6, 2024)**
  - 8.1 File 24-22 Development Agreement: 411 King Street, Windsor Phase 2 (Alex Dunphy)
- 9.0 Business Arising from the Minutes (File Updates) - Pg. 164**
  - 9.1 Minas Basin Flood Study Results
  - 9.2 File #24-03 Development Agreement: Bear Lake Wind Farm (Sara Poirier)
  - 9.3 File #24-17 Development Agreement: 1809 Hwy 1, Falmouth (Alex Dunphy)
  - 9.4 File #21-16 Development Agreement: Ellershouse 3 Wind Project (Alex Dunphy)
  - 9.5 File #24-12 Rezoning: 4859 Highway 1, Three Mile Plains (Alex Dunphy)
  - 9.6 File #24-15 Development Agreement: Irven Drive Extension (Sara Poirier)
  - 9.7 File #24-14 Development Agreement: 198 Water St, Windsor (Alex Dunphy)

- 9.8 File #24-10 WHMPS Amendments: Wind Turbine Setbacks (Sara Poirier)
- 9.9 File #24-01 Rezoning: PID 45045879 Willow St, Hantsport (Alex Dunphy)
- 9.10 File #23-04 Development Agreement: PID 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Dr, Windsor (Alex Dunphy)
- 9.11 File #23-33 Development Agreement: PID 45402831 Windsor Back Road, Three Mile Plains (Alex Dunphy)

**10.0 Building and Development Activity Reports (October 2024) - Pg. 168**

**11.0 Notices from Adjacent Municipal Units**

- 11.1 Notice from Kings County - Pg. 169

**12.0 Public Participation Period**

**13.0 Next Meeting Date (December 12, 2024) / Adjournment**



**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT**

Information <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation X	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---	--

**To:** Members of Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC)

**Submitted by:** \_\_\_\_\_  
 Alex Dunphy, Senior Planner

**Date:** November 14, 2024

**Subject:** Development Agreement: 439 Clifton Avenue (PID 45049921), Windsor;  
 File # 24-21

**LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY**

Municipal Government Act Section 230

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the PAC/HAC forward a positive recommendation by passing the following motion:

...that PAC/HAC recommends that Council give First Reading and hold a Public Hearing to consider entering into a development agreement to allow the conversion of the existing single unit dwelling and accessory garage to accommodate up to 8 total dwelling units on PID 45049921 at 439 Clifton Avenue in Windsor, which is substantively the same as the draft set out in Attachment B of the report File #24-21 to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee dated November 14, 2024.

...that PAC/HAC recommends that Council require that the development agreement with Dave and Sarah LeRiche which permits the conversion of the existing single unit dwelling and accessory garage to accommodate up to 8 total dwelling units on PID 45049921 at 439 Clifton Avenue in Windsor be signed within 120 days from the date of final approval by Council or the date that any appeals have been disposed of; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

## BACKGROUND

Property X	Public Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

An application was received from Aastha Patel of Brighter Community Planning on behalf of the owners, Sarah and Dave LeRiche, on August 12, 2024. The application is to allow the conversion of the interior of an existing single unit dwelling and accessory garage to accommodate up to eight (8) residential dwelling units by development agreement. The subject lot is owned by 4542828 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED; Dave and Sarah LaRiche are both Directors of that company.

## DISCUSSION

The subject lot is designated Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) of the Windsor Municipal Planning Strategy (WMPS) (Figure 1). The subject lot is zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1) on Schedule A of the Windsor Land Use By-law (WLUB) (Figure 2). The subject lot is approximately one acre in size and is located on the corner of Clifton Avenue and Alexander Street. The subject lot currently has an existing estate-style, single unit dwelling with a detached garage and large lawn surrounding the existing buildings.

### ***Surrounding Context***

Surrounding properties on the east side of Clifton Avenue and on Alexander Street are designated Residential and zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1), with some properties zoned High Density Residential (R-4) to the north. These properties consist of residential units with a range of density from single unit dwellings to 8-unit apartment buildings. Surrounding properties on the west side of Clifton Avenue are designated Community Use and zoned Open Space (OS). These properties make up the Clifton Museum Park.

### ***Windsor Land Use By-law***

Section 6.0 of the WLUB, *Development Agreements*, states that: *The following developments may be considered only by development agreement in accordance with the Municipal Government Act and the Municipal Planning Strategy:*

*(b) multiple unit residential development consisting of three or more units in a Residential designation in accordance with Policy 5.4.6 of the Municipal Planning Strategy;*

### ***Development Agreement***

A development agreement is a contract between an owner of land and the Municipality to allow Council to consider a use that is not a listed permitted use within a zone on a specific lot. The ability for Council to consider a development agreement must be stated in the Land Use By-law and the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) must identify the kinds of uses Council may

consider in each area. Uses which Council may consider are those which Council has determined may have sufficient impact on an area that a negotiated process is required to ensure the potential impact is minimized. A proposal being considered must be measured against only the specific and general criteria for the proposal in the MPS and not any other criteria.

### ***Municipal Planning Strategy Review***

Policy 5.4.6 of the WMPS is the primary enabling policy to be considered for this application. This policy provides Council with the ability to consider conversion of existing buildings to three or more units in the Residential designation by development agreement. The full list of criteria is included within this report in Attachment A. In summary, the proposal meets the criteria since:

- the proposal will not change the built form and the existing buildings meet the current zone setback requirements;
- the proposal is considered compatible with adjacent land uses;
- the Development Officer, Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services, and Municipal Traffic Authority have no concerns which have not otherwise been addressed in this report.

Policy 16.3.1 of the WMPS establishes the general criteria that must be considered for all development agreements applications. The full list of criteria is included with this report in Attachment A. In summary, the proposal meets the criteria as:


- the proposal is not considered premature or inappropriate for the area;
- no municipal costs related to the proposal are anticipated; and
- the Fire Chief, Development Officer, Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services, Public Works Engineering Division, and Municipal Traffic Authority have no concerns which have not been addressed in this report.

### **MUNICIPAL CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN**

The subject lot is not identified in the Municipal Climate Change Action Plan (MCCAP) for Windsor (2014) as being affected on either the Inland Flooding Map or the Sea Level Rise Modeling Map.

### **NEXT STEPS**

As noted above, the draft development agreement is consistent with the intent, objectives, policies and criteria of the WMPS. As a result, it is reasonable to consider permitting the conversion of the existing single unit dwelling to accommodate up to 8 dwelling units at 439 Clifton Avenue (PID 45049921) in Windsor by development agreement.



\*anticipated dates; final dates set by Council

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications to the Municipality or residents with regard to the filing of this report.

**ALTERNATIVES**

In response to this application, PAC/HAC may recommend that Council:

- hold First Reading and authorize a Public Hearing to approve the development agreement as drafted or as specifically revised by direction of PAC/HAC;
- hold First Reading and authorize a Public Hearing to refuse the development agreement as drafted, citing the criteria that PAC/HAC consider not to be met; or
- provide alternative direction such as requesting further information on a specific topic.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Figure 1	Windsor GFLUM Extract
Figure 2	Windsor Zoning Map Extract
Attachment A	Policy Summary for Development Agreement
Attachment B	Draft Development Agreement
Attachment C	Public Information Meeting Notes

Report Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Alex Dunphy, Senior Planner

Report Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Kari Fougere, Manager of Planning


Report Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development

Figure 1 – Windsor GFLUM Extract



Figure 2 – Windsor Zoning Map Extract



**Attachment A – Policy Summary for Development Agreement**

<p><b>Policy 5.4.6</b> <i>It shall be the policy of Council to consider entering into a development agreement to allow, in the Residential designation, new multiple unit residential development consisting of three or more units, grouped dwellings, boarding houses and residential care facilities, as well as the conversion of existing buildings to three or more units, subject to the following:</i></p>	
<p><i>(a) the proposed use meets one of the following:</i></p>	
<p><i>(i) in the case of a new building or the conversion of an existing non-residential building, that the development is generally consistent with the High Density Residential (R-4) zone standards; or</i></p>	<p>Not applicable as the proposed development includes the conversion of an existing residential dwelling and accessory building.</p>
<p><i>(ii) in the case of a conversion of an existing residential building, that any addition or enlargement to the building meets the setback requirements of the zone in which it is located, or that any undersized setbacks are not further reduced by the addition or enlargement;</i></p>	<p>The existing single unit dwelling and accessory building meet all setback requirements for the Single Unit Residential (R-1) zone. The proposed development does not include any additions or extensions to the exterior of the existing building. Any additions or extensions to meet Building and Fire Code requirements for the conversion of the existing single unit dwelling to allow up to 7 dwelling units would be required to meet the lot requirements of the underlying Single Unit Residential (R-1) zone, as described in the draft development agreement.</p>
<p><i>(b) the height, bulk, lot coverage and appearance of any building is compatible with adjacent land uses;</i></p>	<p>The proposed development does not alter the exterior of the existing building. The existing building is considered compatible with the adjacent land uses as it is large residential dwelling situated on the boundary of a low density residential neighbour hood and several higher density residential buildings. Any potential extensions to the exterior due to Fire or Building Code requirements will be required to meet the Residential</p>

	<p>Single Unit (R-1) zone setbacks and maximum building heights.</p> <p>The Development Officer commented that they had no concerns regarding the built form of the proposed development.</p>
<p><i>(c) the development is considered compatible with the residential character of the area with respect to traffic generation and population density;</i></p>	<p>Lots immediately abutting the subject lot to the north have multi-unit buildings consisting of both 4- and 8-unit buildings. The addition of 7 more units to the existing buildings on the subject lot provides a smooth transition between the higher density units to the north and the lower density units to the south. Staff consider the proposal to be of a compatible density to the surrounding residential area.</p> <p>The Municipal Traffic Authority commented that there are other multi-unit structures with similar characteristics to the proposed development in the area and that they have no concerns regarding traffic generation of the proposed development.</p>
<p><i>(d) consideration is given to the provision of fences and/or landscaping as part of the residential development to minimize effects on adjacent land uses;</i></p>	<p>The draft development agreement outlines the requirement to screen the outdoor parking from adjacent properties. The existing tree line, foliage, and berms serve to buffer the parking areas from adjacent uses.</p>
<p><i>(e) adequate on-site parking is provided and parking areas are well designed;</i></p>	<p>The draft development agreement only requires 1 parking space per dwelling unit. A total of 12 parking spaces are provided within the site plan for the proposal, this is more parking than other similar development agreements for residential uses in Windsor. The Development Officer commented that the proposed parking is considered adequate for the development.</p>

<p><i>(f) there is adequate on-site recreational open space suitable in extent and design to the nature of the development; for conversion of existing buildings, nearby public parks may be deemed sufficient;</i></p>	<p>As the proposal is a conversion, the Clifton Museum Park is on the west side of Clifton Avenue, would provide suitable recreational space for the proposal. In addition, the Development Officer commented that the subject lot is large enough to accommodate all the estimated required recreational space of 2000 sq. ft. for the proposal on site.</p>
<p><i>(g) the development abuts an arterial or collector street as shown on the Transportation Map (Map 2), if the development consists of 12 or more units;</i></p>	<p>Not applicable, as the proposal consists of the conversion of the existing single unit dwelling and accessory building to allow up to 8 total dwelling units.</p>
<p><i>(h) the architectural design of the development is reasonably consistent with the provisions of the Architectural Design Manual if the proposed development is located in an Architectural Control District;</i></p>	<p>Not applicable, as the subject lot is not within an Architectural Control District.</p>
<p><i>(i) in the case of the conversion of an existing structure, renovations can be made to ensure the safety of residents in case of fire;</i></p>	<p>The Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services commented that fire safety measures could be achieved for the proposed development. They performed a site visit with the owner and informed them of all the requirements for fire separations and exits. These fire safety requirements would be addressed during the building permit process.</p>
<p><i>(j) any other matter which may be addressed in a development agreement; and</i></p>	<p>All relevant matters have been addressed in this report.</p>
<p><i>(k) the provisions of Policy 16.3.1 of the Municipal Planning Strategy.</i></p>	<p>See below.</p>

<p><b>Policy 16.3.1</b>  <i>In considering development agreements and amendments to the Town of Windsor Land Use By-law, in addition to the criteria set out in various policies of this Strategy, Council shall consider:</i></p>
<p><i>(a) whether the proposal is considered premature or inappropriate in terms of:</i></p>

<i>(i) the adequacy of sewer and water services;</i>	The Public Works Engineering Division commented that the subject lot has access to Municipal services and there are no concerns regarding capacity for the proposal.
<i>(ii) the adequacy of school facilities;</i>	The Director of Operations for the Annapolis Valley Regional Centre for Education has stated that they will accommodate all students.
<i>(iii) the adequacy of fire protection;</i>	The local Fire Chief and the Manager of Building and Fire Inspection Services both commented that they had no concerns regarding fire protections for the proposed development.
<i>(iv) the adequacy of road networks adjacent to, or leading to the development; and</i>	The Traffic Authority has no concerns regarding the road networks adjacent or leading to the proposed development.
<i>(v) the financial capacity of the Town to absorb any costs relating to the development.</i>	There are no anticipated costs to the Municipality regarding the proposed development.
<i>(b) the suitability with any aspect relative to the movement of auto, rail and pedestrian traffic;</i>	The Traffic Authority has no concerns regarding the movement of automobiles to the subject lot. There is an existing sidewalk on Alexander Street and Clifton Avenue has a large shoulder on the side of the road for pedestrian traffic. There is no active rail line in the vicinity.
<i>(c) the adequacy of the dimensions and shape of the lot for the intended use;</i>	The Development Officer commented that the subject lot is suitable in terms of dimension and shape for this proposal. As the 8 residential units are proposed to be contained entirely within the existing structures on the lot and there is adequate space for both parking and recreation, staff would

	consider the subject lot adequate in dimension and shape.
<i>(d) the pattern of development which the proposal might create;</i>	The proposal does not significantly change the existing pattern of development as the proposal is a conversion and the existing buildings are a large, estate-style house and detached garage, which appears sufficient to accommodate the requested number of units. In addition to this, there are a number of multi unit residential structures on the abutting lots to the north of the subject lot. The Development Officer has no concerns regarding the pattern of development that the proposal may create.
<i>(e) the suitability of the area in terms of steepness of grade, soil and geological conditions, location of water courses, wetlands, and susceptibility of flooding;</i>	The subject lot is not located within the Dykeland Overlay or the Environmental Constraints Overlay. The lot appears elevated from Clifton Avenue, with no visible watercourse present.
<i>(f) whether the proposal meets the requirements of the appropriate provincial or federal agencies as well as whether it conforms to all other relevant municipal by-laws and regulations; and</i>	All Municipal, Provincial, and Federal regulations will have to be met.
<i>(g) any other matter required by relevant policies of this Strategy.</i>	All relevant matters have been addressed in this report.

**Attachment B – Draft Development Agreement**



West Hants

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

**THIS AGREEMENT** made this                    day of                    , 2024.

**BETWEEN:**

**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**, a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, having its chief place of business at 76 Morison Drive, Wentworth Creek, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Municipality”)

OF THE FIRST PART

- and -

**4542828 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**, a body corporate with a head office at 602 Sangster Bridge Road, Upper Falmouth, in the County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia,

(Hereinafter referred to as the “Owner”)

OF THE SECOND PART

**WHEREAS** the Owner is the registered owner of the parcel of land located at PID 45049921 at 439 Clifton Avenue in Windsor hereinafter referred to as the “Property”, which lands are more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto; and

**WHEREAS** the Property is designated Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map of the Municipal Planning Strategy and zoned Single Unit Residential (R-1) on the Zoning Map of the Land Use By-law; and

**WHEREAS** the Owner has requested that the Municipality enter into a development agreement to convert the existing residential building and accessory garage to allow up to 8 dwelling units on the Property (the “Development”); and

**WHEREAS** Policy 5.4.6 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Section 6.1 (b) of the Land Use By-law enables Council to consider conversions of existing buildings to three or more units by development agreement; and

**WHEREAS** the Council of the Municipality, at a meeting held on **MONTH DAY, YEAR**, approved this request and adopted this Agreement by policy, subject to the execution of this development agreement by the parties hereto and the other conditions herein;

**NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH** that in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

## **PART 1 AGREEMENT CONTEXT**

### **1.1 Definitions**

In this Agreement, all words or phrases used shall carry their customary meaning unless otherwise set out in the Land Use By-law.

### **1.2 Schedules**

The following attached schedules shall form part of this Agreement:

Schedule A - Legal Description

Schedule B - Site Plan

### **1.3 Municipal Planning Strategy, Land Use By-law and Subdivision By-law**

- (a) Municipal Planning Strategy means the Windsor Municipal Planning Strategy, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (b) Land Use By-law means the Windsor Land Use By-law, effective on September 21, 2005, as amended, or successor by-laws;
- (c) Subdivision By-law means the Windsor Subdivision By-law, effective on March 21, 2012, as amended, or successor by-laws.

## **PART 2 DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

### **2.1 Use**

The Parties agree that uses on the Properties shall be limited to the following:

- (a) those uses permitted by the underlying zoning in the Land Use By-law;
- (b) up to seven (7) dwelling units within the existing residential building on the Property; and
- (c) one (1) dwelling unit within the existing accessory garage.

Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the provisions of the Land Use By-law and the Subdivision By-law apply to any development undertaken pursuant to this Agreement.

## **2.2 Development Location and Design**

- (a) The Development location and design shall be consistent with the Site Plan shown in Schedule B.
- (b) The Development Officer may approve in writing minor changes to aspects of the Site Plan.
- (c) Accessory buildings are permitted in accordance with Section 5.1 of the Land Use By-law, Accessory Buildings and Structures.
- (d) The Owner shall keep all undeveloped areas of the Property landscaped which may include grass, shrubs, trees or other appropriate vegetative cover.
- (e) Any addition or enlargement of the existing buildings in the Development must meet the setback requirements of the underlying zone.

## **2.3 Access and Egress**

- (a) The Owner shall maintain the driveway in the Development in general conformance with the driveway shown on Schedule B.
- (b) Pedestrian access from Alexander Street to all building entrances must be provided.

## **2.4 Parking**

- (a) All parking spaces shall be located on the Property and shall be buffered in accordance with Section 2.5, *Buffering*.
- (b) A minimum of one parking space per dwelling unit shall be provided for the Development.
- (c) Outside parking aisles and spaces shall be constructed to create a stable surface for vehicle traffic and be clearly demarcated and lined by the Owner. They may be constructed using permeable construction materials to assist with stormwater retention.

- (d) Each parking space shall be a minimum of 9 ft. by 20 ft. (2.7 m. by 6.1 m.) exclusive of driveways and manoeuvring aisles. Parking aisles shall be a minimum of 20 ft. (6.1 m.) wide.
- (e) The number of parking spaces may be varied by the Development Officer.

## **2.5 Buffering**

Outdoor parking shall be screened from abutting properties, through the use of:

- (a) a mix of local species of coniferous trees. At planting, each tree shall have a diameter of at least 2 in. measured at 4.5 ft. above the surrounding grade and a minimum height of 5 ft.; or
- (b) a hedge of a variety of coniferous shrubs each of which will reach over 6 ft. in height at maturity; or
- (c) a wall or an opaque fence which is a minimum of 5 ft. in height and of sufficient height to provide a visual buffer to the abutting property; or

any combination of the above, all arranged to form a dense or opaque screen, and maintained for as long as the buffer is required.

## **2.6 Signs and Lighting**

Signage and illumination shall be regulated under Sections 5.18 and 7.0 of the Land Use By-law, *Illumination* and *Signs*, which controls lighting, size, location, and number of signs. Exterior lighting for driveways, parking areas, signs or structures shall be shielded and directed downward to ensure there is no light spilling, glare or light cast over neighbouring properties or the street.

## **2.7 Maintenance**

- (a) The Owner shall keep the Property and building and any portion thereof clean and in good repair. Any driveways, fences, lawns, trees, shrubs, walkways and other landscaping elements shall be regularly maintained and kept in a tidy state and free from unkempt materials or matter of any kind.
- (b) The Owner shall maintain the driveway to a level adequate to allow for access by emergency services vehicles.

## **2.8 Servicing**

### **(a) Waste Collection**

- (i) Municipal garbage collection will be provided to the Development from Alexander Street.

**(b) Water and Sewer Services**

- (i) The building shall be serviced with water and sewer services provided by West Hants Regional Municipality and authorized by the Municipal Engineer. Detailed design plans of the water and sewer servicing connections and layout shall be in accordance with the Municipal Services Specifications Manual and shall be submitted to the Municipal Engineer for approval prior to construction.
- (ii) The Owner shall be responsible for constructing, installing and maintaining the water and sewer services on the Property.

**(c) Snow Plowing**

The Owner shall have sole responsibility for snow plowing within the Development.

**2.9 Fire Safety**

All access routes shall be kept clear of overhead obstructions and wires and be maintained by the Owner to allow unimpeded access to the Property by emergency services vehicles, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Fire Chief.

**2.10 Subdivision**

Subdivision of the Property shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable Subdivision By-law.

**PART 3 CHANGES and DISCHARGE**

**3.1** The Owner shall not vary or change the use of the Property from that provided for in Section 2.1 of this Agreement, *Use*, unless a new agreement is entered into with the Municipality or this Agreement is amended.

**3.2** Any matters in this Agreement which are not specified in Subsection 3.3 below are not substantive matters and may be approved in writing by the Development Officer without a public hearing, in accordance with Section 230 of the *Municipal Government Act*, provided that the Development Officer determines that the changes do not significantly alter the intended effect of this Agreement.

**3.3** The following matter is a substantive matter:

- (a) the uses permitted on the Property as listed in Section 2.1, *Use*.

- 3.4** Notwithstanding the foregoing, discharge of this Agreement is not a substantive matter, and this Agreement may be discharged by the Chief Administrative Officer in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act*.
- 3.5** Notice of Intent to Discharge this Agreement may be given by the Municipality to the Owner following a resolution of Council to give such Notice:
- (a) as provided for in Section 4.1, *Commencement of Development*, of this Agreement; or
  - (b) at the discretion of the Municipality, with or without the concurrence of the Owner, where the Development has, in the reasonable opinion of Council on advice from the Development Officer, ceased operation for a period of at least twenty-four (24) months; or
  - (c) at any time upon the written request of the Owner, provided the use of the Properties is in accordance with the Land Use By-law or a new Agreement has been entered into.
- 3.6** Council may discharge this Agreement 30 days after a Notice of Intent to Discharge has been given.

#### **PART 4 IMPLEMENTATION**

##### **4.1 Commencement of Development**

- (a) The Owner may not commence any construction or use on the Property until the Municipality has issued any development permit, building permit and/or occupancy permit that may be required. The date of commencement will be determined as the date the Owner begins Active Construction on the building within this Agreement as permitted by an issued development and building permit.
- (b) Active Construction shall commence not later than forty-eight (48) months from the date this Agreement is signed. If, in the opinion of the Development Officer, this time limit has not been met, this Agreement may be discharged at the option of the Municipality by resolution of Council in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act* 30 days after giving Notice of Intent to Discharge to the Owner. Upon the written request of the Owner, the Municipality, by resolution of Council, may grant an extension to the date of commencement of Development without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

- (c) If the Owner is bona fide delayed from commencing the Development for reasons which are beyond the Owner's control, the determination of which shall be at the sole discretion of the Development Officer, then performance by the Owner is excused for the period of the delay and the time period for the Owner to perform their obligations shall be extended by the Development Officer in writing for an equivalent period, without such an extension being deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement.

#### **4.2 Material to be Provided**

- (a) The Owner shall provide record drawings to the Development Officer for any portion of the development for which an engineered design is required, within ten (10) days of completion of any work which requires the engineered design.
- (b) The Owner shall, upon written request, provide the Municipality with copies of any documentation, permits or approvals required by Provincial or Federal governments or agencies.

### **PART 5 ADMINISTRATION and COMPLIANCE**

#### **5.1 Compliance with Other Bylaws and Regulations**

- (a) Nothing in this Agreement shall exempt the Owner from complying with Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws, by-laws and regulations in force or from obtaining any Federal, Provincial, or Municipal license, permission, permit, authority, or approval required thereunder.
- (b) Where the provisions of this Agreement conflict with those of any by-law of the Municipality applicable to the Property (other than the Land Use By-law to the extent varied by this Agreement) or any statute or regulation, the higher or more stringent requirements shall prevail.

#### **5.2 Severability of Provisions**

The provisions of this Agreement are severable from one another and the invalidity or unenforceability of one provision shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision.

#### **5.3 Interpretation**

- (a) Where the context requires, the singular shall include the plural and the neutral gender shall include the masculine and feminine.
- (b) Where the written text of this Agreement conflicts with information provided in the Schedules attached to this Agreement, the written text of this Agreement shall prevail.

- (c) References to particular sections of statutes and bylaws shall be deemed to be references to any successor legislation and bylaws even if the content has been amended, unless the context otherwise requires.

#### **5.4 Municipal Responsibility**

- (a) The Municipality does not make any representations to the Owner about the suitability of the Property for the development proposed by this Agreement. The Owner assumes all risks and must ensure that any proposed development complies with this Agreement and all other laws pertaining to the Development.
- (b) Any failure of the Municipality to insist upon a strict performance of any requirements or conditions contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any rights or remedies that the Municipality may have and shall not be deemed a waiver of any subsequent breach or default in the conditions or requirements contained in this Agreement.

