

GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

THE COUNTY OF HALIBURTON

May 21, 2014



MHBC
P L A N N I N G
U R B A N D E S I G N
& L A N D S C A P E
A R C H I T E C T U R E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2.0 | MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY HOUSING ALLOCATION..... | 2 |
| 2.1 | Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 1 – Existing Distribution..... | 2 |
| 2.2 | Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 2 – Haliburton and Minden Focus | 3 |
| 2.3 | Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 3 – Balanced Approach..... | 3 |
| 2.4 | Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 4 – Haliburton Focus | 4 |
| 3.0 | LOW DENSITY ALLOCATION..... | 5 |
| 3.1 | Low Density Allocation – Option 1 – Existing Distribution..... | 5 |
| 3.2 | Low Density Allocation – Option 2 – Recent Development Rates | 5 |
| 3.3 | Low Density Allocation – Option 3 – Service Settlement Area Focus..... | 6 |
| 4.0 | HOUSING ALLOCATION SUMMARY | 7 |
| 5.0 | EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION | 9 |
| 6.0 | ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 10 |
| 6.1 | Residential Allocation..... | 10 |
| 6.2 | Residential Allocation Summary..... | 12 |
| 6.3 | Employment Allocation Recommendation..... | 12 |
| 7.0 | CONCLUSIONS..... | 14 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| Table 1: | Option 1 - Allocation Based on Existing Distribution | 2 |
| Table 2: | Option 2 - Allocation Based on Recent Development Rate 2009-2013 (Haliburton & Minden Focus) | 3 |
| Table 3: | Option 3 - Allocation Based on Balanced Distribution (Haliburton & Minden) | 3 |
| Table 4: | Option 4 - Allocation Growth Focus - Haliburton | 4 |
| Table 5: | Option 1 - Allocation Based on Existing Distribution | 5 |
| Table 6: | Option 2 - Allocation Based on Recent Development Rates 2009-2013 | 6 |
| Table 7: | Option 3 - Service Settlement Areas Focus | 6 |
| Table 8: | Option 1 – High/Medium Density Combined with Low Density Options | 7 |
| Table 9: | Option 2 – High/Medium Density Combined with Low Density Options | 7 |
| Table 10: | Option 3 –High/Medium Density combined with Low Density Options | 8 |
| Table 11: | Option 4 – High/Medium Density combined with Low Density Options | 8 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 12: | Employment Allocation to 2036 | 9 |
| Table 13 | Option 1 – Allocation Summary | 10 |
| Table 14 | Option 3 – Low Density Allocation Summary | 11 |
| Table 15 | Residential Summary – Recommended Options | 12 |
| Table 16 | Employment Allocation to 2036 Summary | 13 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Haliburton Growth Strategy has been developed based on the information compiled in the Draft Growth Management Strategy Background Study. This document provides various options for Council to consider in allocating housing units, and employment to each municipality in the County. The housing and employment allocation options that are identified are to be considered as targets and not maximums or minimums.

This document is based on the following parameters:

1. Housing unit allocations are based on a growth projection of 1,910 housing units being required to accommodate population growth to 2036.
2. Housing mix allocations are based on the County's desire to have a 90 percent low density and 10 percent medium and high density housing mix by 2036.
3. Medium and high density housing allocation is based on focusing housing to the serviced settlements of Haliburton and Minden and targeting some medium and higher density housing to Wilberforce.
4. Low density housing allocation is based on focusing housing to Settlement Areas, with a priority on serviced settlement areas, while recognizing the importance of rural Settlement Area development and opportunities for limited residential development in rural areas.
5. Employment allocation is based on a percentage of housing allocation to each municipality.

It is important to note that the current housing mix within the County is 95