#### **5.5 Breach of Terms or Conditions**

Upon breach of any term or condition of this Agreement, the Municipality may notify the Owner in writing. In the event that the Owner has not cured any such breach or entered into arrangements with the Municipality related to such breach to the Municipality's satisfaction, acting reasonably, within six (6) months of such notice then the Municipality may rely upon the remedies contained in Section 264 of the *Municipal Government Act* and may enter the land and perform any of the terms contained in the Development Agreement, or take such remedial action as is considered necessary to correct a breach of the Agreement, including the removal or destruction of anything that contravenes the terms of the Agreement and including decommissioning the site. It is agreed that all reasonable expenses, whether arising out of the entry on the land or from the performance of the terms, are a first lien on the land that is the subject of the Development Agreement.

#### **5.6 Costs**

The Owner shall pay all costs associated with registering this Agreement and all costs associated with any amendment thereof.

#### **5.7 Development Agreement Bound to Land**

This Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto and their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns, and shall run with the land which is the subject of this Agreement until such time as it is discharged by the Municipality in accordance with Section 229 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

## **5.8 Assignment of Agreement**

The Owner may, at any time and from time to time, transfer or assign this Agreement and its rights hereunder and may delegate its obligations hereunder to an assign, successor, heir, or purchaser of the land bound by this Agreement.

## **5.9 Written Notice**

- (a) The Municipality may serve notice on the Owner personally or by ordinary mail which shall be deemed to have been received within three (3) business days of mailing, addressed to 4542828 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED, 602 Sangster Bridge Road, Upper Falmouth, Nova Scotia, B0P 1P0, or at any other address provided by the Owner in writing.
- (b) The Owner may serve notice on the Municipality by registered mail addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer, West Hants Regional Municipality, 76 Morison Drive, P.O. Box 3000, Windsor, NS, B0N 2T0, or at any successor address provided by the Municipality to the Owner in writing.

## **5.10 Full Agreement**

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and contract entered into by the Municipality and the Owner. No other agreement or representation, oral or written, shall be binding.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF** this Agreement was properly executed by the respective parties hereto on the day and year first above written.

**SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED**

In the presence of:

) **WEST HANTS REGIONAL**

) **MUNICIPALITY**

)

)

)

Per: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness

) Abraham Zebian, Mayor

)

)

) Per: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness

) Deanna Snair, Municipal Clerk

)

)

) **4542828 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**

)

)

Per: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness

) David LeRiche, President

)

)

Per: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness

) Sarah LeRiche, Director



**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA  
COUNTY OF HANTS**

**ON THIS**            day of            , A.D. 202\_ , before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared            , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that **THE WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**, one of the parties thereto, caused the same to be executed in its name and on its behalf and its corporate seal to be thereunto affixed in            presence.

---

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

**PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA  
COUNTY OF HANTS**

**ON THIS**            day of            , A.D. 202\_ , before me, the subscriber, personally came and appeared            , a subscribing witness to the foregoing Indenture, who, having been by me duly sworn, made oath and said that, **David LeRiche**, one of the parties thereto, signed, sealed and delivered the same in            presence.

---

A Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia

**AFFIDAVIT OF CLERK**

**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**

I, Deanna Snair of \_\_\_\_\_, Hants County, Nova Scotia make oath and swear that:

1. I am the Clerk of the West Hants Regional Municipality (the “Municipality”) and I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. The Municipality is a body corporate pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended.
3. I acknowledge that the Municipality executed the attached Instrument by its proper designates duly authorized in that regard under seal on the date of this Affidavit pursuant to subsection 13(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*, S.N.S. 1988, c.18, as amended. This acknowledgement is made pursuant to subsection 31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 and/or clause 79(1)(a) of the Land Registry Act, S.N.S. 2001, c.6, as amended, for the purpose of registering or recording the Instrument.
4. The Municipality is resident in Canada for the purposes of the Income Tax Act (Canada).

I certify that on this \_\_\_\_\_, 202\_ the Municipal Clerk, Deanna Snair came before me, made oath, and swore the foregoing affidavit at \_\_\_\_\_, Nova Scotia.

\_\_\_\_\_  
A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA  
Print name/affix seal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deanna Snair, Clerk

Canada  
Province of Nova Scotia

**AFFIDAVIT & PROOF OF EXECUTION (CORPORATE)**

I, David LeRiche, Nova Scotia, make oath and say that:

1. I, David LeRiche of **4542828 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**, the “Corporation”. Except as otherwise stated I have personal knowledge of the matters to which I have sworn in this Affidavit.
2. I acknowledge that I executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of the Corporation on the date of this affidavit; this acknowledgment is made for the purpose of registering such instrument pursuant to s.31(a) of the Registry Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.392 or ss.79 and 83 of the Land Registration Act as the case may be.
3. I verify that I have the authority to execute the foregoing instrument on behalf of the corporation and thereby bind the Corporation.
4. The Corporation is a resident of Canada under the Income Tax Act (Canada).
5. The ownership of a share or an interest in a share of the Corporation does not entitle the owner of such share or interest in such share to occupy a dwelling owned by the Corporation.

I certify that on this \_\_\_\_\_, 202\_  
the Deponents came before me, made oath,  
and swore the foregoing affidavit at  
\_\_\_\_\_, Nova Scotia.

\_\_\_\_\_  
A BARRISTER/COMMISSIONER OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

\_\_\_\_\_  
David LeRiche, President

**Schedule A**  
**Legal Description – PID 45049921**

All that lot of land conveyed by Ralph Churchill et al to John Hebb by deed dated the 22nd day of March, A.D., 1975, recorded at the Registry of Deeds at Windsor, NS in Book 352, page 361, and therein described as follows:

All that lot of land and premises situate on the East side of Clifton Avenue, in the Town of Windsor, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia, bounded and described as follows:


BEGINNING at the Northeast corner of the junction of Clifton Avenue and Churchill Street and from thence to run along Churchill Street 258' more or less to lands now or formerly owned and occupied by Lewis McCoy;

THENCE at right angles in a Northerly direction 210' more or less along lands now or formerly owned and occupied by Lewis McCoy to lands now or formerly owned and occupied by the Town of Windsor;

THENCE at right angles 265' more or less along lands now or formerly owned and occupied by the Town of Windsor to Clifton Avenue;

THENCE 214' more or less along Clifton Avenue to the place of beginning.

**Schedule B  
Site Plan**



EXISTING SITE DESCRIPTION	
No changes	
439 Clifton Avenue, Windsor, NS	
PID: 4504921	
ZONE (R-1)	EXISTING
LOT SIZE	56,801 sq' (5,277 m <sup>2</sup> )
BUILDINGS FOOTPRINTS	3,486 sq' (322m <sup>2</sup> )
GREEN AREA	75.7% of SITE 45,272 sq' (4,206m <sup>2</sup> )
COMMON AREAS - RECREATION SPACE OUTDOOR	11,840 sq' (1,100m <sup>2</sup> )
HARD SURFACES	8,062 sq' (748 m <sup>2</sup> )
BUILDING HEIGHT	2.5 Storeys 37'
CAR PARKING - EXTERIOR	11 SPACES + 1 ACCESSIBLE

EXISTING SETBACKS	
FRONT YARD SET BACK	100' (31.5M)
REAR YARD SET BACK	7'9" (24.2M)
SIDE YARD - NORTH	93.5' (28.5M)
SIDE YARD - SOUTH	24' (7.3M)

BUILDING AREA		
FLOOR	FLOOR AREA sq'	FLOOR AREA m sq
BASEMENT	2,401 sq'	223 m <sup>2</sup>
LEVEL 100	2,525 sq'	235 m <sup>2</sup>
LEVEL 200	2,406 sq'	224 m <sup>2</sup>
LEVEL 300 (ROOF)	1,068 sq'	99 m <sup>2</sup>
TOTAL	8,399 sq'	781 m <sup>2</sup>



SITE PLAN  
SCALE = 1:300

439 Clifton Avenue  
Windsor, NS  
Development Agreement  
Proposal

**MoDE**  
Architecture Inc.  
mosica@modearchitects.ca  
902 223 7322

3 Issued for DA AUG 6, 2024  
Revisions / Issues:

LERICHE DEVELOPMENT

PRE DESIGN

SITE PLAN  
Scale: 1/5" = 1'-0"

**Attachment C – Public Information Meeting Notes**

**September 4 – 18, 2024**

**Development Agreement: 439 Clifton Avenue (PID 45049921), Windsor; File # 24-21**

<p><b>Meeting date and time</b></p>	<p>A Public Information Meeting was held on September 4, 2024, beginning at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was broadcast live on the Municipal Facebook page.</p>
<p><b>Attending</b></p>	<p>In attendance for the meeting:</p> <p>One (1) Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Ivey</li> </ul> <p>Three (3) members of staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Assistant Lake</li> <li>• Director Poirier</li> <li>• CAO Phillips</li> </ul> <p>One (1) member of Planning Advisory Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul Beazley</li> </ul> <p>Four (4) representatives of the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aastha Patel</li> <li>• Sarah LeRiche</li> <li>• Dave LeRiche</li> <li>• Suzanne LeRiche</li> </ul> <p>One member of the public attending the meeting.</p>
<p><b>Applicants</b> Aastha Patel of Brighter Community Planning and Consulting on behalf of Sarah LeRiche and Dave LeRiche</p> <p><b>Property</b> 439 Clifton Avenue, Windsor (PID 45049921)</p>	<p>Director Poirier outlined the request for a development agreement to convert the existing single unit dwelling and detached garage to allow a total of 8 dwelling units on the subject lot.</p> <p>Aastha Patel provided a presentation on the proposal on behalf of the applicant.</p>
<p><b>Comments</b></p>	<p>Comments from the public could be submitted by mail, e-mail and telephone between September 4 – 18, 2024. No comments were submitted from the public during the comment period.</p> <p>One member of the public spoke during the Public Information Meeting. Staff and applicant responses are in purple.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bob Stairs asked when the development would be completed if the development agreement was approved.</li> </ul> <p>Sarah replied that they would complete the project as soon as possible, hopefully within a year.</p> <p>Bob asked if the units would have AC.</p> <p>Sarah replied that each unit would have a heat pump.</p> <p>Bob asked about ownership and tenancy.</p> <p>Sarah replied that the units are intended to be long-term rentals or permanent residency.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	The Public Information Meeting ended at 6:21 p.m.



**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT**

Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation <input type="checkbox"/>	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---	--

**To:** Members of Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC)

**Submitted by:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Will Hong, Planner

**Date:** November 14, 2024

**Subject:** What We Heard: Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives 1-3

**LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY**

Part VIII, Planning and Development, = *Municipal Government Act*.

**RECOMMENDATION or DECISION REQUEST**

This report is being provided for information purposes only.

**BACKGROUND**

Property <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

In March 2023, the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) announced the launch of the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF); a \$4 billion fund to support local governments across Canada to accelerate the development of a diverse range of quality housing, identify critical solutions to increase housing supply, and promote the development of affordable, inclusive, and diverse communities at the local level.

To participate, municipalities were required to develop a Housing Action Plan as part of the application. This Housing Action Plan identified attainable actions Council could take between 2024-2027 to support the development of new housing units by making policy changes that will enable or incentivize new home construction. West Hants Regional Municipality applied to the HAF funding stream and submitted a Housing Action Plan on August 16, 2023.

West Hants Regional Municipality was one of seven municipalities in Nova Scotia that was selected to participate in the HAF program. On January 30, 2024, Council approved the Housing Action Plan as submitted to CMHC and directed staff to begin implementation. The Municipality signed a contribution agreement with the CMHC and was approved for \$1.08 million for the 3-year HAF term. The Municipality received the first disbursement in February 2024.

The approved Housing Action Plan outlines seven initiatives that the Municipality committed to undertake. Since May 2024, staff have been prioritizing the first three initiatives which include changes to the municipal planning documents. The three initiatives include:

1. Allowing greater density as-of-right;
2. Creating affordable housing policy requirements; and
3. Reducing parking requirements for new residential developments.

In July 2024, staff provided an information report to update Council on these three initiatives and the public engagement plan. Staff initiated public engagement with an online survey which collected 320 responses between August 21 and September 30, 2024. Additionally, staff hosted two public open house sessions on September 11 and 19, 2024, to provide other opportunities for the public to give feedback these three initiatives and engage with staff. These sessions were attended by 20 members of the public. All the responses received through the survey and open house sessions can be found in Attachment A.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Survey**

The online survey was launched to collect public feedback on the current housing situation in the Municipality and future housing policy direction related to the first three initiatives in the Housing Action Plan. The survey was promoted across multiple channels, including 17 posts on the Municipal Facebook page during the 41-day survey period to encourage public participation. Each post reached an average of 1,200 people, with about 26 engagements (e.g., liking, commenting, and sharing) per post. A total of 320 survey responses were received over the survey period.

Among those respondents, 94% are residents of West Hants Regional Municipality and a large majority (72%) live within the serviced areas of the Municipality. The survey responses provide

a good representation among all age groups within the Municipality. The survey also received 19 responses from non-residents of the Municipality, which allows staff to understand the housing needs from a potential future resident perspective. Non-resident survey responses were analyzed separately from resident results.

### **Open House Sessions**

Staff hosted two open house sessions during the engagement period. The open house session provided an opportunity for community members to engage directly with planning staff and gain insights into this project. A total of 8 people attended the first open house which was held on September 11, 2024, from 6-7:30 p.m. at the Windsor Community Centre in Windsor. A total of 12 people attended the second open house which was held on September 19, 2024, from 6-7:30 p.m. at the Churchill House in Hantsport. At the open house attendees were invited to review eleven (11) information boards that staff prepared, including three feedback boards for them to leave written comments regarding each initiative. Each feedback board featured two sections where participants could share either opportunities or concerns related to each initiative. A total of 50 written feedback responses were received during the open house sessions.

### ***Key Findings***

**Limited Housing Options:** Housing option refers to the capacity of individuals or households to access a range of affordable, safe, and suitable (rooms needed for the size of family) housing that meet their needs within the community. The survey responses indicated that most (77.4%) of respondents live in single-unit dwellings within the Municipality. This number corresponds to the data found in the West Hants Housing Needs Assessment (80% living in single-unit dwellings) prepared by the Provincial Government in 2023. This finding further suggests that there is a limited variety of housing in the Municipality, which can lead to an imbalance in available housing types and may leave residents without suitable housing options, particularly for those considered to be part of a vulnerable population. With rising housing costs and increasing concerns around affordability, single-unit dwellings are becoming less attainable for many individuals in the Municipality. This shift highlights the need for more affordable alternatives, such as duplexes, triplexes, small multiplexes, and townhouses—often referred to as "missing middle" housing types. Initiative 1 of the Housing Action Plan aims to address this concern by permitting more “missing middle” housing alternatives within the serviced areas in the Municipality to provide more housing options.

**Lack of Housing Affordability:** According to CMHC, housing is considered affordable if individuals or households spend less than 30% of their pre-tax monthly income on housing costs. This 30% threshold is meant to ensure that there would still be enough money left-over

in an individual or households budget for other household necessities. With this in mind, survey respondents were asked what percentage of their income they currently spend on housing in the Municipality. Survey results indicated that only 58.8% of residents spend less than 30% of their monthly income on housing, while the remaining 41.2% live in housing considered unaffordable. This suggests that future housing policy will need to focus on the delivery of a variety of affordable housing within the Municipality through innovative planning policies and initiatives. Initiatives 1-3 in the Housing Action Plan aim to incentivize the provision of affordable housing in developments by streamlining the approval process for “missing middle” housing types, creating affordable housing policies or programs, and minimizing off-street parking requirements to reduce housing costs and increase affordability.

Satisfaction with Housing: Survey respondents were asked to rate how satisfied they are with their current housing situation. Across all age groups, communities, and housing tenures, most of the participants (81.7%) are satisfied with their housing situation. The survey results showed that age is a factor in housing satisfaction; residents aged 24 years or younger are the least likely to be satisfied (71.4%), followed by those aged 35-44 (75.6%) and 25-34 (76.5%). Satisfaction is higher among senior residents, with those aged 65 and older reporting the highest satisfaction (89.7%), closely followed by the 55-64 age group (89.6%). When asked how the Municipality could better address housing needs and satisfaction, many expressed a strong desire for more efforts to improve housing affordability, especially for vulnerable groups like single parents, people with support needs, and young renters. To improve housing satisfaction among younger age groups and vulnerable groups, future housing policies should focus on expanding affordable housing options, permitting a wide range of “missing middle” housing types within serviced areas as-of-right, incentivizing the development of affordable and accessible units, and ensuring that future residential development contributes to a balanced housing market to address the unmet local needs of housing.

Housing Tenure: Housing tenure describes the legal and financial relationship an individual has with their home (i.e., homeowners and renters). Among survey respondents, 16.7% are renters and 77.9% own their own home. Survey results showed that renters in the Municipality are much less likely to be satisfied (54.9%) with their housing situation, compared to homeowners (90.1%). In addition, more than three-quarters (76%) of renters are living in an unaffordable dwelling, compared to homeowners (33%), which suggests a significant difference in housing experience between homeowners and renters in the Municipality. In addition, renters are most likely to agree that the Municipality should allow more housing types and permit 4 dwelling units as-of-right in the serviced areas. This suggests that future housing policy should work towards reducing housing cost burdens on renters, providing more rental options, and creating a more inclusive community for all residents.

More Flexibility on Housing Policy: The feedback gathered through the survey and open house sessions was beneficial for staff to help understand the community’s perspective on future housing policy directions. Survey results indicated that 77% of surveyed residents agree that the Municipality should have a variety of housing options to meet the needs of diverse demographics. Additionally, 63% support greater housing density in areas with the most services (i.e., areas with both municipal water, sewer and amenities). Initiatives 1-3 of the Housing Action Plan aim to increase flexibility and promote gentle density (i.e., “missing middle” housing) within serviced areas, enhancing housing affordability for all residents. These initiatives will support a broader range of housing sizes, types, and tenure options. By promoting “missing middle” housing development and permitting it as-of-right in serviced areas, the Municipality can provide residents with greater choice and stability. This approach makes it easier for individuals and families of varying income levels and household sizes to find suitable housing within the community.

### NEXT STEPS

Staff are preparing draft amendments to the planning documents to incorporate the commitments of initiative 1-3 which are to be completed by the end of March 2025. Staff anticipate the following process for these amendments.





\*Anticipated dates; final dates set by Council

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Municipality will receive its funding from CMHC under the contribution agreement in four equal installments. The first installment was paid upon signing the agreement in February 2024, while the release of the next two annual installments in 2025 and 2026 will depend on the Municipality’s progress in achieving the milestones outlined in the Housing Action Plan. The final installment in 2027 will be contingent on the Municipality's performance in meeting housing supply targets in accordance with the contribution agreement. Any delays or scope changes in implementing these initiatives may have financial implications for the Municipality.

**ALTERNATIVES**

N/A

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A            What We Heard Report: Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives 1-3

Report Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Will Hong, Planner

Report Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kari Fougere, Manager of Planning

Report Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development

**Attachment A**  
**What We Heard Report: Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives 1-3**



# **What We Heard Report:**

Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives #1-3

October 2024



## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0 Method</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1 Online Survey .....	6
2.2 Public Open House .....	6
<b>3.0 What We Heard from the Online Survey</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 Respondent Demographics .....	7
3.2 Housing Situation .....	11
3.3 Building Height .....	18
3.4 Parking .....	20
3.5 Preference Questions from Residents .....	21
3.6 Survey Responses from Non-Residents .....	32
3.7 Preference Questions from Non-Residents .....	34
<b>4.0 What We Heard from the Open House Sessions</b> .....	<b>36</b>
4.1 Activity 1 .....	36
4.2 Feedback Boards .....	37
<b>5.0 Next Steps</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>6.0 Appendix</b> .....	<b>41</b>
6.1 Housing Action Plan .....	42
6.2 Survey Questions .....	54
6.3 Raw Survey Data & Additional Survey Comments .....	64

## Executive Summary

In 2023, West Hants Regional Municipality developed the Housing Action Plan as submitted to CMHC as part of the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) application. HAF is a federal funding program designed to support local governments across Canada in accelerating the development of housing at the local level.

West Hants Regional Municipality was one of seven municipalities in Nova Scotia that was approved and selected to participate in the HAF program. There are a total of seven initiatives that the municipality committed to implementing during the HAF funding period. Between August and September 2024, the Planning and Development Department conducted a comprehensive community engagement process to get feedback on the first three initiatives in the Housing Action Plan, and this report summarizes what was heard from the public.

In review of 320 survey responses and 50 written feedback from engagement sessions attendees, the key findings are summarized in the following:

- Housing affordability is an evident challenge within the municipality, with 41.2% of residents spending more than 30% of their average gross (pre-tax) monthly income on housing costs, classifying it as unaffordable.
- Renters in the municipality (76%) are much more likely to experience housing affordability challenges compared to homeowners (33%).
- The biggest challenges, identified in the survey, in finding housing today are high housing costs (40.9%), and lack of rental options (21.9%) and missing middle housing types (16.3%).
- 55% of respondents support the statement that the municipality should provide incentives to developers to provide affordable housing units within proposals, and renters are generally more supportive of this statement than homeowners.
- The majority (77%) of participants support for more missing middle housing types in the municipality, and more than half (56%) support for increased dwelling units as-of-right.
- There is a low support (27%) for lower parking requirements for residential buildings.

This report and findings will be used to inform staff while developing the proposed planning document amendments and will be presented to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee (PAC/HAC).

## 1.0 Background

In March 2023, the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) announced the launch of the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF); a \$4 billion fund to support local governments across Canada to accelerate the development of a diverse range of quality housing, identify critical solutions to increase housing supply, and promote the development of affordable, inclusive, and diverse communities at the local level.

To participate, municipalities were required to develop a Housing Action Plan as part of the application. This Housing Action Plan identified attainable actions Council could take between 2024-2027 to support the development of new housing units by making policy changes that will enable or incentivize new home construction. West Hants Regional Municipality applied to the HAF funding stream and submitted a Housing Action Plan (Appendix 6.1) on August 16, 2023.

West Hants Regional Municipality was one of seven municipalities in Nova Scotia that was approved and selected to participate in the HAF program. On January 30, 2024, Council approved the Housing Action Plan as submitted to CMHC and directed staff to begin implementation. The municipality was approved for \$1.08 million from CMHC and received the first disbursement in February 2024.

Since May 2024, staff have been prioritizing research on the first three initiatives outlined in the Housing Action Plan which include changes to the municipal planning documents. The three initiatives include:

1. Allow greater density as-of-right;
2. Create affordable housing policy requirements; and
3. Reduce parking requirements for new residential developments.

In July 2024, staff provided an information report to update Council on the first three initiatives and public engagement plan.

## 2.0 Methods

The Planning and Development Department recognizes the importance of public participation and is committed to engaging with the public in a manner that is thoughtful, educational, interactive, visual, and meaningful. The engagement phase was designed to capture both qualitative feedback and quantitative feedback from the public by using different tools.

The following engagement tools were used during the engagement phase for initiatives #1-3:

- Online Survey (August 21, 2024 - September 30, 2024)
- Two Public Open House Sessions (September 11 and 19, 2024)

Staff offered several different methods of engagement in order to provide opportunities for all community members to participate. These included:

- Hosting two open house sessions on two separate occasions and in two different communities.
- Hosting an online survey with printed copies of the survey available at Municipal offices and the open house sessions for individuals who may have limited access to technology and/or internet.
- Providing printed copies of display boards in the lobby of the Municipal office for individuals who did not have a chance to attend one of the open house sessions.
- Advertising public engagement information through different online platforms.
- Reaching out to different community organizations and groups about engagement opportunities.
- Setting up a dedicated webpage on the municipality's website with public engagement information.

The feedback received helps and supports the Planning and Development Department learn what works and what could be done better to meet the housing needs in the municipality, as well as provide guidance and justification for future policy directions.

## 2.1 Online Survey

An online public survey was available from August 21 to September 30, 2024. The purpose of this survey was to gain an understanding of residents' current housing situation, potential housing needs, their preferences on proposed policy aimed at increasing housing availability, as well as collect feedback on future policy directions. The survey also invited non-residents (e.g., people who work in the municipality but live elsewhere and people who wish to move to West Hants in the future) to participate to understand their housing needs if they were to move to the municipality. The survey was developed using branching logic to ensure that respondents were directed to questions that pertained to their housing experience (i.e., residents vs. non-residents).

The survey included 24 questions and took an average of 9 minutes to complete. The municipality advertised the survey through a variety of channels. In total, the Planning and Development Department received a total of 320 survey responses over the 41-day period.

A copy of the survey questions is attached as Appendix 6.2. The survey responses are summarized in Section 3.0. All survey responses are attached in Appendix 6.3.

## 2.2 Public Open House

The Planning and Development Department hosted two public open house sessions in September, providing an opportunity for community members to engage directly with planning staff and gain insights into this project. The open house invited participants to review 11 information boards that staff prepared, which included two icebreaker activities, an overview of the community, an introduction to missing middle housing, an overview for each of the three initiatives, a feedback board for each initiative, and a project summary. On the feedback boards, participants were asked to identify any opportunities and concerns associated with each initiative. Designed as drop-in events, the open houses allowed participants to engage at their own pace and join the session at any time.


A total of 8 people attended the first open house which was held on September 11, 2024, from 6-7:30 p.m. at the Windsor Community Centre. A total of 12 people attended the second open house which was held on September 19, 2024, from 6-7:30 p.m. at the Churchill House in Hantsport. The responses from the open house sessions are included in detail in Section 4.0.

### 3.0 What We Heard from the Online Survey

The online survey questions included several demographic questions to allow the Planning and Development Department to understand who participated and where the participants were from.


#### 3.1 Respondent Demographics

*Q: Are you a resident of West Hants Regional Municipality?*




From the survey results, 94% of participants identified as residents (full-time or part-time) of West Hants Regional Municipality. 6% of participants were not current residents. Among those participants not currently residing in the municipality, 3% are looking to find housing in West Hants Regional Municipality, 2% currently work or conduct business, and 1% access the municipality often for services and amenities.

**Q: The proposed initiatives will only be applicable to the serviced areas of WHRM: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor. Where in the Municipality do you live?**




Among those 301 residents that reside in the municipality, 98 (32%) are living in Windsor; followed by 85 (28%) people live in other communities in West Hants Regional Municipality; 50 (17%) residents live in Falmouth area; 38 (13%) residents live in Three Miles Plains area, and 30 (10%) residents live in Hantsport area. A large majority (72%) of residents live within the serviced areas of the municipality, which falls within the project scope of the aforementioned three initiatives.

**Q: Which age group best describes you?**



participants were asked to identify their age group, which allows staff to perform a more detailed statistical analysis based on their responses. The age groups used in the survey correspond with the age groups of census reports created by Statistics Canada. To better understand housing needs across different age groups, staff re-categorize the age groups into six categories below, based on key stages of life in terms of housing needs. This breakdown allows staff to identify trends and highlight demographic gaps in this report.




Relevant Statistical Findings:

- The survey responses provide a good representation among all age groups, except for those 24 or younger with only 7 participants. This limited participation from the youth suggests that their perspectives may be underrepresented in the overall findings in this report.
- The survey shows a strong representation of the age group 25-34 and 35-44, with 51 and 78 participants in each age group, respectively. These two age groups are a crucial age range for housing needs, as many people in these groups are trying to secure more permanent housing options.
- There was a large number of responses from the age groups 55-64 and 65+ with a total of 87 participants. People in these age groups are generally more likely to be approaching retirement or in retirement and are more likely to be considering long-term housing needs, downsizing options, or aging in place.

### 3.2 Housing Situation

#### Q: What type of housing do you live in?




Survey participants were asked to identify what type of housing they currently live in. The responses suggest that most (77.4%) of participants live in single-unit dwellings within the municipality. This number corresponds to the data found in the West Hants Housing Needs Assessment (80% living in single-unit dwellings) prepared by the Provincial Government in 2023. This finding further suggests that there is a limited variety of housing in West Hants Regional Municipality, which can lead to an imbalance in available housing types and may leave residents without suitable housing options.

#### Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those who currently live in single-unit dwellings are most satisfied with their current housing situation at an average satisfaction rate of 87.2%, compared to the lowest rate of 54.2% for those living in apartments (both small and large).
- Those who live in apartments all identified themselves as renters and 75% of them reported their housing costs exceeded 30% of their monthly pre-tax income (i.e., unaffordable).
- Those who live in semi-detached/duplex/two-unit dwellings are the least likely to experience housing affordability challenges compared to people living in other types of housing.

- More than half (52.6%) of people who live in single-unit dwellings in the municipality reported living in an unaffordable situation (i.e., monthly housing expenses exceed 30% of monthly gross household income).
- Those who currently live in mobile homes (3.7%) are most likely to strongly agree (72.7%) with the statement that the municipality needs more housing options, compared to those who live in single-unit dwellings (43.6%).

**Q: Do you own or rent?**




Participants who selected “Other” in this question provided comments such as “exchange (goods or services) for rent”, “live in an owned family home”, and “have lived in our home 17 years and being evicted”.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Renters in the municipality are much more likely (76%) to experience housing affordability challenges compared to homeowners (33%).
- Renters are more likely to support the statement that the municipality should provide incentives to developers to provide affordable housing units within proposals.

**Q: How satisfied are you with your current housing situation in terms of how it suits your needs? (e.g., housing options, adequacy, suitability, and affordability)**



*\*Participants were asked to select from “Very satisfied”, “Somewhat satisfied”, “Not very satisfied”, or “Not satisfied at all”. The satisfaction rate was assessed by calculating the percentage of respondents who chose “Very satisfied” or “Somewhat satisfied” out of the total number of survey participants.*

When it comes to residents’ satisfaction with the current housing situation, the majority of respondents (81.7%) were satisfied with their current housing situation.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Across all age groups, communities, and housing tenures, most of participants (81.7%) are satisfied with their housing situation.
- Renters are less likely to be satisfied (54.9%) with their housing situation, suggesting a significant difference in housing experience between homeowners and renters in the municipality.
- Senior residents are more likely to be satisfied. Those 65+ years are most satisfied (89.7%), followed by those 55-64 years (89.6%) and 45-54 years (82.9%).
- Those 24 years or younger are least likely to be satisfied (71.4%), followed by 35-44 years (75.6%) and 25-34 years (76.5%).
- Those 25-34 and 35-44 years are most likely to select “Not satisfied at all” than any other respondents.

***Q: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.***

A total of 113 participants shared more insights into how their housing needs can be better met and provided more details about what made them dissatisfied with their current housing situation. There was a strong sentiment that more should be done to make housing more affordable in the municipality, particularly for vulnerable groups such as single parents and people with disabilities. When it comes to housing suitability, many renter participants stressed the need for landlords to ensure their units are properly maintained. Participants identified several themes, including:

- Need for affordable housing;
- High rental costs for new renters/young professionals/vulnerable groups;
- Called for measures to protect renters from irresponsible landlords (difficult to have repairs done and amenities maintained);
- Support required for vulnerable populations in home maintenance and repairs;
- Concerns with high interest rates/mortgages rates/tax rates;
- Concerns with infrastructure capacity;
- Lack of pet-friendly rentals;
- Shortage of doctors/medical staff in the region; and
- Need for public transit.

## Selected comments from the respondents:

*“Our family was lucky to have bought a house in 2017, but now we (and many others) find ourselves stuck in a starter home that no longer meets our needs”*

*“As a single mother of 2, the cost of rent is not affordable. I work full time and still just make enough to pay rent. I also live in a house that has mold issues and the basement floods every time it rains heavily. I will never be able to able a home of my own.”*


*“There needs to be more options for families that are AFFORDABLE. 1200 a month for a bachelor apt in Windsor is insane, and trying to find a rental in TMP is nearly impossible. Most rentals outside of town are also extremely cost prohibitive for young families! The amount of landlords who put "mature professionals only" as a way to say NO CHILDREN is completely unacceptable. We have the crossing for people 55+, now the woodlands in TMP is also only for people 55+! We need these sort of communities for FAMILIES WHO HAVE CHILDREN. I am currently in a living situation that is FAR from ideal, because my family could not possibly afford to both pay the rental prices, and be able to eat!!”*

*“We want to add a second suite in the basement for a friend to live in but don’t have the financing, and can’t get a contractor to even come look and give an estimate”*

*“I am paying 70% of my income to rent and power. I work full time. I have to use the food bank and still we go hungry sometimes. My lease was changed to a fixed term in Feb so I think I have to leave soon.”*

*“I am a satisfied with my current housing. I am concerned about the next generation having the same options available and the long term impacts this will have on individuals and families.”*

**Q: Which of the following do you believe are the biggest challenges for people seeking housing in WHRM today? (choose all that apply)**



When asked to identify the biggest challenges for people seeking housing in the municipality today, high housing price or rental cost (40.9%) were the biggest challenges identified by survey participants.


Relevant Statistical Findings:

- All age groups mentioned “high housing price or rental cost” as the key challenge with minimal statistical differences. This suggests that housing affordability is a widespread issue across all demographics.

Those who responded “other” stated:

- *“Many of the available listings specify “mature building” which always means No Children. Not to mention the lack of places that will let people have their cats or dogs”*
- *“Insufficient affordable, accessible housing”*
- *“Strict mortgage rules, keeps some people out of the market, don't qualify for a mortgage but can pay rent that would be higher than a mortgage”*
- *“Supported housing for people experiencing homelessness”*
- *“No land as rezoned for apartment complexes”*

**Q: The definition of housing affordability is whether the household needs to pay 30% or more of before-tax income towards housing costs (e.g., rent, mortgage, property taxes, condo fees, utilities, and other municipal services). My household spends:**




**Relevant Statistical Findings:**

- More than three-quarters (76%) of renters are living in an unaffordable dwelling, compared to homeowners at 33%.
- Age is a factor when it comes to affordability. Those 24 years or younger (57.1%) are two times more likely to live in an unaffordable dwelling than those 65+ years (25.6%).
- Half of the survey participants in the age group 35-44 years reported living in an unaffordable dwelling and half of the residents in Windsor reported living in an unaffordable dwelling.
- Three Mile Plains has the lowest rate of residents reporting living in an unaffordable dwelling at 23.7%.

### 3.3 Building Height

*Q: The current planning documents allow up to three storeys in height for residential uses in serviced areas. I think the Municipality should:*

- Maintain the current standard (i.e., 3 storeys)
- Increase residential building height to allow 4 or 5 storeys
- Increase residential building height to allow 6+ storeys
- Other



A slight majority (45.8% total) feel that the municipality should increase the current residential building height, while 43.2% prefer to maintain the existing standard. The percentage of those supporting an increase in height may be higher, as many who selected "Other" provided additional comments and suggestions in the following question.

#### Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those residents who live in Hantsport are more likely to support (53%) an increase in residential height, followed closely by residents of Windsor at 52%. In contrast, residents of Three Mile Plains are more likely to prefer maintaining the current height standard (68%).
- Those 35-44 years are more likely to support (59%) an increase in residential height, followed by those 25-34 (52.9%), then those 65+ (51.3%).


***Q: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.***

116 additional responses were received, commenting and suggesting opportunities or concerns of increased height of residential buildings. Some of the key findings from the responses include:

- The municipality should maintain sight lines to the valley and Avon River and compatibility within the historic areas;
- Increase the maximum building height in a manner that is compatible with the immediate surroundings;
- Density matters more than height; the municipality should allow more missing middle housing as-of-right;
- We need to preserve our small-town uniqueness;
- The municipality should provide a gradual transition in terms of building heights and forms;
- The housing market in the municipality is not competitive enough. More heights mean more housing units and potentially more affordability;
- Density is needed to prevent more sprawl in the municipality;
- Medium density should be prioritized in the municipality;
- We need more housing options; however, we need to be careful where we decide to put large developments;
- The height of the building should reflect the other residential buildings in the area;
- Increasing building height should be in combination with improvement to infrastructure;
- The heights should be raised, but there must be escape routes in case of emergencies and the fire department should have appropriate training and equipment to respond to new developments; and
- Accessibility will be a concern for higher residential buildings.

### 3.4 Parking


*Q: How many vehicles does your household own or lease?*



Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Most (73%) of households without a car live in the Windsor area.
- The majority of single-car households (71%) are living in serviced areas of the municipality (i.e., Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains, and Windsor).


*Q: When you park at your primary residence, where do you typically park?*



### 3.5 Preference Questions from Residents

The survey featured nine preference questions. Participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree or disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree. The average preference rating was calculated based on the sum of values for each statement over the number of survey participants (excluding non-residents).

**Statement 1: We need more housing options in the Municipality. (e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)**





77% of survey participants agree with this statement. Further 14% of participants disagree with this statement, and 9% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

#### Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those 65+ years are most likely to support the statement with an average rating of 8.4, followed by those 35-44 years with an average rating of 8.0, then both 25-34 and 24 years and younger share an average rating of 7.9.
- Residents who live in the Windsor area are more likely to support this statement than other communities in the municipality with an average rating of 8.4.
- Those who live in apartments or mobile homes are the most likely to strongly agree (63% and 73%) compared to those who live in single-unit dwelling (44%).
- Renters are more likely to support this statement than homeowners, with an average rating of 8.6 and 7.4, respectively.

**Statement 2: The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)**





63% of survey participants agree with this statement. Further 23% of participants disagree with this statement, and 14% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those 35-44 and 25-34 years are more likely to support this statement than other ages group, with an average rating of 7.4 and 7.2, respectively.
- Residents who live in the Windsor area are more likely to support this statement with an average rating of 7.3.
- Those who live in mobile homes are most likely to strongly agree (73%) with this statement than people who live in other types of housing.
- Those who rent are more likely to agree (7.6) compared to those who rent (6.4).

**Statement 3: Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property owners more flexibility in serviced areas. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)**




62% of participants agree with this statement, with an average rating of 6.4. Further 25% of participants disagree with this statement, and 13% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those 25-34 years are more likely to agree with this statement with an average rating of 6.9.
- Those 55-64 years have the lowest average rating (5.5) among all age groups.
- Those who already live in a two-unit dwelling, townhouse, or small apartments are most likely to strongly agree with this statement.
- Residents who live in mobile homes have the highest average rating of 8.4 compared to those in other housing types.

**Statement 4: I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)**




56% of participants agree with this statement, with an average rating of 6.1. Further 28% of participants disagree with this statement, and 16% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Residents living in two-unit or duplex dwellings are significantly more likely to agree with the statement, with an average rating of 7.6, compared to 5.7 for those living in single-unit dwellings.
- Renters are much more likely to agree with this statement, with an average rating of 7.4, compared to 5.7 for homeowners.
- Those 25-34 years are more likely to agree with this statement, with an average rating of 6.6.
- Those 45-54 and 55-64 years are the only two age groups with below-average ratings, at 5.88 and 5.29, respectively.

**Statement 5: I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood. (e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)**




77% of participants agree with this statement. Further 15% of participants disagree, and 8% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- 42% of participants who previously disagree with Statement #2 regarding greater density in serviced areas agree with this statement.
- 47% of participants who previously disagree with Statement #3 regarding more flexibility in serviced areas and discourage sprawl agree with this statement.
- 45% of participants who previously disagree with Statement #4 regarding 4 units as-of-right in serviced areas agree with this statement.
- There are no major statistical differences found across age groups.
- Half of participants who live in a two-unit or duplex dwelling strongly agree with this statement, with an average rating of 8.1.

**Statement 6: To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures. (Also known as "lot coverage requirement")**





79% of participants agree with this statement. Further 10% of participants disagree with this statement, and 11% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- 76% of residents living in serviced areas of the Municipality agree with this statement, compared to 68% of residents from other communities in the municipality.
- Those 65+ years are most likely to agree with this statement than other age groups, with an average rating of 8.4.
- 80% of homeowners across the Municipality agree with this statement.

**Statement 7: I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals. (e.g. density bonus, height bonus)**





55% of participants agree with this statement. Further 31% of participants disagree with this statement, and 14% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Those 25-34 years are most likely to agree with this statement than other age groups, with an average rating of 6.6.
- Of those who agreed with this statement, more than half (57%) indicated they "strongly agree."
- 62% of renters in the municipality agree with this statement, compared to 52% of homeowners.
- Residents in the Windsor area are more likely to agree with this statement than those in other communities, with an average rating of 6.6. Predictably, over half (52%) of Windsor residents reported living in an unaffordable dwelling, which is higher than all other respondents.

**Statement 8: I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)**





37% of participants agree with this statement. Further 43% of participants disagree with this statement, and 20% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Findings:

- Residents who currently live in serviced areas of the municipality are slightly more likely (38%) to agree with this statement than those who live outside of serviced areas (33%).
- There are no major statistical differences found across age groups.

**Statement 9: The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit. (Currently, the Municipality requires 1.5 parking space per dwelling unit for a residential building with more than three units)**



27% of participants agree with this statement. Further 49% of participants disagree with this statement, and 24% of participants neither agree nor disagree.

Relevant Statistical Finding:

- Those 65+ years are more likely to agree with this statement than other age groups.

***Q: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.***

Participants were asked to leave additional comments at the end of the preference questions. 102 responses were received, some of the key findings from the responses include:

- Parking on-street is challenging to find a spot closer to destination;
- Most families are two income earners and have two vehicles;
- Density is needed but should be placed in areas with appropriate infrastructure;
- High-rise apartments are not appropriate for the serviced areas. Medium density should be the priority;
- The municipality should make sure that the units are actually affordable if affordable units are proposed in a development;
- The municipality should support NGO by tax exemption when they seek to build affordable housing;
- Affordability should be focused on all age groups, especially seniors;
- Public transit is preferred in order to lower parking requirements;
- Need for more non-market housing (public housing, non-profit housing, Co-ops) in the municipality; and
- Housing incentives should also be available to rural communities outside of the serviced areas.

***Q: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?***

Participants were asked to leave final comments at the end of the survey. 106 out of the 320 survey participants responded to this question. Many respondents stressed again the need for affordable housing. On a positive note, some participants appreciated the municipality's efforts to address the housing challenges and engage the community. Some of the key findings from the responses include:

- Need for affordable housing;
- Need for accessible housing for senior population;
- Showed more support for gentle density and medium density housing;
- Called for a more permissible land-use environment;
- Raised concerns over increased homelessness;
- Raised concerns over housing shortages;

- Suggested the development of public transit;
- Concerns with population growth and its impact on existing infrastructure;
- Need for more sidewalks and crosswalks;
- Raised concerns over protection of natural areas and continued sprawl development;
- Need for a focus on rural housing in the future;
- Need for different modes of transportation; and
- Concerns for high density units in low density communities.

### **Selected comments from the respondents:**

*“We desperately need affordable rentals for single income families and seniors in the WHRM, especially Hantsport.”*

*“I work in WHRM and myself, along with many colleagues, commute long distances from HRM and other municipalities to get to work. I think a large contributing factor to why many of us do this is the lack of housing options in the area, especially for young professionals who are more likely to rent and not yet in a position to own housing. This seems to be a significant demographic that could be better served”*

*“Windsor is very different than the other communities and should allow more density.”*


*“West Hants is a happening area. We should really look at developing a business park area. Driving to the city or new Minas is too far. We should have areas for box stores. We should also look at unrestricted development. At a bare minimum we should allow four plexes as of right but really we should allow anything at this point. Any unit helps towards the housing shortage.”*

*“Accessible, affordable housing is desperately needed in our community and this must be planned hand in hand with the development of a transportation service to enable residents to access employment, health and education, to name a few essential services that are located beyond the regional borders. A transit service that links to those serving HRM and the Valley has been identified as a significant community need which needs to be addressed.”*


### 3.6 Survey Responses from Non-Residents:

19 people that are not residents of West Hants Regional Municipality participated in the survey, 11 of them expressed interest in moving to West Hants Regional Municipality in the future, 4 of them were not sure, and 4 had not considered moving. Those who were considering or not sure about moving (15 in total) were directed into a different set of questions to further understand their housing needs from a potential resident perspective.

*Q: If you were moving to WHRM, do you plan to own or rent?*




**Q: What type of housing would ideally suit your housing needs? (Select all that apply)**



Over half (67%) of non-residents indicated a preference for “missing middle housing” forms in their responses. Only a quarter (27%) of non-residents selected single-unit house as their only preference for housing choice. One participant chose "Other" specified "Seniors housing”.

**Q: Which of the following do you believe are the biggest challenges for people seeking housing in WHRM today?**



Those non-residents who were planning to rent/lease all indicated high housing price or rental cost as their biggest challenges when seeking housing in the municipality today.

Those who chose “Other” stated:

- *“Seniors on fixed income can't afford a rental unit while waiting for a senior apartment”*
- *“Jobs in WHRM”*

**Q: Optional - Are you satisfied with the housing options offered in the WHRM? Please explain. (e.g., rental availability, a variety of housing options like duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)**

Non-residents were asked to provide additional comments on housing options offered in the municipality. 9 out of 15 participants added comments, a few of those comments are listed below.

*“No there isn't adequate housing for those with seniors with disabilities”*

*“No as rent is so high and can't afford most places ..and landlords don't want you if your on income assistance (disability) it's like they don't want to half to deal with you or the paper work that's involved in the low income housing it sucks big time”*

*“No. Many places are run down, and landlords charging way too much.”*

*“There is no housing diversity at all, all on the market are either single-family houses or some semi-plex, which are out of reach for the young generation today.”*

### **3.7 Preference Questions from Non-Residents:**

Non-residents were asked the same nine preference questions, and their responses were analyzed separately from the residents' results. Each participant rated preference on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree or disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree. The average preference rating was calculated based on the sum of all values for each statement over the number of participants. The following data was compiled from the 15 non-residents' responses:

Statement	Average Preference Rating	Percentage of people who agree	Percentage of people chose "Strongly agree"
1: We need more housing options in the Municipality. (e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)	9.6	100%	87%
2: The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl	9.1	93%	73%
3: Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property owners more flexibility in serviced areas.(Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)	9.1	93%	67%
4: I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)	8.9	87%	67%
5: I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood. (e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)	8.6	87%	67%
6: To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures. (Also known as "lot coverage requirement")	7.1	67%	33%
7: I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals. (e.g. density bonus, height bonus)	7.7	73%	47%
8: I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality. (Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)	6.9	73%	27%
9: The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit. (Currently, the Municipality requires 1.5 parking space per dwelling unit for a residential building with more than three units)	6	47%	27%

Key findings:

- All non-residents survey participants reinforced the need for a broader range of housing forms in the municipality. Statement 1 had the highest average rating among all statements.
- Non-residents are more likely to agree with the statements compared to residents.

## 4.0 What We Heard from the Open House Sessions

The two public open house sessions in September welcomed 20 attendees with various backgrounds. The open house format allowed people to drop in at any time during the session to talk with the staff. Although fewer attendees resulted in less written feedback on the engagement boards, the smaller turnout allowed staff to engage in longer, more meaningful conversations with those who participated.

### 4.1 Activity 1 – Guess how many units are in each dwelling

**Addressing Housing Needs in WHRM**

**Icebreaker Activity 1** Use a sticker to guess how many dwelling units are in each building

**Did you know?**  
The housing options in our Municipality are limited, with 80% consisting of single-unit dwellings. However, dwellings with three or four units could also integrate well into our neighborhoods, as shown in the images below.

**Dwelling 1** I think Dwelling 1 has:  
1 unit  
2 units  
3 units  
4 units

**Dwelling 2** I think Dwelling 2 has:  
1 unit  
2 units  
3 units  
4 units

**Dwelling 3** I think Dwelling 3 has:  
1 unit  
2 units  
3 units  
4 units

**Dwelling 4** I think Dwelling 4 has:  
1 unit  
2 units  
3 units  
4 units

Are you ready to reveal the answers?  
Just ask a staff member for them!


**West Hants Regional Municipality**

Participants were invited to guess how many dwelling units were in each building upon joining the open house session. There were four buildings on the activity board, three of which were examples of “missing middle” housing, providing more housing choices between single-unit dwellings and larger apartments while maintaining the look of a small-scale dwelling. Participants appreciated the idea that housing can take on various forms and multi-unit building could also resemble single-unit housing and blend well into existing communities. Participants commented that it was challenging to determine the number of units in a building at first glance. During the activity, only about 28% of participants guessed all the answers correctly.

## 4.2 Feedback Boards

Participants were invited to share their thoughts and provide feedback for each initiative of this project; a total of 50 written responses were received across the boards. Each feedback board featured two sections where participants could share either opportunities or concerns related to each initiative.

### Feedback Board – Initiative #1



#### Opportunities that Initiative #1 could bring to the Municipality:


- Increase rental/housing options which means more affordability (2);
- Increased housing options which mean more young people;
- Reduce burden on planning staff;
- Population increase could lead to public transportation;
- Opportunities for people who are on waitlists for long-term care (in-home caregivers);
- Return of the multi-generation home structure;
- More density and more business (2); and
- Opportunities for tiny homes in the municipality.

#### Concerns or challenges that are anticipated regarding Initiative #1:

- Existing service/infrastructure capacity (3);
- Changing style of existing neighborhoods;

- Delays due to lack of labor and construction workers to handle increased demand (2);
- NIMBYism; and
- Impact on wildlife living spaces.

### Feedback Board – Initiative #2



#### Opportunities that Initiative #2 could bring to the Municipality:

- More affordable options for growing families;
- Collaborate with Province to build affordable housing;
- Designate surplus municipal lands for affordable housing;
- Keep seniors aging-in-place; and
- More educational opportunities regarding affordable housing options.

#### Concerns or challenges that are anticipated regarding Initiative #2:

- Developers from out of the province/Investors buying up property to renovate and thus increase housing prices (2);
- Business support for new contractors/developers;
- How to ensure units remain affordable long-term;
- Affordable units need to have minimum quality standards (in good repair);
- Education to ensure people understand what affordability means;
- A more holistic approach is needed; and

- Lack of legislation that supports vulnerable populations (single parents/disabilities) or support to enforce rules.

### Feedback Board – Initiative #3



#### Opportunities that Initiative #3 could bring to the Municipality:

- More developments;
- Developers decide market/flexibility (2);
- Bring back public transit;
- Encourage a more walkable community (2); and
- Encourage local consumptions/business.

#### Concerns or challenges that anticipate regarding Initiative #3:

- Parking on road increasing;
- More cyclists;
- Households may have more than 1 vehicle;
- 1:1 ratio may still be too high for properly dense community;
- 1.5 spaces should be the minimum; and
- No public transit to offset less vehicles.

## 5.0 Next Steps

The findings in this report provided baseline data for initiatives #1-3 of the West Hants Regional Municipality Housing Accelerator Fund project, particularly regarding housing, density, height considerations, affordable housing policy, and parking requirements.

The next steps in relation to this project are to:

- Present the findings of this report to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee.
- Review and consider the findings captured within this report when drafting the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land-use Bylaw amendments associated with initiatives #1-3 .
- Present the draft amendments to the Planning and Heritage Advisory Committee and Council

# APPENDIX 6.0

# APPENDIX 6.1

## Housing Action Plan



# Housing Action Plan

Submitted as part of the requirements for the CMHC Housing Accelerator Funding Program



## 1.0 Introduction

West Hants Regional Municipality (WHRM) is a centrally located, thriving, and growing collection of communities. With a travel time of only 35 minutes to the Provincial capital of Halifax, the Stanfield International Airport, and the centre of the Annapolis Valley, it is an ideal location to live, work, and grow. WHRM has a population of 19,500 residents, residing on 1,253.11 square kilometres which is dispersed among the former Towns of Windsor and Hantsport, and the former Municipality of the District of West Hants. This includes growth centres and rural expanses resulting in a population density of 15.56 persons per square kilometre.

In the 2021 Census, Statistics Canada reported that there are 9,136 total private dwellings in WHRM. Approximately 80% of those are single detached dwellings, 9% are apartments under 5 storeys in height, 6% are moveable dwellings, and 3% are semi-detached dwellings. There are also 172 units of public housing in the Municipality.

Over the past few years, WHRM has felt the pressure of the housing crisis. The median price of a home increased 78% from 2019 to 2022. The 2021 census reported 15% of households (10% owner, 34% renter) are living in unaffordable conditions, with 8% of households living in core housing need (4% owner, 22% renter). The 2022 Community Support and Serviced-Based Counts reported approximately 230 individuals experiencing homelessness between West Hants to Digby, Nova Scotia. At least 55 individuals are expected to be experiencing homelessness in WHRM specifically.

To combat some of this housing pressure, WHRM has undertaken amendments to its planning documents including permitting secondary suites accessory to any single- or two-unit dwelling, amending definitions to permit small options homes in residential areas, and reducing lot size requirements in certain serviced areas. WHRM has also created a Fees Policy that ensures fees will not be collected from non-profit organizations registered under the Societies Act for any permits required under the Building Code Act By-law, Land Use By-laws, Subdivision By-laws, Hantsport Swimming Pool By-law, and for amendments to the planning documents.

There is still a long way for WHRM to go to increase housing, and specifically affordable housing, in the Municipality. The purpose of the action plan is to outline a housing supply growth target and the specific initiatives that WHRM will undertake to grow housing supply with support of the Housing Accelerator Funding.

## 2.0 Housing Supply Growth Target

According to the 2021 Census, there are 9,136 total private dwellings in WHRM. In addition, 159 new units have been issued occupancy between January 2022 and July 31, 2023.

It is estimated that WHRM will need 560 new units by 2027 and 1,115 by 2032 to keep up with population increases in the area. Based on historic construction trends it is anticipated that 110 new units could be completed annually. This equates to 330 new units being permitted over a three-year period without support of the Housing Accelerator Funding. If this pace continues, it will leave a remaining gap of 10 units by 2027 and 15 units by 2032.

With the support of Housing Accelerator Funding, the number of permits issued over a three-year period could increase to 370. The additional 40 units have an annual growth rate of 1.33% and annual growth rate percentage change of 12.12%.

### Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
8	18	14	0	6	40

### Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$600,000	Plus \$550,000 for action items 8-9
<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$1,082,000	

### 3.0 Action Items

WHRM staff recognize the following seven (7) actions to increase housing, and specifically affordable housing units, in the Municipality:

- Allow greater density as-of-right
- Create affordable housing policy requirements
- Reduce parking requirements
- Remove permit fees for accessory dwelling units
- Promote infill development
- Promote alternative housing forms
- Upgrade permitting software

Staff also recognize three (3) additional actions that would support increased density in the serviced areas of the Municipality specifically:

- Hire a housing support worker
- Develop an Integrated Resource Plan
- Develop a Rural Transportation Feasibility Study

#### Action #1: Allow greater density as-of-right

All the areas of the Municipality are planned. The Town of Hantsport dissolved into the Municipality of West Hants in 2015, but the community of Hantsport still has its own planning documents. The Town of Windsor consolidated with the Municipality of West Hants in 2020, but the community of Windsor and the former Municipality of West Hants still have their own planning documents. Growth centres and the former Towns are served by municipal water and/or sewer and where residential and commercial growth is concentrated.

On June 27, 2023, Council approved planning staff to engage with a consultant to assist with the consolidation and review of the Municipal planning documents. During this review the following amendments will be prioritized to increase housing stock:

- Increase density through rezoning all Single Unit Residential (R-1) zoned properties in serviced areas to Two Unit Residential (R-2)
- Allow an increased number of units and number of storeys as-of-right in serviced areas instead of through a rezoning or development agreement process
- Update the minimum zone requirements to permit development on smaller lots with smaller required setbacks

The Housing Accelerator Funding would speed up the process to ensure the documents are amended to allow greater density as-of-right prior to the full planning document review being completed.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that any amendments to the planning documents would take approximately 6-8 months to be approved by Council. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the second year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2024-September 2025).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	8	2	0	0	<b>10</b>

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$250,000	For planning document review associated with action items 1-3.
<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$390,000	Combination of impact from items 1-3.

**Action #2: Create affordable housing policy requirements**

The current WHRM planning documents do not have any requirements for developers to provide affordable housing units within multiple unit apartment buildings. On June 27, 2023, Council approved staff to investigate ways to require and regulate affordable housing within developments. The Nova Scotia Municipal Government Act allows municipalities to require and regulate the provision of affordable housing within developments and provide for incentive or bonus zoning in a land use by-law, or accept money instead of any required provision of affordable housing in a municipal planning strategy. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM with amendments to the planning documents to ensure affordable housing provisions are added prior to the full planning document review being completed.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that any amendments to the planning documents would take approximately 6-8 months to be approved by Council. The dwelling units associated with this action are

anticipated to be completed within the second year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2024-September 2025).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	0	2	0	2	2

Anticipated Budget

Noted in Action 1.

**Action #3: Reduce Parking Requirements**

The WHRM planning documents require 1.5 parking spaces for any dwelling containing three (3) or more units. These parking requirements can be a deterrent for small to medium scale infill development especially in areas of the Municipality that have pedestrian infrastructure and are within walking distance to services, amenities and recreation spaces. It is expected that staff will review the current parking requirements and amend the planning documents to reduce these in serviced areas. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM with amendments to the planning documents to ensure parking requirements are revised prior to the full planning document review being completed.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that any amendments to the planning documents would take approximately 6-8 months to be approved by Council. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the second year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2024-September 2025).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	0	2	0	0	2

Anticipated Budget

Noted in Action 1.

#### Action #4: Remove permit fees for accessory dwelling units

WHRM planning documents currently allow attached and detached secondary suites accessory to any single or two-unit dwelling. Since 2020, 7 secondary suites have received occupancy. To encourage increased development of secondary suites, staff propose removing the fees associated with the required development and building permits for secondary suites within the time period of the Housing Accelerator Funding program. This would encourage conversion of existing accessory buildings and the construction of new accessory buildings specifically to be used as secondary suites.

##### Timeframe

It is anticipated that any amendments to the Fees Policy would take approximately 3-6 months to be approved by Council. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the first year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2023-September 2024).

##### Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	8	0	0	0	8

##### Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$50,000	Includes engagement with residents.
<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$160,000	

#### Action #5: Promote infill development

Infill development in serviced areas can increase housing options in existing communities, while making more efficient use of existing services like central water, sewer and sidewalks. Staff recognize many large properties could be subdivided or vacant properties could be utilized for infill development. Staff anticipate mapping all vacant or underutilized properties in the Municipality to determine what land may be suitable for infill development. Engagement and collaboration with these identified properties would then be required. Staff would connect interested property owners with potential developers to encourage infill development on these properties. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM with the cost of mapping these properties and engaging the property owners.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that the mapping exercise would take approximately 6 months to complete. The engagement portion of the project would take an additional 6 months. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the third year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2025-September 2026).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	0	4	0	0	4

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$100,000	
<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$128,000	

**Action #6: Promote Alternative Housing Forms**

As noted previously, the 2021 census reported 15% of households (10% owner, 34% renter) living in unaffordable conditions, with 8% of households living in core housing need (4% owner, 22% renter) within WHRM. Additionally, at least 55 individuals are expected to be experiencing homelessness in WHRM specifically. Promoting alternative housing forms such as boarding houses or single room occupancy would help house more individuals that may not be able to afford to rent or own an entire house. It may also reduce the stigma around these sorts of housing forms within WHRM.

Staff would become subject matter experts on alternative housing forms to promote the benefits of these forms of housing and provide examples of these forms of housing experiences elsewhere including from those using home-sharing platforms such as Happipad. Staff would ensure the planning documents do not impede the development of these forms of housing and assist homeowners determine any development and building permits that may be required.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that any amendments to the planning documents would take approximately 6-8 months to be approved by Council. Staff would have to develop an advertising campaign on alternative forms of housing and create promotional materials and attend community meetings to promote alternative forms of housing. The dwelling units associated with this action are

anticipated to be completed within the third year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2025-September 2026).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
0	0	4	0	4	4

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$100,000	
<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$204,000	

**Action #7: Upgrade permit software**

WHRM currently requires all development and building permit applications to be submitted in person or via mail. There is no opportunity for applicants to submit applications online or make a payment for a permit online. Upgrading the permit software to allow applicants to submit applications and payment online would reduce the time for the applicant and reduce the time for staff to receive a completed application. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM in purchasing and implementing this new software.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that the new permitting system would take approximately 1 year to implement and educate developers on. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the third year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2025-September 2026).

Targeted Unit Type

Single detached	Two Unit	Multi-unit (less than 5 storeys in height)	Multi-unit (above 5 storeys in height)	Affordable	Total
8	2	0	0	0	10

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$100,000	
---------------------	-----------	--

<b>HAF Revenue</b>	\$200,000	
--------------------	-----------	--

## Additional Actions

### Action #8: Hire a Housing Support Worker

As noted previously, the 2021 census reported 15% of households (10% owner, 34% renter) living in unaffordable conditions, with 8% of households living in core housing need (4% owner, 22% renter) within WHRM. Additionally, at least 55 individuals are expected to be experiencing homelessness in WHRM specifically. A housing support worker would be able to assist developers with applications to CMHC funding opportunities to assist developing affordable housing units and connect those experiencing homelessness or in core housing need to services within the community, including grants for low-income households to upgrade their homes. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM developing the position in collaboration with the West Hants Housing Coalition and local non-profits such as POSSE (Peer Outreach Support Services and Education) and the West Hants Family Resource Centre.

#### Timeframe

It is anticipated that the housing support worker position would be developed and staffed within 1 year of funding approval. The dwelling units associated with this action are anticipated to be completed within the third year of the Housing Accelerator Funding program (September 2025-September 2026).

#### Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$200,000	
---------------------	-----------	--

### Action #9: Develop an Integrated Resource Master Plan

Growth centres and the former Towns are served by municipal water and/or sewer. This is where residential and commercial growth is concentrated, and infill development is encouraged. Due to the increased concentration of development within these serviced areas, the WHRM Public Works Department would like to develop an Integrated Resource Plan. This plan will produce an optimal servicing strategy for the overall wastewater, treatment / collection and water supply, treatment, fire storage /supply and distribution networks to ensure sufficient service to existing developments and to support future capacity in development. It is anticipated that this plan will identify where efficiencies can be made and where capital additions and or upgrades are necessary within these systems, which will increase the capacity available for future

development. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM with development and implementation of this plan.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that the Integrated Resource Management Plan will be completed within 2 years of funding approval. The Plan will be implemented through Council budget cycles once complete.

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$250,000	
---------------------	-----------	--

**Action #10: Develop a Rural Transit Feasibility Study**

WHRM does not currently operate a local transit system for residents. There are small local service providers who provide specialized transportation services where possible. A local transit system would reduce transportation costs and provide another option to residents and visitors.

At the Council meeting on April 25, 2023, Council directed staff to prepare a report on the possibility of creating a local bus service. A Transit Feasibility Study will determine the feasibility of a new transit service and discuss the potential features of a service including routes, size of service, stop locations and frequencies. This would support the development of complete communities and more affordable living situations for residents of WHRM. The Housing Accelerator Funding would assist WHRM with development and implementation of this plan.

Timeframe

It is anticipated that the development of a Transit Feasibility Study would be completed within 2 years of funding approval. The Plan would be implemented through Council budget cycles once complete.

Anticipated Budget

<b>Total Budget</b>	\$100,000	
---------------------	-----------	--

# APPENDIX 6.2

## Survey Questions



West Hants  
something inspiring awaits

## Addressing Housing Needs in WHRM

West Hants Regional Municipality is undertaking housing accelerator initiatives as an opportunity to address the pressing housing needs faced by our growing community and inform future direction around land use planning. Recognizing the urgent need for more diverse and affordable housing options, the Municipality aims to streamline regulatory processes, making it easier and faster to build more housing.

**This survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.** We invite all residents to participate. We want to hear from you!

### **This survey will focus on three initiatives:**

1. Allowing greater density as-of-right in serviced areas (i.e., areas of the Municipality that have Municipally owned water, sewer and storm water systems)
2. Creating affordable housing policy incentives or requirements
3. Reducing parking requirements for residential buildings in serviced areas

### **These three initiatives will be focused within the following serviced communities:**

- Falmouth
- Hantsport
- Three Mile Plains
- Windsor

Other communities within the WHRM fall outside the scope of these initiatives and will experience minimal impact.

### **How can I get involved?**

Share your feedback on the housing accelerator initiatives by:

- Participating in this survey by **September 30**. Please note that all survey responses will remain anonymous.
- Participating in an **open house session** in your community (staff will be available to answer questions and receive comments)
  - September 11 | 6 to 7:30 p.m. | Windsor Community Centre, 78 Thomas St in Windsor
  - September 19 | 6 to 7:30 p.m. | Churchill House, 6 Main St in Hantsport

If you would like to know more about these initiatives, have any other questions regarding this survey, please contact Planner Will Hong at [whong@westhants.ca](mailto:whong@westhants.ca) or call 902-798-8391 Ext. 110

# 1. Are you a resident of West Hants Regional Municipality?

If you are not sure whether you are a resident of WHRM, use our interactive map: <https://shorturl.at/P8hu7>

- Yes
- No, I work or conduct business in WHRM
- No, I access WHRM often for services and amenities
- No, but I am looking to find housing in WHRM
- Other

# 2. The proposed initiatives will only be applicable to the serviced areas of WHRM: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor. Where in the Municipality do you live? \*

- Falmouth
- Hantsport
- Three Mile Plains
- Windsor
- Other communities in WHRM outside of the scope of these initiatives
- I don't live in WHRM

4. What type of housing do you live in? \*



Single-unit house



Semi-detached/Duplex/Two-units



Townhouse/Row house




Apartment (6 units or less)



Apartment (more than 6 units)



Mobile Home



Secondary Suite/Backyard Suite/  
Basement Suite



Assisted living/long-term care facility



Cabin

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**5.** Do you own or rent?

- Own
- Rent
- Live with family/friends and don't pay rent
- Other

**6.** Which of the following do you believe are the biggest challenges for people seeking housing in WHRM today? \*

Please select at most 3 options.

- Not enough housing options available (duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)
- Housing shortage
- Lack of rental options
- High housing price or rental cost
- Other

**7.** How satisfied are you with your current housing situation in terms of how it suits your needs? \*

(e.g., housing options, adequacy, suitability, and affordability)

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Not very satisfied
- Not satisfied at all

**8. Optional** - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.

9. The definition of housing affordability is whether the household needs to pay 30% or more of before-tax income towards housing costs (e.g., rent, mortgage, property taxes, condo fees, utilities, and other municipal services). My household spends: \*

- Less than 30% of before tax income on housing (i.e., affordable)
- More than 30% of before tax income on housing (i.e., unaffordable)

10. The current planning documents allow up to three storeys in height for residential uses in serviced areas. I think the Municipality should: \*

- Maintain the current standard (i.e., 3 storeys)
- Increase residential building height to allow 4 or 5 storeys
- Increase residential building height to allow 6+ storeys
- Other (Please explain)

11. **Optional** - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.

**12.** How many vehicles does your household own or lease? \*

- None
- One
- Two
- Three or more

**13.** When you park at your primary residence, where do you typically park?

- On-street
- Off-street in my private driveway/garage
- Off-street in a private parking lot
- Off-street in a Municipal public parking lot
- I don't own/lease a vehicle
- Other

Please share your preference on the following statements:

**On a scale 1-10: 0 meaning strongly disagree, 5 meaning neither agree or disagree, and 10 meaning strongly agree**

**14.** We need more housing options in the Municipality. \*  
(e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**15.** The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl. \*  
(Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**16.** Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property owners more flexibility in serviced areas. \*  
(Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**17.** I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM. \*  
(Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**18.** I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood. \*  
(e.g., duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**19.** To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures \*  
Also known as "lot coverage requirement"

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

**20.** I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals. \*

(e.g. density bonus, height bonus)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

**21.** I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality. \*  
(Serviced areas: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Windsor)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

**22.** The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit. \*  
(Currently, the Municipality requires 1.5 parking space per dwelling unit for a residential building with more than three units)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

**23. Optional** - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

**24.** Which age group best describes you? \*

- 14 or younger
- 15-19
- 20-24
- 25-29
- 30-34
- 35-39
- 40-44
- 45-49
- 50-54
- 55-59
- 60-64
- 65+
- I prefer not to say

**25. Optional** - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

## End of Survey

Thank you for participating in the 'Addressing Housing Needs in WHRM' Survey

**Please return to Planning & Development Department at 76 Morison Dr, Windsor by September 30, 2024.**


For any other questions regarding this survey, please contact Planner Will Hong at [whong@westhants.ca](mailto:whong@westhants.ca) or call 902-798-8391 Ext. 110

## **APPENDIX 6.3**

# **Raw Survey Data & Additional Survey Comments**


1. Are you a resident of West Hants Regional Municipality?

● Yes	300
● No, I work or conduct business in WHRM	6
● No, I access WHRM often for services and amenities	3
● No, but I am looking to find housing in WHRM	9
● Other	1



2. The proposed initiatives will only be applicable to the serviced areas of WHRM: Falmouth, Hantsport, Three Mile Plains and Winds...


● Falmouth	50
● Hantsport	30
● Three Mile Plains	38
● Windsor	98
● Other communities in WHRM outside of the scope these initiatives	85
● I don't live in WHRM	0



3. If you were moving to WHRM, do you plan to own or rent?


*\*this question is only open to participants who are identified as non-residents*

● Own	7
● Rent/lease	4
● I am not sure	4




4. What type of housing do you live in?

● Single-unit house	233
● Semi-detached/Duplex/Two-units	21
● Townhouse/Row house	3
● Apartment (6 units or less)	14
● Apartment (more than 6 units)	10
● Mobile Home	11
● Secondary Suite/Backyard Suite/Basement Suite	3
● Assisted living/long-term care facility	0
● Cabin	2
● Other	4




5. Do you own or rent?

● Own	232
● Rent	51
● Live with family/friends and don't pay rent	11
● Other	5




6. Which of the following do you believe are the biggest challenges for people seeking housing in WHRM today?

● Not enough housing options available (duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouse)	100
● Housing shortage	100
● Lack of rental options	136
● High housing price or rental cost	253
● Other	30



7. How satisfied are you with your current housing situation in terms of how it suits your needs?

● Very satisfied	154
● Somewhat satisfied	91
● Not very satisfied	32
● Not satisfied at all	24



Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.

Id	Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.
6	Need help MAINTAINING the home. Roofing/shingling, repairs, etc. Disability does not allow for those costs.
8	Being houseless is no joke - we need shelter for the winter months and there is nothing affordable in the province let alone in the municipality -- this is a Canadian problem not just a local one
11	Would like to move but housing has jacked up so high, along with taxes and interest rates that that doesn't seem feasible. We'd be paying considerably more for considerably less housing. It seems over and above the normal inflation that we've previously experienced.
14	<p>There needs to be more options for families that are AFFORDABLE. 1200 a month for a bachelor apt in Windsor is insane, and trying to find a rental in TMP is nearly impossible. Most rentals outside of town are also extremely cost prohibitive for young families!</p> <p>The amount of landlords who put "mature professionals only" as a way to say NO CHILDREN is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>We have the crossing for people 55+, now the woodlands in TMP is also only for people 55+!</p> <p>We need these sort of communities for FAMILIES WHO HAVE CHILDREN.</p> <p>I am currently in a living situation that is FAR from ideal, because my family could not possibly afford to both pay the rental prices, and be able to eat!!</p>
15	My landlord is an ***. Won't fix anything and is going around talking shit about me.
16	Although my rent has increased the legal percentage every year for the past three years and I'm certain it will continue to increase yearly
23	Very very over priced. Gotta work 2 jobs just to even pay the bills and keep food on the table.
25	It will always be cheaper to stay in your own home than to downsize to a rental situation that you couldn't afford even if you had 2 incomes. I understand ROI but the province should cap rents at affordable living rates.
26	As a senior it will help to have help with yardwork and other house maintenance.
30	Interest rates are too high
31	Desperate people in WHRM are taken advantage of by landlords who rent condemnable units, and a town who won't fix their horrendous sewage water overflow problem. Standards need to be put in place and affordable housing established.
42	Housing and rental pricing is as high and in some cases higher than the most sought after areas of Halifax. There are no amenities here and it makes no sense to gouge residents here in this way. There needs to be reasonable and affordable housing for our residents.
44	The current rental prices in Windsor and all over NS are just ridiculous. It's difficult to provide with a single outcome and having a second outcome does not make a huge difference.
45	More low cost housing for single moms
48	We are lucky and own our own house already and do not experience a lot of the same challenges as those who are renting or looking for a house in the current market
50	We need affordable housing.

**Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.**

51	Our family was lucky to have bought a house in 2017, but now we (and many others) find ourselves stuck in a starter home that no longer meets our needs.
52	I'm personally not needing housing. But would like to see options for more low income to move closer to amenities. Especially for Seniors.
53	I am a single women living in a 1 bedroom for 1025/mth I am able to afford barley if I have a rent increase or lose hours I will be in trouble. I am also stuck here because if I move the rent would never be 1000\$ or less
54	Mortgage rates are through the roof and middle class doesn't qualify for ANY initiatives. Middle class is suffering now just as much as low income and i work with low income individuals and DO THEIR BUDGETS and help them access resources, I KNOW they are struggling but I know we are struggling too. West hants offers support for property taxes but how many people really qualify for that??
56	PVSC assessments dictating tax bills is a joke, they don't even step foot inside a home
57	Difficult to have repairs done by landlord.
59	More affordable housing/rental options
61	Looking for a new hour to accommodate my family but cannot afford it
65	Most places now require you to do a credit check even before looking at a rental. I had a friend looking for a place and 95 percent of what she found was no children no pets senior or single quiet people only. Down payment was first and last months rent plus damage deposit and there are hidden fees everywhere.
66	I am fortunate to have purchased our property before the cost of housing increased dramatically. Others are not as fortunate.
67	Living on a flood plain - every time it rains I think about flash floods and lost lives. Every. Single. Time.
70	It's extremely small, I live in a tiny 2 bedroom basement apartment and we are a family of 4
72	Mortgage is too high as on single income
78	I live with family, seniors which is not ideal. I work full time in the community in ***** and I play a huge role in the community yet, all I give is not returned there is no viable safe decent priced pet friendly houseing. The old hospital isnt for quiet professionals.
79	New landlords do not take care of building or yard. We use to have the building cleaned 2 times a week now once every other week and not well. Grass is not cut unless they want to rent out a unit.
81	A lot of us paid premium prices and taxes to live in an area of peace not over run with apartment complexes and land clearing.
85	New owners took over. My rent went up 5%by Dec 1/2024. I'm 72 and seniors do not have extra income to match rent increases. More than just me. No elevator in this three story building.
92	I have a rental that needs repair and also my power bills are way to high.I believe everyone should be able to live in a decent rental.Rentals should be inspected every 1-2 years.I would love an affordable and decent place to live within our community.
93	The fixed term leases causing distress of not being renewed for any reason they want to give( or not give)
95	Landlords overpricing rental
96	Municipality and province need to work together to allow more developers to develop all lands whether deemed marshland or farmland

Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.

98	Taxes need to stay stable or decrease, do not rely on "programs" to help. No money to make repairs or upkeep our homes. Money should also be made available to help people maintain their home!
100	As a single mother of 2, the cost of rent is not affordable. I work full time and still just make enough to pay rent. I also live in a house that has mold issues and the basement floods every time it rains heavily. I will never be able to own a home of my own.
103	When we down size from our home we want to stay in West Hants. We don't want to live in a HIGH RISE apartment or mini home.
104	The area is being serviced. Any significant increase in numbers will put a strain on water and sewer systems school and overall quality of life.
107	Affordability, particularly as it relates to very high property taxes within the town. It discourages property upkeep and maintenance or property upgrades to avoid higher property assessments that ultimately leads to higher property taxes.
108	We lucked into buying my in-laws house, otherwise we wouldn't be able to afford to own
110	Don't bring people in if there isn't any houses for them... and I don't like people anyways, I like quiet... something that soon isn't going to exist
111	By-laws for property improvement are barriers for adequate quality of living
116	The infrastructure needs to be updated before new developments are added/ tied in.
117	This place is old and not insulated. My power bill is higher than a person that lives in a house with 4 people. We have mold and our heat pump doesn't work properly and it spits out black powder. My landlord is not interested in making any repairs at this time. I need a two bedroom preferably without stairs and a clean environment. I need something that is accessible. Lower rental with everything included would be ideal.
120	Allowed live stock
128	Rent regulation
130	Water/sewage, power rates and property taxes are not very affordable
131	Owner cuts corners and neglects proper maintenance. We are blind and I have some mobility challenges on a 3rd floor. Need accessible safer home.
132	I purchased before the Inflation, now it is too expensive especially for young people, options to rent or buy now is more for elderly people. Lot of new retiring communities are being built so all made to not attract young people unfortunately. Also please include garages in new houses, I miss that in my house. And tax for owners is super high. And please improve quality of city water.
134	Every year the rent is going up & will soon be unaffordable as we are very close to the 30 per cent
137	215
140	Street is in horrible condition
141	Prices of land and homes have skyrocketed since the pandemic. We were fortunate to have worked hard all our lives and paid for and built our home. Stop the greed of apartment/home pricing. Then there is no need to build these huge monstrosities in our communities.
143	Stop building more houses until we have Doctors for today's residents

**Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.**

144	The landlord does not want to repair the water damage and leaks inside my porch that have been going on since he took the place over. The roof that was put on was done by family members without experience. The leaking continued, the ceiling in my porch is soon going to fall in. There is rot in the wall behind the bathtub water spout which is leaking onto my kitchen ceiling collecting black mold. The second bedroom is starting to look like the porch and the hall upstairs is starting to leak as well. Rot under the kitchen window. When work gets done to the other units, a professional contractor is hired. When work gets done to my place it is the landlord doing the work. He replaced rotten boards on my steps, didn't cut them to size so there are random boards sticking out for someone to trip over.
145	I am getting older and live alone and find the upkeep of my home is getting to be too much. However I can not afford rent prices in or around town. In order for this to change my daughter is looking into an inlaw suite however she would need the piece of land next to her that is owned by the municipality and is not for sale at this time.
153	Landlords should be restricted regarding rental amounts
154	There are too many short term rentals in the area.
160	Development in surrounding area is affecting my resale price as well as my outlook/ happiness with my surrounding area.
163	In area with water service and lot is large enough for septic; road paved; pleasant neighbourhood.
165	While my home is suitable now indoors about the future as my spouse and I age. We'll probably downsize and there aren't affordable options in the area. We can't afford the exorbitant prices of The Crossing.
166	For the size of the immediate subdivisions around me, there is no recreation site (slide & swing) for kids to use.
169	Building 87 apartments on the lot next-door in a rural area is wrong on so many levels. It will get passed by council because it's pushed by the federal government to do so, Meeting, we have no voice and the people we elect are not doing their job
172	Mould problems and property managers will not fix things because they want us to leave so they can charge more for rent.
177	I moved to a rural area from the city. The new developments are negatively impacting me.
178	Because of this housing crisis I don't have a clue what I am going to do.
179	House floods due to poor infrastructure.
188	Water and sewer would be nice. Plus better cell service.
194	are you over riding some subdivisions that have the clause single family dwelling only, no rental buildings etc
196	It's amazing that you allow rentals beside people that own their own house There valley of their house would go down if there beside Keep bringing people into Falmouth without upgrading water sewer schools Not fair to the people that lived here for awhile
197	There are many tents in Windsor too and these tent persons need bathrooms and help and care! Its fear driving the increase so lets UP THE LOVE & Understanding.
203	There are very few people who can't afford a mortgage IF they know how to budget and are responsible with their income. Government hand-outs have created unreasonable financial expectations. I believe the next generation could be more successful if they were taught fiscal responsibility in school.

Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.

206	Need for new well and septic
208	Renting and owning is all fine and dandy but utilities are outrageous, so is cost of living, and cost of heating.
214	We want to add a second suite in the basement for a friend to live in but don't have the financing, and can't get a contractor to even come look and give an estimate
215	I am satisfied because I own my home, what is unacceptable is adding more "homes" in communities where the infrastructure cannot support them. There is not an adequate hospital, roads, water or sewer systems. And a local government whi doesn't notice or care about these issues.
216	People should be payed a living wage to afford the prices wanted for a substandard rental
219	Sewer upgrades
221	I own a duplex so I appreciate the income aspect. But my living space is really too big for one person, but I don't see any other suitable ownership opportunities right now.
223	I'd rather my community have nice housing versus ugly affordable housing.
224	Please stop building and approving developments in the black community without consulting us. This isn't sufficient, we need clear representation on all committees and a hired liaison from the municipality to the community to ensure our needs are met
225	The base charges on things caught me by surprise since I moved from HRM. I also pay higher land taxes with zero services (excluding snow and garbage which are half as good). I don't know how young people could afford to live here and commute.
227	Stop building on Farm land. Just stop building until the infrastructure is built to handle it. We need a hospital that is open 24/7 and more Schools
232	Public transit is desperately needed here.
233	Condos on the waterfront please
236	The property taxes here are outrageous for how little it seems to go toward the actual infrastructure.
237	My housing needs include the area I live in. The character of neighborhoods should be protected to some degree. A person who has invested time and money in maintaining a property should not have to worry that a 3 story box that does not fit with their neighborhood is going to be built next to them. The old zoning ideas were important to maintain the character of neighborhoods.
238	Something has to be done about wells for people outside of the serviced areas. As more houses are built and more areas developed the people will wells can have issues with wells running dry where they never ran dry before. Also with the cost of potable water being raised it hurts people on wells that need this water when their wells run dry by increasing their costs.
244	We are fine, but I consider it appalling that there are more than 20 people living in tents in Windsor, more in the rural areas and many, many more in unsustainable situations.
246	We need an increase in services before more housing is added, everything is already stretched so thin
248	I am a satisfied with my current housing. I am concerned about the next generation having the same options available and the long term impacts this will have on individuals and families.
251	Need housing grants.

Q8: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions to meet your housing needs.

253	We were very lucky to get the house we currently own. If it wasn't for a lucky financial windfall we would be homeless
256	As a small business owner and renter, I find it deplorable that housing is the only business where everyone is guaranteed a profit because they are allowed to raise rent every single year, indefinitely. The biggest step WHRM could take would be to implement rate increase caps to ensure that the locals aren't priced out of available housing.
260	My friend and her family have been living in the hotel for 2 years with a baby because there are no places to live.
261	would like it to be all on 1 floor
264	I live with my parents at almost 27 years old and can't afford to move out because the prices of things are astronomical. I can't even afford to rent and I work an average of 12 to 14 hours a day.
271	Rent is way to high plus a lot of places don't include utilities in the price anymore
273	Health care is the most important thing for my housing needs. Why bring in more people and we can't take care of the ones we currently have that paid taxes here for decade's. Not to mention all the floods etc. in our homes. Fix these issues first.
275	It would be nice to have a municipal water supply.
280	I am paying 70% of my income to rent and power. I work full time. I have to use the food bank and still we go hungry sometimes. My lease was changed to a fixed term in Feb so I think I have to leave soon.
281	We are living with family as we cannot afford the housing market right now
282	My housing situation is great for my needs but I know a lot of others who aren't as lucky
286	Current housing low income options in Windsor could use some renovation to update them and to make them more affordable (heating costs on the rise, while most of the low income housing has old drafty windows and walls with little to no insulation.
288	Taxes are too high for my area and services provided
289	Taxes are wayyyy too high for the amenities included. I pay for my own sewer, water and street lights. I pay as much in taxes as other towns that have these included. There should at least be a rebate if we pay for our own sewer and water, like other towns that have the rebate.
292	Everything available is run down and extremely over priced. Standards are beyond slipping and have totally collapsed. Nova Scotians, and Canadians more broadly are *****.
303	Bought when the market was reasonable and locals were able to get jobs
311	I wish there were active transportation options where I live. (Martock area) I work within walking/biking distance of my workplace but feel it is unsafe to walk/bike where I live due to traffic, poor or no road shoulders and constant heavy truck traffic. In a residential area where I live 70 is too high a speed for large trucks. I've lived in my home for more than 20 years and the children on my road have never felt safe walking, playing or riding bikes. I pay high property taxes for no real services other than road plowing in winter
317	Rent is to high need to have lower rent and more places need to be build for low income
320	Public transport to enable folks to live in WHRM & work within or outside WHRM; like Halifax, Lower Sackville, and Dartmouth


9. The definition of housing affordability is whether the household needs to pay 30% or more of before-tax income towards housing ...

- Less than 30% of before tax income on housing (i.e., affordable) 177
- More than 30% of before tax income on housing (i.e., unaffordable) 124



10. The current planning documents allow up to three storeys in height for residential uses in serviced areas. I think the Municipali...

- Maintain the current standard (i.e., 3 storeys) 130
- Increase residential building height to allow 4 or 5 storeys 90
- Increase residential building height to allow 6+ storeys 48
- Other (Please explain) 33



Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.

Id	Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.
1	Ensure necessary infrastructures are in place BEFORE allowing/approving building permits!!
3	I believe we have to maintain sight lines and compatibility within our historic areas .
6	You're going to cost people their backyards. Stop it.
8	Expanding while maintaining that small town feel is in the best interest of all regarding attraction and sustaining families and middle class people
10	It's not about ho high or how many it's about being affordable which right now nothing is. I'm sad for the next generation and the ones trying to make it today.
12	WHRM is facing many challenges, including those related to housing. All of the challenges will require more tax revenue and the best way to increase tax revenue is through the addition of efficient development in the form of compact, complete communities.
14	<p>I do not agree with high rise buildings being placed outside of Windsor. In town, sure, but not in Three Mile Plains.</p> <p>Many people live out here because they want a rural setting, or have animals/livestock.</p> <p>We need more things like the crossing, but for families with children and people who are under 55. It seems like every new development is only for seniors, and with how cost prohibitive rentals are, people who's families have lived here for HUNDREDS OF YEARS are being priced out of their birthplace!!</p>
19	We do not need higher than 3 stories butt ugly apartment buildings. We need green spaces, gardens, trees, water.
25	Depending on location should determine height. In an established single family neighbourhood, 3 stories is sufficient. In an area where duplexes are the norm, townhomes should be the next increase in density. Only in an area that already contains multi storey buildings would more than 3 stories be appropriate.
31	We need more housing, affordable housing! The market is not competitive enough for affordable housing. Slum landlords rent uninhabitable units at astronomical prices and people pay it because the only other option is homelessness.
39	I've see a new apartment building was recently built and it looks like it's more than 3 stories. I'm questioning the point of this question
41	We need more density. We don't need bigger towns or more sprawl, we need to build up.

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**

42	There is no need to create high rise buildings in this area. It will alter the charm of our community. The reality is if the housing was reasonable with the amount of development, and existing housing, there should be enough to go around. The bigger issue is the pricing on rentals and new construction. Our residents are moving out of the area due to pricing more than availability. These are hard working families not looking for a handout. We are failing them and as a result failing our community.
43	The cost of housing and rent in this area is incredibly high — not appealing or affordable/sustainable for young families. This needs to be addressed. Costs are more in line with HRM where there is at commercial infrastructure within walking distance for most family’s needs (diverse shopping).
48	In my opinion medium density development should be prioritized in Hantsport. There is limited space for extensive development of single family homes, and high density development is a bit out of place for the size of town
51	While we need lots of additional housing and fast, I'm concerned about a strain on infrastructure that is already literally crumbling.
61	Specific areas for apartments
62	I would support high rises
66	Building up within residential serviced areas will decrease the need for urban sprawl and pressure on existing infrastructure.
67	High rises belong in HRM not west hants
70	Please allow for family's and dogs it's a real struggle to find affordable housing for families with dogs
74	There is definitely a housing shortage due to lack of housing options. I am in agreement, we need more housing options, however, I believe we need to be very careful where we decide to put these developments ie. an apartment building does not belong in the middle of a subdivision.
78	Please build as much, but please make it affordable for those with modest incomes and allow pets, as most of us have a dog.
80	Density matters more than height. If it's gonna stay as 3 storeys that's fine, but allow triplexes and quad as of right. The PIM process for such small, valued developments is a waste of town resources and does NOT improve anything
81	I did not move from the city to live in a city. I moved for the small town and quiet life
85	High buildings destroy the footprint of Windsor. It’s so nice to keep it rural settlement. The Crossing has the high one - too expensive for most seniors and looks terrible in that community setting.

Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.

91	the best way to densify is to have go higher, up to 9 floors seem to be efficient from a HRM perspective. Areas where buildings up to 9 floors are allowed, should be included in the planning strategy and limiting these buildings in some areas may be necessary. If the planning strategy was amended this would be a transparent process where public feedback could shape the process and provide input where the are community values or areas of historical significance could be considered.
92	Three story high look nicer and feels more like a home than the higher apartments.
93	I guess that depends where the building will be built for the amount of storys it would have. If it allows more units then more storys
95	Development in West Hants is way overpriced for the majority of residents, Regular canadian Residents are being forced out due to new immigrants .
103	I believe 3 storeys is the maximum height in the downtown area. We don't want to lose our small town uniqueness and sight lines to the valley and Avon river. Max 5 stories that don't loom over existing housing in other areas.The large building in the Crossings might be OK there but ask the people who spent over \$500, 000 to have people sitting on their balconies looking into their homes. The ones that back on to that building aren't selling and some people are moving from that street.
104	Three stories is fine. Parking, etc can be addressed wiithout a scramble. This height allows for more( hopefully affordable rentals) places without butdening the small square mile of land in Hantsport.
106	The meca large storey apartments are not sustainable in small rural sectors, like Hantsport as we do not have the local services and amenities to support this influx of people. West Hants should be encouragd to build between St. Croix towards Mt Uniacke where they can access HRM amenities. Also, we need to maintain the heritage of small community living and thus, I support current standards.
111	Creating more options for permanent housing will increase the quality of life among people in west Hants. Options for renting are of course important but I believe most people are looking to invest in something they will OWN. More small village-type neighbourhoods. Wholesome and connected. Affordable.
113	To much development without the upgrade of roads,doctors,local transport,

Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.

115	Maybe having more stories in Windsor would make sense, but Three Mile Plains is a rural area and should not be allowed to have monstrous buildings in the area. The municipal should stop trying to allow too much development of big units outside of Windsor's "town" limits. What they should do is focus on forcing developers to make a certain percent of what they are developing as low-income housing that would be managed by a non-profit through the province or municipality. Not sure how it works in this province as I had left for 20 years once I came of age. So I know how the system works in Alberta.
117	I think the height of the buildings should reflect the other residential buildings in the area.
119	Keep the current height limits, but build more row houses or duplexes.
126	The height is not the issue, housing that directly relates to income is what is required, simply saying "low cost" because it's slightly below current rents does not make it affordable
129	I don't mind the height and the extra accommodations, but I don't think the existing infrastructure and businesses can support it.
130	Only makes sense to increase the height if the rate to rent is going to be affordable. We need lower rental rates for the area
137	2366
141	I think the municipality should fix/repair or replace the existing infrastructure before allowing more apartments to be built in and around the municipality. The speed in which they are being built is staggering and thus far, none seem to be reasonably priced. If the prices were lower on rentals and family homes, there may not need be such an influx of so many apartments. I'm all for progress but I see greed making its way in and builders/ construction companies in it for the money, not the needs of the people.
143	Do not change the character of Windsor
144	I'm not sure what the point of this survey was because you know you will do what you want whether the residents of Windsor want it or not.
147	In my opinion, providing 6+ storey apartment buildings is not necessarily providing quality housing. More housing options need to be available, and building high rise apartments would be a less desirable option to meet this need
148	Increase to 4 stories would be great.
152	The municipality should approach projects that exceed the current standard on a case by case basis. Projects that want to exceed the standard should be required to include 20% of units at below market rates for rentals or sales.
153	More government help

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**

160	I think it should depend on surroundings, available resources like sewer, water capacity, drainage traffic etc. you shouldn't just stick a large tall building in an established neighborhood it's not only unsightly most times the infrastructure can't handle the extra volume. For example that multilevel monstrosity in the crossings, looks like a sore thumb in what used to be a very nice development and is causing many issues with drainage/ runoff that doesn't seem to have been taken into consideration. Who know how the water tables have been affected let alone the sewer backups etc
162	Increase the maximum building height in a manner that is compatible with the immediate surroundings. You can provide a gradual transition in terms of building heights and form. Just going from 3 storeys to 6 storeys as a blanket exercise is likely too much for some areas.
163	Consider effect on nearby lower properties.....new skyline monument above the Crossing and everything nearby!
164	I think, especially in Falmouth, an increased building height would not fit the existing community, as it is based on sprawl and many of the homes are single-family dwellings. If increased density is what WHRMis going for, especially in Falmouth, potentially reducing lot sizes and encouraging the development of townhomes into the community of Falmouth may be more beneficial without increasing the existing height restrictions.
165	While increasing storey height provides for more units, our local infrastructure and services can't meet the needs of these new residents. Our schools aren't big enough, you can't buy decent clothing or linens locally, there are no sidewalks once you leave Windsor etc.
166	I think the limit in height of a building should be the limit that fire & rescue services can reach. That way the limits on set by a tangible item that can be addressed through planning & budget considerations.
167	Placing the burden of affordable options for housing on private sector doesn't make sense, long term. Incentives only go so far, once the time has expired to offer reduced cost units they will adjust rents to market value. It's business. All 3 levels of government should be working to provide long term housing solutions for low income by building portfolios of government owned housing. Further, just providing housing isn't enough, the community services need to grow to support increased housing. This expands across many sectors from infrastructure with roads, water, sewer, and parking to public transportation options including school bussing which is currently at a tipping point. It needs to include being able meet needs for health and education as well as extracurricular, child care, and food banks. Building taller buildings on smaller lots needs more insight and planning

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**

169	This is to answer question 9 where there is no text box for other. The tax rate, water rate and all rates are going up astronomically in the municipality. Meanwhile, the population keeps going up and infrastructure isn't getting built or renewed. If you want to go higher than three stories on a residential building the municipality is going to have to provide firefighting services other than volunteer. We are already tax to death with water and municipal taxes. \$800 a year per family for RCMP, which they do not cover the 24 hour already as is. The local firefighters are great and we appreciate their services, but you can't be expecting a firefighter that drives a truck or works at Irving and is extremely out of shape to actually climb an 8 story building to save lives.
172	Only would want more height provided our fire stations have the proper height ladders and equipment in case of emergency.
175	I feel the infrastructure in Falmouth is at its max. I don't think more houses is feasible.
177	We should only be supporting single dwelling and duplex. Not 3 story build. Negative impact on area
179	The taller the building the more units it can hold meaning greater population density which hopefully means more green space saved.
188	If it's not blocking anyone make it tall, if it's in town make it short..
189	Windsor could be 6+, other towns 4-5.
195	We have no views to protect like Halifax. Allow for an unlimited as of right height limit and allow developers to decide if the market can support buildings that size.
196	No rental apartments over two storey besides existing home owner
197	The Sewer System needs tending too before we add any new housing! Please let us know about that first? Thank you
201	It is essential to consider other regional infrastructure supports such as Fire Department capacity to respond to evacuating multi-story residential buildings before changing the limitations on number of floors. This is particularly important for facilities that have elevators to meet their accessibility requirements.
203	I think the municipality needs to worry more about the infrastructure and less about building height. There is a sewage problem in Windsor. What are big apartment buildings going to do to that sewage problem? When questioned about the apartment buildings being built by Brison Development, the current mayor did not know how much of a strain the additional users would be on the sewage, water or road infrastructure.
206	buildings not more than 10 storeys
208	If you are going to push large buildings on us Rural people we need to be compensated. We moved here or built here because it wasn't like the city. You are trying to ruin our way of life pushing giant, eyesore complexes.

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**

211	We need denser housing built here. The problem is current developments are insanely expensive. In addition, they are being built for a specific demographic (retirement) which we do need. But with the amount of retirement targeted units becoming available, we don't have the support services here to support that kind of influx - doctors, dentists, transit, etc. yes we need affordable housing (I currently pay 50% of my monthly income to housing costs) but we also need support services, infrastructure and more. The municipality shouldn't be looking at just one piece of the puzzle - they all need to be discussed together.
213	West Hants is allowing an over development of our area into apartment buildings. That our working poor cannot afford to even rent. Let alone rent and save for a down payment on a first home. Our infrastructure cannot stand the strain.
214	Three stories is plenty without destroying the beautiful views. We have lots of space to spread out without spreading up.
215	Review the areas infrastructure and make decisions on a case by case basis. How many more units will be added to already stresses water and sewer systems?
221	In order to increase density, you have to go up.
223	I support increasing the height allowed but only if neighbouring properties have a veto in the project. This affects those neighbours and they may not have signed up for this change.
224	Maintain the current, anything else should be by development agreement
225	I don't want us to limit ourselves. I do see a number of buildings going up but they certainly do not meet the need nor the demographic if you want to maintain growth in the communities. Many are over priced semis. With the water issues in WHRM I am still concerned we are adding a lot of "draw" on the system without considering the upgrade to an aging infrastructure. (I am leaving out the flood zone area, I don't know enough about that).
226	I believe the height should be raised but there needs to be a serious look at escape routes in case of emergencies and the building needs to be secure for safety.
227	Only Windsor and Hantsport should have any residential buildings
228	While I answered question 9. with a suggestion to increase the allowable residential building height, I don't think it's as simple as increase or don't. It's about encouraging thoughtful development in strategic areas (more specific than just Windsor, Falmouth, TMP). For example, I believe it was a large missed opportunity to not encourage/require the developer of the new retail unit on O'Brien Street (Pet Value) to also include 2-3 floors of apartments at that extremely walkable location and it would not be appropriate to allow multi-story units to disrupt the experience and view plains from Fort Edward or Clifton House.

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**

231	Density needs to address parking concerns, especially for higher buildings. Also not good for people with mobility issues. Accessibility concerns for higher heights.
232	Please consider fixing the CSO and flooding issues, aged water lines, lack of accessibility issues and transit BEFORE trying to expand with the population in any way, shape or form with new development.
235	Speed up the approval process for multiple unit construction.
237	We have to be very careful that uncontrol development does not ruin the neighborhoods of the people who live here. There needs to be control. It would be very short sighted to allow careless development at the expense of the long term residents. Especially if we are just building homes for people that will commute to HRM. We have to look at the big picture. Density is important to stop urban sprawl, but if the density is just for commuters to HRM, it defeats the purpose.
240	We don't have the infrastructure to cram more people into smaller spaces.
243	Build better & stronger units to combat damage done by climate change
248	It will be important that our fire departments have the appropriate training and equipment to respond to the new housing in WHRM.
251	Make sure you have accessibility to disabled on 1st levels.
252	Any apartment needs parking for its tenants
253	When thinking about housing I'm sure you take the environment on which West Hants sits on into consideration. We are in a marsh basically so we need to rethink traditional apartment building design to reduce flood damage and to grow with the surrounding environment.
256	WHRM skirted established provincial & federal laws to allow for housing development on the former dairy farm on Bog Road. If they can disregard agricultural laws so easily, height restrictions should be no issue. Limiting building heights (for the sake of "the view") is ridiculous considering that many of us have to look at neighbours who have more cars in their driveway that don't move than ones that do. Generational junk and poorly maintained properties are the norm in WHRM. Restricting heights would be a slap in the face for many.
257	Residential not on ground level in downtown cores.
258	Please stop letting the rich get richer. This is outrageous, one man owns most of the town and anyone who has a half decent job can barely afford to find a place to live. Pay rent or eat. Listen to the working poor.
259	The height of new buildings should match the surrounding excising buildings.

**Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.**


260	My friend and her family have been living in the hotel for 2 years with a baby because there are no places to live.
261	2 floors is enough
263	Stop trying to put major apartment complex's in rural west hants. We live here for a reason. If you'd like to live in HRM please do so.
268	Depends on where the building is located, can create parking problums..
269	Our infrastructure has to be able to support the development. Many seniors are willing to sell their homes but there are no apartments that are affordable for fixed incomes. If their house is paid off, they feel it doesn't make sense to move and have to pay \$2000+ for rent. If there were better options this would free up more real estate.
273	Take care of our people stand up for the people you represent. Please don't be puppets for our provincial/federal government.
277	Council needs to stop listening to the few people who don't like change and do what's right to allow developers to create affordable housing. They should also insist that a few units per development be created in conjunction with Housing NS that ARE truly affordable.
278	We need to increase density and building up is a good way to do that.
286	No tall buildings, but fixed up ones downtown. These big Grey squares going up are making our town look like a concrete grey box too. The older apartments add character.
289	Do what makes sense to solve the Unhoused crisis! Someone take charge and lead the way.
292	People need to stop clutching their pearls and let go of the idea of maintaining the small town, historical buildings etc. We need more housing asap and it needs to be affordable to people. That won't happen unless we increase supply in a big way.
300	We need more high density housing. More levels means more people can live there.
303	Fix the sewer. Make a new building paynfor everything including any road upgrades to accomadate the urban spray they want to bring here. House locals first
304	in the towns +3 three storeys would be ok, but outside of the towns 3max.
306	We don't need more housing we need affordable housing. Just because you build it doesn't mean the average person can afford it. Not everyone has a 9 to 5 job, most don't. We leave this province because others pay better and have affordable housing. Something has gone terribly wrong in this one and it will soon be all outsiders, no locals can afford this standard that has been set.
309	The question i have is if "fill" is needed to be brought in, where does the three stories begin? That should be taken i to consideration when approving structures

Q11: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding residential building height in serviced areas.

311	We don't need tall apartment buildings, we need well laid out walkable 'communities' of triplexes/duplexes ect that create long term homes for families with connections to green spaces and transportation. There are lots of areas that could be nicely developed but the infrastructure is not there to support residents that do not own vehicles or choose to not use vehicles for every need. Public transport and active transport options involved in the planning process.
312	Reduce to 2 storeys.
314	The price of rent in general needs to be addressed.
315	We are allowing people to build properties for rentals that are not affordable and that bring down the value of the properties around them which is disgraceful. Allowing those two huge buildings on the corner of Gabriel has brought down the value of the houses around them because of the size and the face that multiple buildings were allowed in such a small lot. Plus this individual is charging 2300-2500 per unit. That's way more than a typical mortgage. Shame on the municipality for allowing this.
318	We must preserve Windsor's history, particularly the views from Fort Edward. Three storeys is tall enough. We don't want to become Halifax, with towering apartment complexes overshadowing homes nearby. There's a reason why people live here versus the city. We want to know our neighbours.
320	Have you given any thoughts to the infrastructure like road, water, sewer systems, flood prevention/mitigation, etd.Fix what you need to fix before building more more; causing chaos.


12. How many vehicles does your household own or lease?

● None	11
● One	108
● Two	137
● Three or more	45



13. When you park at your primary residence, where do you typically park?

● On-street	3
● Off-street in my private driveway/garage	263
● Off-street in a private parking lot	17
● Off-street in a Municipal public parking lot	2
● I don't own/lease a vehicle	9
● Other	6



Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
1	0	2	0	0	7	10	0	5	0
2	8	5	7	6	7	5	2	2	2
3	3	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0
4	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
5	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	5	5
6	8	10	0	8	10	5	10	0	10
7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	6
8	10	5	7	7	9	7	3	5	5
9	10	10	7	9	10	10	7	10	3
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	5
11	10	5	8	9	8	9	5	4	2
12	10	10	10	10	2	5	5	10	7
13	10	5	8	5	10	5	10	5	5
14	10	5	10	7	8	6	10	5	5
15	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	2	0
16	0	2	5	5	10	7	10	5	5
17	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	2
18	8	10	10	10	10	5	10	0	0
19	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	5	5
20	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	8
21	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	10	5
22	10	5	5	5	8	7	10	5	5
23	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	6
24	10	5	4	5	8	10	5	8	6
25	6	0	1	1	7	9	5	5	1
26	10	10	8	10	8	10	10	5	10
27	8	8	7	8	8	9	6	7	4
28	8	7	4	4	5	5	4	4	1
29	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0
30	4	5	5	2	2	7	5	5	5
31	10	10	0	0	10	0	5	0	0
32	2	1	3	2	1	5	1	2	5
33	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	8	2
34	10	10	10	10	10	7	9	9	10

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
35	10	5	8	8	5	2	5	2	5
36	6	2	6	2	3	5	3	6	3
37	6	7	6	7	8	9	7	5	2
38	9	9	9	9	10	10	6	6	7
39	7	4	5	2	5	3	2	8	1
40	10	5	2	3	8	10	5	3	3
41	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	6	6
42	5	5	5	3	7	5	0	3	1
43	10	8	0	0	10	10	10	10	0
44	9	9	0	0	0	8	0	10	0
45	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	10
46	10	10	10	10	5	5	10	10	5
47	6	6	5	5	5	10	10	2	5
48	10	8	10	8	10	4	3	8	7
49	10	5	8	8	8	5	9	4	3
50	10	10	10	7	8	10	10	7	9
51	10	8	8	7	10	9	8	6	9
52	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	5	5
53	9	9	9	9	9	4	10	3	8
54	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	6	5
55	0	8	7	7	0	8	5	0	5
56	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5
57	9	9	4	4	9	8	3	4	3
58	10	10	8	10	10	5	10	10	10
59	10	10	7	9	8	8	10	5	7
60	10	3	7	10	10	10	10	8	1
61	3	3	0	0	6	6	10	2	0
62	6	10	7	10	9	6	10	10	1
63	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
64	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10
65	10	8	5	5	8	9	6	1	3
66	10	10	10	10	9	10	9	1	5
67	3	5	5	5	5	0	0	4	0
68	6	2	5	2	7	7	1	7	3

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
69	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	7	5
70	10	10	4	8	8	4	6	4	4
71	8	10	8	7	8	7	9	2	0
72	10	5	5	5	8	8	10	6	5
73	5	3	5	3	7	8	5	1	5
74	10	10	0	0	10	10	7	0	5
75	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	0	4
76	10	10	7	6	10	8	10	8	1
77	10	6	8	8	9	8	6	7	0
78	10	10	10	10	10	4	10	2	7
79	10	7	7	7	7	8	7	8	2
80	10	10	10	10	10	7	6	10	10
81	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8	5
82	7	8	2	2	7	8	7	0	0
83	10	8	10	8	8	5	8	1	7
84	8	10	8	8	9	9	6	7	9
85	10	6	10	10	7	5	5	5	6
86	10	10	10	10	8	8	5	5	6
87	4	4	6	8	8	8	7	3	3
88	8	8	6	7	8	10	10	8	7
89	8	8	8	8	10	10	2	10	2
90	10	4	4	4	10	10	7	3	6
91	6	8	7	5	6	9	5	4	5
92	10	5	9	8	8	9	2	0	0
93	10	10	10	10	10	3	8	5	1
94	10	10	10	10	10	7	6	6	6
95	10	10	10	5	10	9	0	0	5
96	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	0	0
97	6	2	4	5	6	8	3	8	3
98	10	8	10	10	6	0	0	3	6
99	10	7	7	7	6	8	6	3	0
100	10	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	5
101	5	4	4	4	4	4	1	6	3
102	6	6	6	4	5	9	6	3	0

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
103	10	4	5	5	10	4	3	2	1
104	7	2	2	2	5	10	0	2	0
105	10	10	6	6	10	10	10	1	10
106	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	10	0
107	5	4	1	1	1	10	3	9	9
108	10	10	7	7	7	7	0	5	3
109	9	5	8	7	7	8	5	6	5
110	7	7	8	6	7	7	6	2	0
111	10	10	0	0	10	10	8	5	0
112	10	10	10	10	8	9	7	4	5
113	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	10
114	2	2	1	1	1	8	1	1	5
115	6	5	5	5	10	10	7	10	10
116	8	4	8	8	10	10	4	3	2
117	10	5	4	9	9	10	10	0	0
118	10	6	6	0	4	10	6	10	0
119	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5	5
120	5	5	5	5	10	10	0	10	5
121	9	8	7	7	8	8	8	7	5
122	10	7	5	5	10	10	10	0	5
123	10	10	10	10	10	7	3	4	5
124	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	3
125	10	10	8	8	8	8	8	2	8
126	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5
127	7	7	5	5	10	10	7	0	0
128	10	10	5	5	10	10	10	5	10
129	8	10	2	2	7	8	7	6	10
130	10	10	10	10	10	7	10	8	2
131	10	5	6	5	7	7	6	3	3
132	10	10	10	9	10	3	8	1	2
133	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10
134	10	5	9	9	9	6	7	2	2
135	10	10	5	8	5	10	10	6	6
136	10	10	7	7	7	10	1	7	5

Q14-22:Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
137	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	7	8
138	8	5	5	5	8	9	6	2	0
139	9	8	5	7	9	7	5	2	7
140	8	1	8	8	9	8	4	5	0
141	1	4	1	1	1	9	4	8	7
142	10	7	10	10	8	5	5	7	3
143	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	8	2
144	1	1	0	0	0	10	7	0	0
145	10	5	10	10	10	5	10	5	5
146	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	8	0
147	10	5	10	10	10	10	7	2	0
148	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10
149	6	6	1	1	6	4	4	3	6
150	4	0	3	1	2	8	2	3	2
151	4	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0
152	8	10	5	5	8	10	8	5	0
153	8	8	9	9	10	8	5	1	5
154	8	7	8	8	8	8	3	2	3
155	5	10	5	5	10	8	6	5	1
156	9	9	3	1	5	9	9	5	3
157	10	10	10	10	10	2	1	8	8
158	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	7	0
159	8	10	7	6	10	9	4	4	3
160	7	7	3	2	8	10	7	5	2
161	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	1	8
162	7	7	6	5	9	8	7	7	9
163	8	10	8	9	8	9	5	8	7
164	9	8	9	10	9	10	6	7	7
165	8	8	7	7	7	9	10	2	4
166	8	9	6	6	9	8	9	5	0
167	10	7	4	4	8	8	2	2	2
168	8	5	7	5	7	7	3	5	5
169	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	10	7
170	5	5	7	7	7	10	5	4	5

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
171	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	0
172	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	4	0
173	10	7	8	8	10	10	10	5	5
174	4	4	4	4	4	6	5	2	4
175	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	10
176	10	8	8	8	10	10	10	3	0
177	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0
178	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1	5
179	7	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	3
180	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	6
181	7	7	1	1	1	3	4	6	9
182	10	10	7	7	10	10	5	7	5
183	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	4	0
184	4	2	1	1	1	9	2	5	2
185	7	7	2	2	8	10	5	8	8
186	10	8	8	5	9	10	7	5	5
187	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	10	10
188	5	7	10	5	10	10	5	3	10
189	5	7	7	7	7	7	5	8	2
190	10	10	10	5	1	2	0	9	10
191	10	10	10	10	10	7	10	4	0
192	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0
193	10	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	0
194	8	0	0	3	0	7	2	2	4
195	10	10	10	10	0	0	10	0	10
196	0	0	0	0	10	10	5	10	10
197	10	10	6	6	10	10	10	5	8
198	7	7	7	7	8	5	8	7	9
199	3	3	0	0	10	8	0	9	5
200	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	1
201	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0
202	10	8	10	5	9	7	10	8	7
203	5	3	5	3	5	10	5	5	5
204	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1	5

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
205	8	9	8	8	8	7	6	9	3
206	10	10	10	8	8	9	9	2	7
207	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0
208	10	0	5	7	10	10	0	5	0
209	1	1	1	1	9	10	0	10	10
210	6	6	7	5	8	5	6	6	4
211	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1
212	8	4	6	5	7	8	6	7	2
213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
214	8	7	8	9	8	4	5	5	4
215	8	4	3	0	8	10	0	2	0
216	1	5	5	5	5	8	1	1	5
217	10	10	10	10	9	10	0	5	5
218	9	9	6	6	7	8	8	2	6
219	9	5	4	5	10	8	4	7	2
220	10	10	10	10	1	4	8	10	10
221	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	5	8
222	10	8	10	10	10	5	7	6	5
223	1	0	0	0	8	9	0	10	5
224	8	5	9	9	9	10	0	0	0
225	6	8	8	8	6	10	3	4	5
226	5	7	6	5	9	9	9	2	0
227	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4	10
228	10	10	8	8	10	8	5	5	0
229	10	7	8	10	10	4	3	5	5
230	5	7	7	7	9	9	3	4	3
231	9	6	8	8	9	7	7	3	3
232	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	1	1
233	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	10
234	0	10	0	0	10	10	5	5	0
235	10	10	10	10	10	2	10	10	10
236	10	0	6	5	5	10	0	0	5
237	6	6	2	0	10	10	0	8	5
238	3	3	3	2	4	7	2	2	2

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
239	1	1	1	1	3	10	3	3	1
240	0	0	0	0	3	10	1	0	0
241	8	1	10	10	10	8	5	5	5
242	10	7	10	10	10	10	5	8	0
243	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	1
244	10	10	6	1	6	10	0	4	2
245	9	10	8	8	10	9	2	8	8
246	7	8	7	3	7	8	7	0	0
247	8	8	8	7	7	10	9	4	1
248	10	10	10	7	9	5	7	6	1
249	5	1	1	1	2	1	0	6	1
250	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	0
251	5	10	10	5	5	5	5	0	0
252	5	10	6	2	0	10	0	0	0
253	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	3	10
254	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0
255	5	8	8	10	7	10	5	10	5
256	10	10	10	10	10	4	0	10	5
257	10	7	4	5	5	10	6	7	0
258	10	10	10	5	9	7	5	0	5
259	10	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	5
260	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	10
261	6	8	2	1	7	8	8	2	2
262	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	4	2
263	5	0	5	6	0	10	10	7	5
264	10	8	8	8	10	8	8	5	5
265	5	4	8	10	9	10	0	7	8
266	5	1	1	1	0	10	1	5	1
267	10	7	5	5	7	8	0	3	3
268	10	5	6	9	10	10	10	0	5
269	6	8	10	10	10	10	10	5	5
270	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
271	5	5	10	5	5	5	10	5	10
272	8	10	8	5	2	9	7	2	5

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
273	2	2	2	2	5	5	2	2	2
274	6	7	5	5	7	5	8	6	4
275	10	4	5	5	6	8	4	2	2
276	10	10	9	10	10	3	10	4	2
277	10	9	10	10	8	7	10	2	8
278	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5
279	8	8	10	9	10	9	10	1	0
280	10	10	7	7	5	5	8	8	5
281	7	5	5	7	7	5	8	4	4
282	10	9	5	5	6	7	9	1	5
283	10	9	8	8	8	10	8	2	0
284	5	5	7	5	7	7	4	1	5
285	4	2	1	1	3	9	2	4	1
286	3	9	1	1	0	6	0	10	6
287	7	7	6	3	10	8	7	5	2
288	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	2
289	10	10	10	5	10	6	6	8	3
290	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10
291	10	5	5	1	7	5	0	2	2
292	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	0	0
293	6	4	4	5	7	10	10	5	3
294	5	5	3	3	7	5	7	7	7
295	10	10	10	8	10	10	9	9	8
296	7	6	8	7	7	7	7	7	5
297	10	10	10	10	10	8	0	6	6
298	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	7
299	10	7	10	9	10	10	8	8	5
300	10	10	10	10	5	0	10	5	0
301	5	0	5	0	5	10	5	7	5
302	10	7	9	9	9	8	10	6	7
303	5	5	0	0	0	10	5	10	0
304	7	8	10	7	7	7	3	7	10
305	7	8	5	6	6	5	6	6	1
306	3	3	5	5	5	5	10	0	10

Q14-22: Preference Questions, participants were asked to rate their preference with each statement on a Likert scale from 1-10, with 10 meaning strongly agree, 5 meaning neither agree nor disagree, and 0 meaning strongly disagree.

Id	We need more housing options in the Municipality.	The Municipality needs to accommodate more housing to meet diverse needs of different residents, and it should allow greater density in serviced areas rather than encouraging sprawl.	Many rural municipalities in NS allow up to 3-4 dwelling units per property in serviced areas (e.g., Town of Antigonish, Victoria County, Town of Yarmouth). WHRM should also allow residential property	I think allowing up to four dwelling units per property in serviced areas is a good starting point to address the housing needs in WHRM.	I support more housing types in residential areas provided they are compatible in scale with the existing neighborhood.	To preserve green space and prevent water runoff, the Municipality should regulate the maximum percentage of a residential properties surface that is covered by buildings or structures	I think the Municipality should incentivize large developments to provide affordable housing units within proposals.	I think there is enough parking available within serviced areas of the Municipality.	The Municipality should reduce the minimum parking requirements for residential buildings to one parking space per dwelling unit.
307	7	7	7	4	8	6	2	4	2
308	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	3
309	10	0	5	5	10	10	4	4	0
310	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	9	8
311	10	2	8	6	10	10	6	0	0
312	4	1	8	5	8	9	1	6	2
313	8	9	9	5	8	5	8	4	5
314	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
315	5	5	0	0	7	8	0	0	5
316	8	8	8	8	8	6	7	9	9
317	10	5	10	10	10	10	5	3	10
318	6	4	4	4	6	6	5	7	3
319	8	10	7	7	8	10	10	4	1
320	2	0	2	6	2	10	1	2	0

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

Id	Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.
1	On street parking causes issues for homeowners. Can't see to back out of driveways, service vehicles have no parking as residents using streets as they don't have enough driveway parking, limited visibility.
3	My visitors have a difficult time parking for a visit let alone our oil deliveries etc. no more density in our architectural zone or downtown. Since you rent out parking spaces at Elmcroft you should know we are at or over our capacity .
5	I would love to see less space taken up by parking lots, but I believe they are still needed, even in serviced areas. As it is now, many people still struggle to find a space close to their destination. We do not have adequate public transit or sidewalks in many areas, and though people are choosing to bike or walk, the roads are often not safe for cyclists or pedestrians. We are still a car-dependent society, especially with so many people who live in WHRM and work elsewhere.
12	I think increasing the total number of units on serviced lots is important, however, currently, I would limit it to areas with appropriate infrastructure. Once the combined infrastructure in Windsor proper is resolved and the flooding is minimized, then I believe it would be best to remove many if not most restrictions on the development of housing within the Town. With regard to incentives for affordable housing within large developments - the devil is in the details but please not inclusionary zoning. It only serves as a disincentive for developers and it is inherently unfair to make new residents pay more while existing residents have benefitted from the conditions that have allowed this housing crisis to occur in the first place.
14	Please make sure that these new *affordable housing options* are actually affordable. 1000+ per month is extremely prohibitive to many families with young children, hence why many are living with their parents or other family members.
19	Why duplex, tri plex, four Plex, more than 3 story high? Why not smaller footages and affordable housing? Outside of Windsor, there could be 'tiny' homes, container built homes. Smaller homes but still single dwelling.
25	With no public transit and most families having two or more working members, limiting parking serves to only discourage living in this area. The only demographic this works for are retired seniors.
31	WHRM is a rural area with minimal job opportunities. 95% of employed persons living in this area will need to commute to work or school. At minimum there should be 1 parking space per paying tenant. Shorting parking is directly discouraging people from choosing to live in whrm
36	Rural communities outside the serviced areas should have incentives or make it easier to subdivide so more homes could be built outside the serviced areas. It seems subdividing land in west Hants is discouraged by the regulations and costs associated. Have some incentives in that area.
39	Some families require 2 cars for work purposes. Where will they park their second vehicle?

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

42	We don't need to jam dwellings into every square foot of land available. We need to remember that if our community grows to fulfill the amount of housing already planned, we will need more amenities, stores, bigger schools and more medical professionals. There will be no room to facilitate this if all land is developed with housing. We need to concentrate on facilitating the needs of our residents with reasonable housing options.
43	Rental cost too high. Growth too fast—implement water and sewage facilities to support current growth.
44	West hants is a small community and should stay as such. Trying to turn it into a city area is despicable
46	What about housing needs on Chester Road? Especially seniors housing. Dill Road has municipality services ..just a thought
47	We're already dealing with multiple CSO issues on a regular basis. I can't see cramming more people and buildings into the space as progress
48	I think some of the incentives to encourage high density development would be appropriate in Windsor, but medium density would be more appropriate in the other identified communities (Hantsport, TMP, Falmouth)
51	You could lower parking requirements if there was literally any kind of public transportation. Even bike paths in and out of the more densely populated areas. A lot of people would consider using e-bikes if it was a feasible option.
54	Why is parking being focused on
61	There's lots of places available but they're not affordable. Increase of building new we need to control the cost of what's built now. Reduce rent prices in large buildings which discourages greedy landlords with illegal apartments.
79	Stop landlords from doubling rents after a tenant moves out of a unit. Any properties not being looked after the landlord should be fined.
80	CLEAN, MAINTAIN, AND UPGRADE THE DANG SEWER SYSTEM Build specific surface water run off pipes that directly connect to the lake or reservoir on Gray / Stannus / Victoria in Windsor. That's easily 50% of flooding issues gone right there.
83	With your concern to run off if you allow a property to have a large percentage of it covered with a building then require that it have a living roof that would allow for more absorption of the water keep the building cooler and then run off could be very specifically directed. Parking wouldn't be such an issue if we had public transportation. Many people wouldn't require a car or parking if this service was provided. Many people are already using e-bikes for the transportation and require much less space.
84	Bonus points for underground electricity services. And roofs suitable for solar.
85	No matter what type of building is constructed it has to be affordable. No sense in creating a palace when no one can use it. We are not RICH seniors. Please keep that in mind.
88	Suburban sprawl has been done elsewhere and the failures created are well documented. Disconnected pockets of development, pedestrian unfriendly, car dependent..... WHRM is in a position to do things better. Developers will always build what works for them. Let's make it work for us as well.

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

89	People need cars in a rural community. Until there is effective and inexpensive public transport we need to ensure proper parking
91	I strongly agree with creating communities with a higher population density. The purpose of this initiative would be to limit the urban sprawl and allowing the green spaces we value in the municipality. both agriculture and forested areas, to exist without pressure of development.
92	If a family is renting a unit with only one parking spot it will cause issues. Most rentals need a two person income so if the father worked in the city and the mother works in New Minas and we're only given one spot for parking where would the other parent park? Also they may have a child that works also. Family units need two parking spots for sure. Retired people maybe one parking spot.
95	Affordability either renting or purchasing a home is many times beyond a persons means. It is unfortunate that the landlords renting an apt. Or house are not controlled In regards to dollar amounts.
98	Remove building permits on small buildings such as sheds and small hobby shops. People need income and man caves more than ever. Stop over burdening people with red tape
102	When considering parking one must also take in to account the no parking bans in winter. Is there any thought to obliging builders to put in charging stations for electric cars?
103	You aren't going to take my answers with this survey seriously as we don't live in a serviced area in WHRM. We however shop and eat in Windsor and may one day live there. We don't want high rise apartments ruining the downtown landscape and charm. Yes we need more housing but this won't take care of the existing WHRM residents looking for now. We are seeing a greater influx of people from outside the area looking for more affordable housing than what is in HRM. HRM is in a building boom and yet they can't meet the need of affordable housing and I don't mean income based housing. Investors don't want to spend multi millions of dollars and take more than 20 years to pay it off. The Province needs to build housing based on income. What is affordable to one is not to another of people. I wish you luck on this. We want growth just don't forget, you have a MAJOR problem with water and sewer now. Where is all the money coming for that? Hmm maybe the taxes from the RURAL WHRM residents that won't benefit.
104	Incentives to a big business is simply a profit item. Parking is crucial if you want safety for the many children and walkers in this community. I strongly disagree that density is the key. Affordable, quality housing that can be supported by the area infrastructure must be the priority. Duplexes and small two- three story dwellings will allow for this. Attention to affordable rentals is important.

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

106	<p>Hantsport is not ready for urban sprawl and development as we are one square mile. I would focus instead on renovating Main St., adding a restaurant and extending tourism to this region. I think the introduction of high storey apartments will ruin tourism in Windsor and Hantsport. You have an opportunity to create a great culture and arts community in both hubs and Windsor is well on its way. Now, extend that into Hantsport - invite businesses to have a pub in Hantsport - there are so many new young families who want walkable services in town, as Windsor is experiencing. Adding high storey apartments will ruin the charm and people will bypass and head to Wolfville as they have maintained their building regulations keeping its charm. And do something with the Windsor waterfront! Add some small boutiques, model the Halifax waterfront!!</p>
107	<p>I strongly oppose new building units within the town of Windsor until our current infrastructure has been updated to support current resident's needs. Our current infrastructure within the town is not reliable or stable enough to support current residents let alone adding more stress with additional units that the current system was not designed to supply. In addition, affordability of homes within the town is within reach however is avoided due to high property tax within the town. It is unclear to me and other residents what the strategic plan is for the municipality and the town and how our development plans contributes to the success of this plan and lives of its residents.</p>
109	<p>Fully support additional housing, even cooperative housing, in Windsor only if our sewer system can support it and it's affordable to the majority.</p>
115	<p>A lot of these questions are loaded and do not give a lot of freedom in how you answer them. I think a less strict approach to your research efforts would give more freedom in how one answers questions. West Hants should not incentivize developers by giving them boons such as variances on height and density. They should force them to provide low-income housing or not award the permits to them to build. If developers are going to make big money in West Hants that should be the price of business. Stop kissing developers' asses to make them come here. Our sewage system can't even handle what we have now - what do you think will happen if you keep allowing big projects to go through without updating the current system? The people downtown who constantly get CSO in their yards and houses deserve better. I feel bad for them, what a nightmare that would be to live like that. I'm thankful I'm on a hill in TMP everytime it floods from heavy rains.</p>
117	<p>Families need two vehicles. Most families have two people working in order to cover the high cost of renting.</p>
119	<p>Build a small, two level parking garage next to the new intended group residences, for use by the residents.</p>
126	<p>If "affordable" units are being built they need to actually be affordable and the only way to do that is to tie the rent paid to the income received</p>
128	<p>Occupants who pay high rental rates should not have to pay extra for parking, that's gouging.</p>
137	<p>2355</p>

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

140	Street parking should be allowed all year round unless calls of more than 5 cm of snow is predicted
144	Building more housing isn't going to help low income people. The low income housing that exists now isn't properly managed and the units are so small they don't even have a normal kitchen. Apartments should be 800 square feet to accommodate being able to have more than 1 person in the apartment at a time. Some people cannot handle small spaces like people in other countries. Make special housing for them where they can happily cram themselves all in there like they are doing now.
152	We need more public housing in the municipality, and the municipality should work with the province to make this happen.  Also, the municipality should explore tiny house options.  The municipality should create a form of landlord licensing to ensure properties are maintained at a proper standard. Too many people rent unhealthy places, and landlords are required to fix them.  The municipality should support a formal rent control system at the provincial level, including a proper way for both landlords and tenants to address problems.
156	There needs to be more affordable housing for seniors. There is already plenty of high priced senior housing that most on a fixed income could not afford. The backyard suite program works for some who have an abundance of money to invest in building this upfront, but without that start up money it's nearly impossible.
160	These last few questions are a bit vague, and results could be almost misleading since there are other options not considered and some options don't provide enough detail and also current regulations are not totally understood by average taxpayer/homeowners
163	Should discourage asphalt paving in favour of compacted gravel or pavers that allow water drainage. Should discourage lawns in favour of native natural areas/trees..
164	In terms of parking requirements for residential units, I think reducing the requirement makes sense, but also that there will be a higher increase in the need for public transportation throughout the town of Windsor and surrounding communities (Falmouth, Hantsport, etc)
165	Many families are two income earners who drive separate vehicles to/for work. Reducing minimum parking requirements is ridiculous if you don't have other means of transportation/infrastructure or a plan for what people are to do with their vehicles during a snowstorm if they're having to park on the street.
167	Parking availability within Windsor town limits is already an issue with many visitors And resident receiving parking tickets. Winter months also see overnight parking bans. Many of the side streets in our region cannot accommodate street parking due to the width Insight lines, as well vehicles tend to travel at high rates speed, regardless of the posted speed limit with little to no enforcement for safety idea accommodating parking on the street an undesirable option
169	I've lost faith in our council and it's time for an election

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

173	Our area needs affordable housing for families. Well maintained low income housing for people who make minimum wage. Families need townhouses/duplexes/fourplexes with a greenspace for children to play safely. Not big apartment buildings.
177	We need to build our roads and infrastructure even before looking at this. 3 story builds should not be a option. Look at Enfield and elmsdale. Great models.
179	Larger buildings with more units and less sprawl will ensure green space is protected for people and animals
188	Jeff for Mayor
190	Build build build!!!
191	Per the parking points: until we have light rail in this province, I feel we cannot reduce parking spaces or lots. We need more parking because there is a lack of jobs in West Hants. As a current city dweller, and formerly of Kentville area, I believe that cars are not going anywhere anytime soon and that municipalities need to have the infrastructure to accomodate commuters, whether they live on Gerrish or in Brooklyn.  Per the housing points: Mobile homes are ideal for families just getting started, as well as townhouses. Having more of these options available for rent to all families (not just the 55 plus crowd) would be beneficial.
195	Number 17- forget preserving character. Just allow development. Number 21- forget parking requirements.
196	With the increase in housing and cost of housing that means a increase in property tax Where is the money going I don't see a increase in service from past years
201	We have insufficient affordable accessible housing and this must be addressed to meet the needs of our residents and aging population. Until such time as there is a public transit service operational in the region it is not reasonable to reduce parking requirements.
202	More affordable housing. Not more apartments with granite countertops and dishwashers for \$3000 per month that no one in this area can afford.
203	The Town of Windsor can't support the infrastructure it has now. Allowing 4 or 5 families to live on the same lot will put a greater strain on this.
206	The Municipality should support NGO's by providing tax exemptions to NGOs seeking to create affordable housing models.

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

208	<p>Our current infrastructure cannot support more development and clearly needs upgraded first and foremost, along with bringing in the health care professionals required to handle and sustain the current and future population booms before we even consider expanding elsewhere. Our education system is also currently over-burdened with new students and this will need to be figured out and sorted before new development can come to our area. We've also got existing developments and homes that have no internet access, and little to no cell coverage.</p> <p>I think the idea of tiny homes or middle sized homes, several to a lot, is a great idea....HOWEVER my fear is what is currently happening with big developments in Nova Scotia. The developers are rich "out of towners" (Ontario, India, etc.), who collect rent money from Nova Scotians, and then spend that money in other provinces or countries, crippling our economy, and taking advantage of the housing situation by raising rents to ridiculous amounts while investing none of the money into repairs or upkeep of the buildings and properties. Now these same developers are going to buy up all the land, slap 6 to 8 tiny homes on it, charge every one of them rent, and make more of a killing than they already are building houses and duplexes to rent. This money is also not going to stay in the province, and the cycle repeats itself. We need to incentivize ONLY LOCAL developers to provide these homes, to ensure that the money stays in the province to bolster our already hurting economy.</p> <p>We are losing more and more of our green spaces and forests, we need to look at other options first.</p> <p>Parking in Windsor at least needs to be increased. During the Winter snow removal times there is nowhere for a good portion of the town to park.</p>
213	Stop turning West Hants into nothing but landlord owned apartment buildings
214	The municipality needs to allow tiny homes to be placed on lots and recognize tiny homes as actual residential units. Entire tiny home communities can exist in a single residential lot, without ruining the views.
221	The decisions on development made today should be looking 30 years out. Building heights should be reasonable but not be afraid of going higher. Parking on street is difficult in some areas of Windsor so providing parking in a parking facility where available would be good. Affordable housing should be made more widely available to suit a broader range of incomes. Rental units are hard to come by and very expensive.
224	Do not reduce the parking requirements please
226	1.5 space for parking is ridiculous. Who has a 1/2 car? I need more info in order to answer some of these questions so I will attend one of the meetings. In any case I strongly urge there be a bi-law put in place that whatever the building is, there has to be absolutely no garbage or junk laying around on the property. This will deter people from wanting to live there and gives the residents who live there a bad reputation.
227	Leave Falmouth alone. Over development has ruined the nice country town environment
231	Some residents will never have their own car. Pick-up and drop off areas and parking for visitors needs should be part of development proposals.

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

232	Public transit is needed before you cap parking per residence. You want fewer cars??? Make that possible with public transit.
233	Housing is needed but road and sewer infrastructure must support it
240	We do not have enough infrastructure to cram more people into smaller spaces. We are a rural communities with an ER room that can barely stay open. We don't have public transit. Our schools are already at capacity. Putting housing in place for people that we can't support with public services is irresponsible and dangerous! It is a greedy grab for more tax dollars and incredibly short-sighted. I hope the council and planning department have in mind what is best for the current communities and not some imagined influx of people who may/may not ever live here.
241	WHRM should consider reviewing how many vacant and dilapidated homes there are throughout the region. With incentive for repairs perhaps these could be made into affordable rental home or torn down and suitable housing developed. A rurally located mini home “park” would be beneficial to many families. Could the Masonic Lodge be purchased by someone and made into housing? Adding even a small bus for public transportation would make it possible for ppl to live on the outskirts more easily. Consider lowering the “move-in” permit requirements for new construction- ppl can live just fine with less as long as safety requirements are met- ie needs smoke alarms, heat and water but who NEEDS to have something like all kitchen cabinetry installed before moving in if they would choose otherwise? Due to processing times this can lead to significant delays during which another home could potentially be freed up for sale or rent. Ask the province to build additional low income homes on the larger rural properties that they own. Ask that blocks of rural Crown Land be made available and install driveway, well and septic- make them low rent properties as incentive to have ppl move in their own mini home, freeing up other housing units and guiding ppl towards affordable home ownership. Allowing and providing grants towards multiple ADUs on properties is an excellent idea. Extend it to include at private secondary homes ppl own ie: cottages to potentially expand the # of ppl willing create spaces that fit the criteria. Create or fund the creation of more affordable rural apartments for seniors- include incentive if their current home will be sold or rented. This would potentially free up larger homes for families and rural seniors could continue to live in their preferred setting.
243	My opinion is that the municipality should meet with developers and make it mandatory that a percentage of new units build for housing be designated for subsidized housing.
244	The problem is affordability. The municipality should lobby the Federal and Provincial governments to return to the support for non-market housing (public housing, non-profit housing, co-ops) they cut between the mid-70s and mid-80s while finding funding sources to create municipal non-market housing.
245	I don't know what the typical requirement is overall. Is 1.5 parking for each unit a standard? It's hard to state my opinion without knowing what is required.
248	It is important that units are affordable for the diverse residents of WHRM. Incentives should only be for deeply affordable housing and with several affordable units.
251	Lower rent!!!!

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.


252	Most people need two incomes to live. Which usually means two cars. Until there is sufficient public transport that can help people get to work, reducing the parking is just going to increase parking along the roads near those buildings.
256	WHRM is in no position to be dictating "coverage" for the sake of run-off when it has done absolutely NOTHING since July 2023 to mitigate the issues stemming from municipal owned or maintained properties.
257	I only have a home because my parents died. Otherwise I would have had to move to HRM.
260	My friend and her family have been living in the hotel for 2 years with a baby because there are no places to live.
262	The only reason I have affordable housing is luck. I bought at the right time and have a good rate . We gave a two person middle to upper class income . Other people in our community do not have that advantage . I consider myself to be in a position of privilege. As a social worker I can see the drastic decline in housing availability . People without homes , in tents , in trailers , hotels , living in cars. This is not acceptable . It is putting families and children at risk . Remaining in abusive unsafe relationships as they have no choices . If they were to leave many of the options are full , shelters are at their capacity , the housing options are limited . The housing crisis is creating unsafe environments for so many people . Families and their children need to have access to a stable consistent home and not worry if they will be homeless . It is essential that more affordable options are made available . The housing crisis is very evident in the province and in our rural community . Many people need access to a vehicle in a rural area as there is no public transit system in windsor or surrounding areas . So limiting parking to one car is also not realistic for an apartment building. Some of the proposed prices for "affordable" units is truly sickening and I would question affordable to whom . There needs to be regulations and limits in place on rent , and it needs to be better then what is currently in place . There needs to be a significant overhaul to housing in this province among many other things . People need housing , a safe secure environment . Safe shelter is an essential human need , not a luxury only few can afford . We do not need large scale luxury buildings . If it's larger in scale it needs to be affordable . Not luxury , safe, and secure .Condos or town houses with absurd price tags and fees are not what is needed . We need to support all of our community members not just the select few elite .
269	I have 2 acres. I'd like to be able to build a separate home on our land for our child. We are zoned for a secondary dwelling, but would be nice to consider doing both so there is space for multiple generations
272	Housing should not be built along flood plains. It should not involve cutting down forests or plowing under fields.
273	We West hantsvhave to stop bringing boat loads of people here until we get on our feet.
277	Definitely more truly affordable housing options needed. 1 bedroom to 3 bedroom.
284	Don't allow the 100 unit development on the Windsor back rd. It doesn't belong in a farming community

Q23: Optional - Please provide any additional comments or suggestions with respect to housing options, lot coverage requirements, affordability, or residential parking requirements.

286	Whrm needs to Crack down on slum lords while at the same time cracking down on the wealthy who buy up property for weekend homes and air bnbs. (Several houses in my area have been bought for both, meaning locals who would have purchased and lived full time in this area were forced further down the valley or up to the city. )
289	Why so many questions about houses? We need apartment buildings.
300	With respect to the affordable housing, a developer should not be able to back out of an agreement just because adding affordable housing might hinder profits.
303	People need cars to get around here development should take this into consideration. We are not halifax
304	we need more sidewalks and crosswalks.
306	Provide affordable housing not just structures that we all get to look at. The generation coming up will never get anywhere in this province the way things are. Sad when we have to encourage our own children to leave for somewhere better.
307	With density comes parking concerns and consideration needs to be made because of lack of public transportation.
311	If more housing is built, it will require more infrastructure and planning for green spaces, playgrounds, walking trails, active transport. I'd hate to see buildings just put up without thought to how the people who live there will access their communities.
315	We do not have the resources for such large development. Look at the high school we have one way out and one way in, if there is an emergency no help can get in if the road is blocked. We do not have enough doctors and all the dentists have waiting lists. Growth for the sake of growth is unacceptable you need to have an overall plan of how to accommodate the people not just their housing.
318	Allowing a giant apartment complex in town isn't going to solve the housing situation in Nova Scotia. Neither is cutting corners to entice developers to build here. Keep the safeguards, keep the limits. If anything, improve them - like requiring better stormwater runoff instead of allowing a developer to simply meet the existing standards.
319	Cooperative living arrangements: single-story rental units ranging from studio apartments to accommodations for families. Shared facilities, including: common rooms, childcare, tool loaning, gardens, greenhouses, academic/ study space and support, car sharing, mentoring arrangements for residents,
320	If the Municipality incentivize a developer to provide affordable housing units, it should be the Municipality's responsibility to ensure the rents be maintained at very affordable rents; so our tax do not go to a developer who will charge high rents. Incentivized after the building has affordable rents for 5 years minimum.

24. Which age group best describes you?

● 14 or younger	0
● 15-19	1
● 20-24	6
● 25-29	23
● 30-34	37
● 35-39	45
● 40-44	39
● 45-49	27
● 50-54	50
● 55-59	26
● 60-64	23
● 65+	39
● I prefer not to say	3



Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

Id	Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?
3	Fix our infrastructure before adding anymore straining our insufficient existing infrastructure ! Do not change our protection of height within our historic downtown Windsor .
5	First, I would like to say that I appreciate all the work being done to improve the state of things. :) Two or more bedrooms to a dwelling are crucial for families. A family of four can't function very well in a dwelling with only one bedroom. Gentle density is a great idea, as is any sort of incentive for affordable housing. However, I feel putting "affordable" units within "regular" developments may cause conflict. Some folks may not want to share a space with "those people"-- as terrible as that sounds, I have heard this sentiment.
14	Once again, please start prioritizing housing for families with children, that are genuinely affordable. Too many people have to go without because the majority of their income goes toward simply keeping a roof over their heads.
17	Affordable and supported housing is what is needed to address the homelessness crisis. This is a problem faced by all Canadians. And it can only be solved by doing everything we can to create opportunities.
19	Stop allowing/ turning a blind eye to the environmental catastrophes of Brison Developments. Allow other construction companies the ability to build here.
24	Make the units affordable
25	Public participation and community members on all planning committees gives more voice to areas being affected by changes in land usage. Creating larger notice areas for public participation sessions benefits everyone, not just those within the current boundaries for notification.
31	Taking care of current residents should be priority. The flooding, lake drainage, lake sewage, and abomination of road conditions should be addressed. Build more houses, but don't forget about the people who already live here and how you represent them.
36	Yes. Look at the smaller options not just big developers. Tiny home developments for example
38	Please construct sidewalks in Falmouth and other communities. Our community would need less parking if we could more easily walk places.
39	I think before you plan to put more family dwellings in Windsor you should first address the sewage issue. Otherwise it will create a perfect storm one day soon.
46	Allow back yard housing or granny suites in rural areas so Seniors may stay with family.
47	Fix the issues you have instead of creating new ones
60	Mitch Brison should address the issues of flooding in his developments
78	Build efficient, affordable, dog friendly safe places. Allow people to live in a safe,quiet enviroment. Our only choices arent safe or quiet, give the modest working clase something, we have nothing it is either live in a dump, or starve n live in a 2,000+ place we cant afford
80	CLEAN, MAINTAIN, AND UPGRADE THE DANG SEWER SYSTEM  Do that CONCURRENTLY with changing zoning laws because any change will take time to propagate. Use that time to clean, maintain, and upgrade the dang sewer system  We can do hard things. Abe and the CAO just need to stop being cowards who go to the media and cry "helpless"

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

83	I look at this in a different way. We need to build many houses simple and moderate sized. We could work on development of single family homes that were 600-1000 sq ft and kept the styles simple (boxes shaped) they would be quick to build and affordable as either a starter or finishing homes 2-3 bedroom this means we can use more renewable resources wooden construction (less concrete) give people a chance again to get into the housing market and wouldn't be limited to the areas that we are looking at and could be completed across all of west hants.
84	Thank you for your work.
85	Please put lights at the intersection to Avonview school over by the credit union and Wentworth Road. It's a nightmare! Also a speedway to the school. RCMP do nothing !
88	Value citizen input. Surveys conducted by WHRM had indicated view plane from Fort Edward was important, height restrictions were important. Subsequent development proposals fly in the face of those issues. Difficult to take surveys seriously when results are not factored into subsequent actions.
90	Water/sewer in Windsor needs to be addressed. Unacceptable, hazardous, destructive to our homes. Constant flooding of basements that up to 4 years ago DID NOT flood. Fix the problem. Our town can't handle anymore demand on our water system.
92	Affordable up to date housing is really needed. The affordable housing units for seniors in our community needs a complete makeover. I viewed these unit. They are way to small and outdated. Also would like to see that landlords are made to repair and do upgrades to their units. Rentals should be inspected on a regular basis. Some landlord are making money off of individual and the units are not suitable to live in..ie..mold bugs, broken windows and the list goes on. They should be made to make them clean and and should have to pass inspection before renting.
93	Obliterate fixed term leases*  *Unless the unit is registered solely as a short term rental
94	My parents lived in tmp and when they were unable to care for themselves I was not allowed to move a trailer on thier land to care for them
95	I do think that PAC are looking more to making revenue for the Municipality rather than the general public and others looking to obtaining a home.
98	A permit required for a small 10x10 or 10x20 shed... really??? Most areas under 120sq ft dont care... stop micro managing and focus on big projects that help our communities
101	Why does the town need to grow its population?
102	Before you add anymore to your sewer system I would think improving that would be your very first concern. Housing is only good with adequate infrastructure. Given the flooding and water main breaks WHRM does not have adequate, sound and reliable systems
103	Yes, look to the future. Don't ruin our unique landscape with high rise buildings. We don't need to be the Larry Uteck of the Valley.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

104	The area has nice lots, good green space and safe streets. A few more walking paths, special attention to making what is here accessible( playground washrooms, pavement around community centre house, etc would enhance the area for ALL citizens. There is some room for growth but it need not be in green spaces or of a size unseen here. If you live herey ou should be able to access what is here and so should visitors. If you live here you should have a safe place to park off the streets. Forward thinking planning to enhance the area for visitors/ tourists could make this area a lovely destination thst does not feel overrun or crowded.
107	This survey is a great start to gauging public sentiment, however there has been no information shared on the demographics or socioeconomic status of the residents currently being served or underserved within our community and therefore can present biased feedback. Do I think affordable housing is necessary? Absolutely. Do I know and understand the demand for my area? Nope. It doesn't feel like the municipality does either. Are we using affordable housing and development to support current residents or attract new ones? Don't know this either. And again, I'm not confident the municipality does either. For the town, if we are looking to attract new residents, shouldn't we first establish and communicate the vision of the community we are looking to support and build and then make plans based on this? All this to say, I don't think accelerating planning and development will be successful in the long term without first understanding what needs its going to fill and how it's going to help us support our community.
108	So many unhoused living in tents, most appear to have drug issues. I have major concerns for safety and theft. Who is responsible for cleaning up their messes?
115	This survey could use better options. I couldn't answer some of the questions as I wanted because all areas in question are not the same. What applies to Windsor, does not apply to TMP.
118	Allow for reasoning from residential to agricultural for farming!! The zoning of ag land specifically ignored our historically black community and that option needs to exist to allow improvement. Any development in the historically Black community of Five Mile Plains requires a meaningful consultation with the community to ensure our heritage and history is maintained!!
119	Just make sure that wherever new homes are built, we upgrade the infrastructure.
128	The housing shortage has made it harder for for our youths to attend secondary education it's very difficult for them to find accommodations that are affordable they have to live at home and travel which creates another problem if they don't drive.
132	Please develop public transportation. Put regular buses to connect West Hants area to HRM, and a bus line to desserve the airport, and another one to desserve cap breton and further destinations like Montreal. Will attract more people to West Hants. Not everyone has a car or can drive but that does not mean that everybody should be stuck in the Valley because of that. Open West Hants to the rest of the world!
137	36
138	I always see posts that people are looking for pet friendly rentals and there is none available in the West Hants area. People should not have to choose between their pet and a place to live. We definitely need more pet friendly affordable housing.
140	Provide more trash cans
144	How about cracking down on landlords who do not keep up their dwellings in proper condition.
152	I hope we will see a focus on rural housing options in the future as well.
160	Seems that this process is not open and equitable. Development is being rushed through without proper local consultation as well as the effects on current infrastructure. People move here to get away from the city, to enjoy a slower pace of life and take in the nature and beauty of the surrounding area, people need housing yes what good is that when quality of life suffers from rushed over development.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

163	Appreciate your work and approachability.
164	I think the densification of Windsor is a good idea - especially with the influx of people towards the area. I do however think that the town needs to begin bringing ideas for different modes of transportation throughout the town and surrounding communities as it is heavily reliant on cars and by the hospital, it is getting overrun with the amount of motor vehicles needing to access that area.
165	I totally agree that we need more affordable housing in the area (\$2000+ for a 2 bedroom is not affordable)!! However the municipality needs to be strategic and consider all sides of this growth. Do we have medical practices to serve the growing community? How do we expand our schools when we don't have enough staff already? Can we entice a bigger store to the area to provide better shopping options to the community so that the population is spending here and not going to New Minas or Halifax? How are our roads going to manage the increased population? Do we have sufficient leisure facilities to support the growing population?
169	Slow down and think about what's going on... take a breather and see what we have for water after this years housing builds are completed and then assess how many more dwellings or water consumption we can handle.
172	Need better accountability for land owners who rent and take advantage of tenants knowing that they have no where else to go. Reporting to tenancy board risks you being evicted in retaliation. On that note landlords need more protection from bad tenants who destroy apartments.
173	We have lots of expensive senior housing. Please start looking after low income families with children. Some of the apartment buildings are not being well maintained. Children should not have to live in run down and overcrowded apartment buildings.
176	We desperately need affordable rentals for single income families and seniors in the WHRM, especially Hantsport.
177	Please share all results with your residents be transparent of the responses including comments.
186	1) I strongly encourage that green spaces be preserved in all communities and that set back distances from wetland and watercourses be considered in relation to development. 2) When a building permit is issued, it is important for the buyer be aware of wetlands and watercourses on the property. Perhaps attaching a fact sheet with the building permit regarding environmental concerns.
188	Fix the culverts and the drainage..this is all irrelevant until then. Dumb survey.
189	Windsor is very different than the other communities and should allow more density.
191	West Hants is a beautiful area, and should be much more densely populated in its towns, and subdivisions outside of towns should be wooded and private, keeping with the natural beauty of the area
194	how do I find out the answer to my previous question ?
195	West Hants is a happening area. We should really look at developing a business park area. Driving to the city or new Minas is too far. We should have areas for box stores. We should also look at un restricted development. At a bare minimum we should allows four plexes as of right but really we should allow anything at this point. Any unit helps towards the housing shortage.
197	Please share plans for dealing with sewage and water and adding more residents after that is taken care of.
201	Accessible, affordable housing is desperately needed in our community and this must be planned hand in hand with the development of a transportation service to enable residents to access employment, health and education, to name a few essential services that are located beyond the regional borders. A transit service that links to those serving HRM and the Valley has been identified as a significant community need which needs to be addressed.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

203	The Planning and Development Department needs to stop wasting money on "studies" and start using that money to fix the current problems. As the old saying goes "You can put lipstick on a pig but it's still a pig"
206	The town should support NGO's in providing affordable housing. A fund should be available to assist in acquisition and / or renovations. Having resources available for potential housing providers, is key in leveraging other funds.
208	Get rid of that cesspool of a fake lake.
212	In the town of Windsor there needs to be bylaw enforcement of property upkeep. There is no other town in NS that seems to mix slums with beautiful old homes, leaving too much of the town as undesirable to outsiders moving in. As well, a much better/newer gym facility and more diverse eating options would help with growth.
214	Please review the policy that does not allow tiny homes to be built, and look at financing assistance for those looking to add additional living areas to their existing homes. In addition, all new housing needs to be the "Housing First" model that prioritizes housing above all else, including sobriety. We need more enforcement of tenancy laws as well to control landlords who refuse to rent to those with small children.
215	Everyone knows the community needs more affordable housing. This survey doesn't cover that opinion. What are you doing to offer affordable housing to the community? Adding \$2500 a month apartments is not the way to fix the issue.
220	People are desperate to live in Hantsport. Increased housing would also help maintain our level of services, as well as support current and future businesses. Hantsport has capacity for substantial population growth.
221	Change is good! People of my age range should not have the final say in what future neighbourhoods look like.
222	there are amazing designs these days of tiny homes... they should be PART of the solution.
224	Yes. Why is nothing happening with the RAD report or the most recent round of development planning - open and transparent planning process is a requirement of good government
225	Where accessible parking is available it seems no one considered you have to walk on the road to get an area without a curb. Specifically the post office and bank.
227	Only single family homes should be permitted in Falmouth, protect what little farm land and community culture that is left. Stop taxing us to the max and over crowding this once beautiful town
228	Please publish and share the results of this (and other) surveys via the same mediums you solicit participation (ie: website, social media), not just in council packages.
229	I work in WHRM and myself, along with many colleagues, commute long distances from HRM and other municipalities to get to work. I think a large contributing factor to why many of us do this is the lack of housing options in the area, especially for young professionals who are more likely to rent and not yet in a position to own housing. This seems to be a significant demographic that could be better served.
231	Incentives should not be only for large developments or developers. Owners of properties suitable for secondary residences should have access to incentives. Especially for water, sewer, electrical plus access to road where drainage can be impacted in addition to providing incentives for aging parent secondary suites.
235	WHRM should prioritize housing starts in built up areas and make it more difficult to build single family homes in remote areas.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

237	By encouraging density in the WHRM area we are really just encouraging urban sprawl of HRM. We need to think about it in a more regional area framework.
240	Our systems are already strained. Our water and sewer are at capacity. Please address and update our current infrastructure and its gaps before you start adding to the strain in the name of "affordable housing" that is never actually affordable. If you want more houses, create an affordable living community for our elders so they can sell their older homes to younger families. Focus on who is currently here, who is currently paying your tax dollars before you start catering to a group of housing developers who just want to make as much money as possible and don't care about the future of our wonderful communities.
241	Allow ppl to build safe but basic homes outside of the densely populated areas. Extravagance is not required for healthy living nor is it desired by many.
242	Water supply is most important. Can enough clean potable water be supplied on a continuing basis to support new development?
244	I put my main message in the last message block. Thanks!
252	Transit is important as well as having the infrastructure to build all these new housing places. You cannot add more to windsor until it is fixed.
253	You're doing the best you can!
256	Incentivizing builders is NOT the way to go. They will, as they always have, abuse it and merely pocket more profit in the end. Housing is unfortunately treated like any other business and large developers only care about profit.
257	The water and sewage lines cannot handle what they have now. How will this be fixed?
259	Stop putting high density units in low density communities.
260	My friend and her family have been living in the hotel for 2 years with a baby because there are no places to live.
263	While west hants is growing, please remember you have tax paying residents who are already here. Take into account the people that voted our councillors into their positions and stop adding more people to the problem.
266	do not agree with the proposed building of apartments on Windsor back road. Not the right area for it.
268	Not so much for the Planning & Development
272	sprawl should not be encouraged. Building in the greenbelt areas will lead to more flooding and our township can't afford to have more flooding. Housing should not be built along flood plains.  Notice of intent/request to build should given to homes further than 500 feet of the proposed building site. At least 1km circumstance from the building site. All those who might be affected.
273	Look at the big issues we have now in our community. Are you guys doing your part in making them better? Or are you making them worst?
275	Review your present policies, are they what the citizens want, or do they need to be revised. Once the policies are decided upon, then use them. I don't see the point if you have a policy, then a developer wants to build out side of what the Municipality has determined to be the regulations for buildings and the council or planning committee changes it. Why bother just give the developer what ever they want. I am being a bit sarcastic however it shouldn't need to be discussed and voted on for each development.
277	You guys are doing a great job!! Now to get council on board with your recommendations.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

279	We have a huge demographic of people that make and bring home less than \$1,100 a month. West hants should require any new development in the service d or rural areas of any rental dwellings including apartments, duplex fourplex, be at least half affordable units. We require tiny homes to be built in the serviced area of westhance. Most individuals that are homeless and single require very little to put a roof over their head. As long as they have a bed, a bathroom and something to cook on they would be happy. We have many organizations in our community that could build these little houses at a very low cost. The municipality should relax their rules and decrease the wait times to have any planning options, hookups, etc. for any not-for-profit group that would like to build this type of community. We have small families of single parents that could use a tiny home as well. The municipality should do more to reach out to a not-for-profit organization who already work for families in west hants and work with them to build a small tiny home community or even smaller shelters for those that are homeless. Our homeless problem in west hants is getting increasingly large as every week goes by. Our local government should do more to help alleviate this problem. It is not just a province problem. It is a whole country problem at this point but somebody has to step up. Our community requires our local government to do so.
280	Affordable housing now.
284	Don't allow the 100 unit building on the Windsor back rd
286	When are y'all going to start enforcing some of those rules.. seems like anyone can do whatever they want and build whatever they want without repercussion.. especially if they have money. Seems like you are losing out on tax and permit money by not enforcing some of these rules.
287	Affordable housing needs to be managed better. What is the average income of West Hants families. I don't think there are many options for the low income to moderate income family.
295	I am seeking housing after feeing a 20 year abusive relationship, I do not do drugs or drink & I am 41 years old & single with 3 budgies. It would be a very safe place for me to relocate & I can offer a wife range of skills as I operated a convince store for 5 years. Thanks so much any questions, you can contact me at 902-202-8792.  -Jennifer Chant
303	Developemwntbshould be for locals first and none of this city development trying to exploit rural towns. The community if not benefitting from city rental prices and lack of local job opportunities
304	develop the tails to trails through windsor/tmp. make it happen!
306	Do better. For you it's a pay cheque, for us it's basic need.
309	Placing nearly 100 apartments in the middle of rural field in TMP is not going to fix the housing crisis. Until rent and/or mortgage rates are controlled, there will be no fixing the issue. Each individual parcel of land that goes up needs to be looked at and seen if it's appropriate for what the "developer" has in mind. The developers should not just get their way because they themselves have paid for a few studies to say all is well...people have chosen to live outside of town for a reason. Build your duplexes, tri-plexes- increase the population in such a way that it keeps with the layout of the land. Not because 40 years ago they brought town water and sewer into the area does it deem it appropriate for multiple unit apartment buildings thrust into open property, disregarding the impacts on surrounding properties.
310	Thank you for your hard work in making West Hants a more affordable and vibrant place to choose from.
315	People have saved most of their lives to buy a house. Allowing developers to come in and put multiple buildings on one lot as rentals takes down the value of the neighborhood and the property they worked so hard for.

Q25: Optional - Is there anything else you would like to share with the Planning and Development Department?

318	Questions were very slanted towards getting residents to agree that regulations need to be loosened to help solve the housing crisis. Many people move to West Hants because it's not Halifax. Yes, we need some development but we need development that complements the community, not development for the sake of development. Keep the three-storey limit in place please and focus on getting the stormwater systems working properly.
-----	---



**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY REPORT**

Information <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Decision Request <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--	---	--

**To:** Members of Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC)

**Submitted by:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Kari Fougere, Manager of Planning

**Date:** 2024-11-14

**Subject:** Heritage Grant Application: 281 King Street, Windsor PID 45056058

**LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY**

Council RCOFN-012.00, *Grants and Contributions Policy*  
 Council RCOPL-003.00, *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy*

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the HAC forward a positive recommendation by passing the following motion:

...that HAC recommends that Council provide up to 50% of eligible project costs to a maximum of \$10,000 to the West Hants Historical Society, owner of 281 King Street, in order to facilitate repairs to windows of the main building located at 281 King Street, and that the funding be provided from account # 01-2-00-26-560-21130 only in accordance with the provisions of the *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy*.

**BACKGROUND**

Property <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Environment <input type="checkbox"/>	Social <input type="checkbox"/>	Economic <input type="checkbox"/>	Councillor Activity <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

An application was received for heritage grant funding on October 9, 2024, from Shirely Pineo, President of the West Hants Historical Society, on behalf of the West Hants Historical Society,

owner of the Municipally designated heritage property located at 281 King Street, Windsor (Attachment A).

This is the first heritage grant application for this property and for the West Hants Historical Society.

## **DISCUSSION**

The application received describes proposed work to repair windows on the main building including repairing windowpanes, repairing deteriorated wood from the exterior casing, reglazing, painting and puttying where necessary.

### Heritage Permit

Examination of the proposed work and the list of non-substantial alterations approved by Council on November 24, 2020 (Attachment B) has resulted in a staff determination that the proposed alterations are not substantial alterations as they are repairs to elements of the exterior where no change is intended, and the work is considered maintenance. As a result, no Heritage Permit is required.

### Municipal Grant

The Municipal *Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy* (Attachment C) approved by Council on November 24, 2020, list specific work as either eligible or ineligible for funding. These repairs to the windows on the main building are eligible for funding in accordance with the Policy under “Preservation of existing architectural elements”. Staff conducted a site visit on Thursday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, to ensure the proposed repairs are eligible prior to the staff recommendation to HAC.

The 2024-2025 Operating Budget approved May 29, 2024, includes \$10,000 as “Heritage Grant” and is intended to provide funds for the *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant* funding program. There is currently a reserve of \$10,000 available as “Heritage Grant” as well.

There are currently 13 registered Municipal heritage properties in the Region that may be eligible for funding through the *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy*. No other application for funding has been received to date.

Applicants are eligible to receive a maximum grant of \$10,000 allocated on a 50% cost-sharing, matching basis within a five (5) year period for eligible conservation work. This is the first grant application for this property and therefore the maximum amount of \$10,000 can be considered. The number of incentives per property is limited to two (2) per fiscal-year and ten (10) in any five (5) year period. Project costs are based on actual eligible expenses; in kind contributions are not included.

## **MCCAP**

The Municipal Climate Change Action Plan (MCCAP) for the former Town of Windsor does not identify any issues with inland flooding or sea level rise in this location.

## NEXT STEPS

Application received and staff review – October 9



**Heritage Advisory Committee Review and Recommendation – November 14**



Council decision – November 26\*

\*anticipated date; final date set by Council

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There is capacity in the budget and reserves to provide this heritage grant to the West Hants Historical Society.

## ALTERNATIVES

In response to the application, HAC may recommend that Council:

- determine that 50% of the funding to the maximum of \$10,000 be provided in accordance with the terms of the *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy*;
- determine that funding to a maximum of some other amount be provided, providing the reason why funding is limited; and
- not approve the recommendation and provide no funding for the work. This is not the staff recommendation, as the work meets the criteria for funding under the *Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy*.

## ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A	Heritage Grant Application
Attachment B	List of Non-Substantial Alterations
Attachment C	Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy

Report Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kari Fougere, Manager of Planning

Report Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sara Poirier, Director of Planning and Development



West Hants  
something inspiring awaits

**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**  
**HERITAGE GRANT APPLICATION**

Owner <i>WEST HANTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY</i>	Civic Address: <i>281 King Street</i>
Mailing Address: <i>PO Box 2335</i>	PID: <i>45056058</i>
Email: <i>info@westhantshistoricalociety.ca</i>	
Name of Property (if applicable):	
Work for Which Grant is Requested: (attach information if necessary) <i>Windows - see attached quote</i>	
Date of Heritage Permit Issued/or Advised No Heritage Permit Required:	
Date Development Permit (if required) Issued:	
Date Building Permit (if required) Issued:	
Date Heritage Grant approved:	
Council: Maximum amount of grant:	
Date Work Completed:	
Total Cost of Work Completed:	
Attach Itemized costs based on invoices – arranged by date:	
Amount of Grant requested:	
<b>IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ DECLARATION BELOW AND THEN SIGN</b>	
It is clearly understood that this is only an application and does not imply that the funding will be approved. I certify that I am the owner of the property or am acting with the owner's consent.	
Date: <i>October 7, 2024</i>	
Signature of Owner or Agent (attach written consent): <i>Shirley Piner, President</i>	
I confirm that the work for which funding is requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has been done</li> <li>• is considered eligible work under the Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Guidelines</li> </ul>	
Print Name of Heritage Advisor:	
Date:	
Application Effective June 2021	

West Hants Regional Municipality  
PO Box 3000, 76 Morison Drive, Windsor, NS, B0N 2T0  
902-798-8391 Ext. 115 Email: cmerry@westhants.ca



Estimate  
David Riley Contracting  
49 Old Halifax Rd. West  
Three Mile Plains  
Windsor ,Hants Co.  
Nova Scotia B0N2T0  
902-790-2991  
Hst # 858410103rp0001

Sept7/2024

Estimate for:  
Windsor Historical Society

Estimate is for repairs to windows in Building  
40 windows need attention

Project includes

Removing loose puddy from window panes

Repairing any deteriorated wood

Removing loose paint and grit from windows

Applying orange shellac to area receiving new glazing puddy

Applying glazing to where necessary to seal window panes

Applying 1 coat oil base primer sealer to window and exterior casing areas

Applying 2 coats latex base finish paint to areas (color choice of manager )

Cost of project	labour and materials	hst	total
	\$35,600.00	\$5040.00	\$40,640.00

**Approved November 24, 2020**

**WEST HANTS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY**

**List of Alterations to Municipally Designated Heritage Properties which are to  
be Considered Non-Substantial**

- replacement of or repair to any element of the exterior or public building interior where no change is intended;
- items which the Heritage Advisor considers to be maintenance;
- changes in storm windows from painted wood to aluminum;
- use of vinyl (or other material) window inserts within the existing opening;
- replacement of shingles with clad board with the same exposure, or clad board with shingles unless cladding is specified as a character-defining element;
- replacement of doors or storm doors with doors within the existing opening;
- replacement of non-traditional elements with traditional (i.e. clad or replace concrete steps with wood; shingle a wall now covered in plywood);
- installation of wooden gutters;
- addition of utilities such as air-conditioning vents and "Selkirk" chimneys to walls which are not visible from the public street;
- installation of solar panels on any roof surface;
- addition of minor accessory structures which do not require a building permit;
- alteration of existing minor accessory structures which do not require a building permit;
- placement of commercial advertising signs;
- construction and repair of fences; or
- landscaping elements such as ground level "patios" or stairways which are not connected to the main building.

*MUNICIPAL HERITAGE PROPERTY CONSERVATION WORK GRANT POLICY*

---

**Objective**

To provide information for owners of Municipal Heritage properties regarding the financial assistance program which supports conservation of this important resource.

**Eligible Applicants**

The program provides eligible owners of Municipal Heritage properties with access to financial assistance comparable to that available to Provincially registered heritage properties. Within the limits of the annual budget, the Heritage Funding Program provides a maximum grant of \$10,000 within a five (5) year period for eligible conservation work.

Eligible owners include only not-for-profit organizations incorporated under the Societies Act of Nova Scotia and private owners.

**General Project Requirements**

- all work must be completed and the final claim made by March 31 of the year in which the work is done;
- an application must be completed and an estimate must be provided from one contractor for the proposed work;
- grants are provided at the discretion of Council and no grant will be provided for work started before the grant is approved.

**Eligible Conservation Work & Materials**

Projects related to architectural elements which support the designation of the property including:

- **Preservation** of existing architectural elements, including but not limited to, repair of windows, doors, cladding, roof, foundation, and architectural trim;
- **Replacement** of architectural elements which still exist but which are beyond preservation or repair, including doors, windows, cladding, roofing, foundation materials, and architectural trim, using materials and configurations similar to the original;
- **Restoration** of significant architectural elements which have been lost but for which the appearance can be determined from physical evidence or documentary sources such as historic drawings or photographs; and
- **Replacement or repair of structural elements** which support the building or structure.

*MUNICIPAL HERITAGE PROPERTY CONSERVATION WORK GRANT POLICY*

---

**Ineligible Work & Materials**

- modern materials or elements such as vinyl or aluminum clad windows, steel doors, vinyl siding, or synthetic cladding unless required to meet the requirements of the Building Code Act By-law;
- short-term routine maintenance, including minor repairs to non-original cladding or roofing;
- landscaping features and repairs to minor structures such as fences and retaining walls which do not support the building;
- work carried out prior to approval of the grant;
- poor or defective work;
- electrical, heating or plumbing work;
- construction of an addition;
- construction of an accessory building;
- new windows and doors that do not support the heritage character of the building; and
- owner's labour.

**Project Evaluation**


The project will be evaluated using criteria established under the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

Priority will be given to:

- first-time applicants;
- work on structural or weatherproofing elements; and
- applications supported by a Building Conservation Plan (a drawing or a report which reasonably illustrates all intended work) prepared by an architect, building official, engineer, or restoration professional.

**Application Review Process**

The process for review of an application takes approximately three (3) months.



All eligible applications may not receive approval due to limited funds.

**Grants & Applications**

- Grants are awarded on a 50% cost-sharing, matching basis;

---

**MUNICIPAL HERITAGE PROPERTY CONSERVATION WORK GRANT POLICY**


---

- The minimum grant is \$500. per property;
- The maximum number of grants per property is two (2) per fiscal-year and ten (10) in any five (5) year fiscal period;
- Grants are based on eligible expenses; in-kind contributions are not included in calculating the grant.

**Conditions of Approval & Payment of Funds**

- Projects must be completed within the fiscal year for which they were approved unless exceptional circumstances arise following approval. Approval for extending the grant into a second fiscal year must be requested from the Chief Administrative Officer as soon as the need is known;
- Grants are conditional on completion of the approved and submission of receipts and paid invoices;
- Deadline for submission of receipts and paid invoices is March 31 each year;
- The applicant shall notify the Municipality of any proposed changes to the approved work and shall receive approval from Council before doing the work;
- Grants are tied to the work approved and will not be given for work which was not approved.

I, Rhonda Brown, Municipal Clerk of the West Hants Regional Municipality, in the Province of Nova Scotia, do hereby certify that this is a true copy of the Policy as adopted by the Council of the West Hants Regional Municipality at a meeting duly called and held on the **24<sup>th</sup>** day of **November, 2020**.

R. N. Brown  
Municipal Clerk

<i>Adoption</i>	
<i>Notice to Council:</i>	November 13, 2020
<i>Approval:</i>	November 24, 2020
<i>Description:</i> Initial approval of the Municipal Heritage Property Conservation Work Grant Policy, RCOPL-003.00.	

## **9.0 Business Arising from the Minutes (File Updates)**

### ***General***

#### **9.1 Minas Basin Flood Study**

The Province, in partnership with Dillon Consulting, conducted a Minas Basin Flood Study. Planning staff received a preview of the mapping on May 21, which has also been posted to the Provincial mapping site. The Province and Dillon Consulting held a workshop with municipal staff involved with planning, public works, emergency management and other policy development that may affect flood mitigation and public safety on September 27. Staff will determine how this information will impact planning and development in the areas identified as flood prone and send this information to WSP to incorporate into the Plan Review.

<https://gis.dillon.ca/maps/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fbf00dae11bc4d97b3454e5e74c185b3>

### ***First Readings / Public Hearings***

#### **9.2 File #24-03 Development Agreement: Bear Lake Wind Farm (Sara Poirier)**

This application is for a development agreement to permit an 11-turbine wind farm across multiple PIDs in Vaughan. The Public Information Meeting was held on April 8, 2024. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of this application with amendments on October 10, 2024. First Reading is scheduled for November 26, 2024.

#### **9.3 File #24-17 Development Agreement: 1809 Hwy 1, Falmouth (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is for a development agreement to permit a take-out café within the existing dwelling on 1809 Highway 1 in Falmouth (PID 45026820). The Public Information Meeting was held on July 16, 2024. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of this application on September 12, 2024. First Reading was held on the October 8, 2024, Special Council meeting. Public Hearing is scheduled for November 26, 2024.

#### **9.4 File #21-16 Development Agreement: Ellershouse 3 Wind Project (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is for a development agreement to expand the Ellershouse Wind Farm with an additional twelve 5.9 megawatt turbines on privately owned forestry lands. The Public Information Meeting was held on May 7, 2024. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of this application on September 12, 2024. First Reading was held on the October 8, 2024, Special Council meeting. Public Hearing is scheduled for November 26, 2024.

## ***Notice of Approval / Minister Review / Appeals***

### **9.5 File #24-12 Rezoning: 4859 Highway 1, Three Mile Plains (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is to rezone the subject property from Two Unit Residential (R-2) to Multiple Unit Residential (R-3). The Public Information Meeting was held on June 4, 2024. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of this application on July 11, 2024, and First Reading was held on July 23, 2024. The Public Hearing and Second Reading were held September 24, 2024, where Council approved this application. The Notice of Approval was in the paper on October 4, 2024, initiating the 14-day appeal period. No appeals were received, and this item can now be removed from the agenda.

### **9.6 File #24-15 Development Agreement: Irven Drive Extension (Sara Poirier)**

This application is for a development agreement to permit 23 four-unit dwellings, for a total of 92 dwelling units, on the future extension of Irven Drive. This application was considered in three parts with this being the final phase. Due to multiple traffic concerns, staff did not recommend in favour of this application. PAC/HAC made an amendment to staff's recommendation and passed it along to Council for First Reading on July 23, 2024. The Public Hearing and Second Reading were held September 24, 2024, where Council approved this application. The Notice of Approval was in the paper on October 4, 2024, initiating the 14-day appeal period. No appeals were received, and this item can now be removed from the agenda.

### **9.7 File #24-14 Development Agreement: 198 Water St, Windsor (Alex Dunphy)**

This is an application for a ground-floor residential dwelling unit within an existing building to be located behind a commercial use. This is a continuation of File #23-39 which amended the documents to allow a ground-floor residential use behind a commercial use in an existing building and did not hold a separate Public Information Meeting. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of the development agreement on July 11, 2024, and First Reading was held on July 23, 2024. The Public Hearing and Second Reading were held on September 24, 2024, where Council approved the application. The Notice of Approval was in the paper on October 4, 2024, initiating the 14-day appeal period. No appeals were received, and this item can now be removed from the agenda.

### **9.8 File #24-10 WHMPS Amendments: Wind Turbine Setbacks (Sara Poirier)**

An application received in November 2023 requesting amendments to Section 4.24 of the WHMPS to further evaluate wind farm development proposals which began a staff investigation and Council discussions on appropriate setbacks for large-scale wind turbines. Following those

discussions, Council approved a motion on February 27, 2024, to direct staff to “follow the planning process to amend the planning documents to include a 4 km setback.” A recommendation report was brought to PAC/HAC on May 9, 2024, and the Committee did not vote in favour of these amendments. The amendments were taken to Council for First Reading on May 28, 2024, at which time Council directed staff to “bring back a report to Council which identifies property lines as the designation for measurement from wind farms and that the distance be established at 2.5 km and with development agreement as part of the process.” Staff revised the report as requested and First Reading was held on June 25, 2024. Council amended the motion to read, “...2.5 km from abutting lots with frontage on a roadway, unless written permission is given by the abutting property owner.” The Public Hearing was held on July 23, 2024. The Second Reading was held on September 24, 2024, where Council approved the amendments. The amendments have been sent to the Province for review and approval.

### **9.9 File #24-01 Rezoning: PID 45045879 Willow St, Hantsport (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is for a request to rezone the subject lot from the Single Unit Residential (R-1) zone to the Multiple Unit Residential (R-3) zone to permit an apartment building on Willow Street in Hantsport. Council held the First Reading on March 26 and scheduled the Public Hearing and Second Reading for April 23, 2024. The Public Hearing was postponed until May 28, 2024, to allow for staff to answer additional questions of Council. At this time, Council voted against the rezoning. The applicant was notified of Council’s refusal of the rezoning, initiating the 14-day appeal period for their application. The applicant appealed Council’s decision. The appeal hearing was held on September 17. Staff await the decision of the UARB, which is expected to be received in early 2025.

### **9.10 File #23-04 Development Agreement: PID 45053030, 45343878, 45343894, and 45234382, Payzant Dr, Windsor (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is for a development agreement to permit a multi-phase residential development on Payzant Drive. Council opened the Public Hearing on March 26, then it was postponed until April 23, 2024, to ensure suitable wording in the draft development agreement regarding the construction of the Payzant Drive extension. The Public Hearing was then further postponed until May 28, 2024, to allow for time to prepare a site plan based on the updated road reserve design. This Hearing was further postponed until June 25, 2024, to allow ongoing negotiations for the draft development agreement regarding the Payzant Drive Extension. Another Public Hearing was scheduled to be held on June 25, 2024, where Council voted to further postpone the hearing until July 23, 2024, to assess connectivity from Payzant Drive to Irven Drive. On July 23, 2024, Council voted in favour of this application and a notice of approval was placed in the paper on July 30, 2024, initiating the 14-day appeal period. An appeal was received on August 8, 2024. The appeal hearing is scheduled for early December.

### **9.11 File #23-33 Development Agreement: PID 45402831 Windsor Back Road, Three Mile Plains (Alex Dunphy)**

This application is for a development agreement to permit 87 residential units in 3 multi-unit buildings on a vacant property on Windsor Back Road in Three Mile Plains. The Public Information Meeting was held on November 2, 2023. PAC/HAC recommended in favour of this application on June 13, 2024. First Reading was scheduled to be held on June 25, 2024, however Council requested staff get written confirmation from NSECC regarding the watercourse on the property. First Reading was then postponed until such confirmation is received. Written confirmation was received, and First Reading was held on July 23, 2024. The Public Hearing and Second Reading were held on September 24, 2024, where Council refused the application. Notification was sent to the applicant on September 27, 2024, outlining Council's reasonings for refusal and initiating the 14-day appeal period. The developer has appealed Council's decision on October 10, 2024, and staff are now working with legal on the appeal.

# ACTIVITY REPORT

For Month of October 10/31/2024

Type	Oct 2023			Oct 2024		
	Permits	Units	Value of Construction	Permits	Units	Value of Construction
Single Family	26	13	4,366,970	25	15	4,765,073
Duplex/Semi	6	4	1,996,100	2	0	20,000
Apartments	1	83	14,400,000	0	0	0
Other Residential	17	0	436,945	12	0	261,200
Commercial	4	0	247,000	2	0	200,000
Industrial	1	0	35,000	1	0	7,000
Inst & Gov	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	2	0	1,005,120	1	0	15,000
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22,487,135</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5,268,273</b>
<b>Year To Date</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>66,683,312</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>67,355,472</b>
Demolition	0	0		2	2	
Sign Permits	1			2		
Sub Applications	7	9 (Lots Requested)		5	5 (Lots Requested)	



MUNICIPALITY *of the*  
COUNTY *of* KINGS

October 22, 2024

File #24-14

Sara Poirier  
Director of Planning and Development  
Municipality of the District of West Hants  
76 Morison Dr, PO Box 3000  
Windsor, NS B0N 2T0

**Re: Notification of application for a Land Use By-law text amendment (County wide)**

Dear Sara,

A Public Information Meeting will be held in the Municipal Council Chambers at 181 Coldbrook Village Park Drive, Coldbrook on Tuesday, October 29, 2024, at 6 pm concerning an application to amend the text of the Land Use By-law to enable bed and breakfast operations in residential units within all zones that permit residential units.

The intent of the meeting is to give an early overview of the proposal, review the relevant planning policies, explain the process that will be followed during the municipal review of the application, and receive early questions and feedback from the public on the proposal.

You are welcome to attend this meeting; however, your attendance is not mandatory. After the meeting, a recording of the presentation will be made available on the municipal website. You are being notified of this Public Information Meeting as required by our planning policies, which mandate notification of any villages or abutting municipalities for applications seeking to amend the text of the Land Use By-law.

If you have any comments or concerns with regard to this application, or if you would like more information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 902-690-6276 or by email at [ajacob@countyofkings.ca](mailto:ajacob@countyofkings.ca). Accommodations are available for this meeting, please submit your request at: [www.countyofkings.ca/accommodationsrequest](http://www.countyofkings.ca/accommodationsrequest)

Sincerely,

*Alice Jacob*

Alice Jacob  
Planner

181 Coldbrook Village Park Drive,  
Coldbrook, NS B4R 1B9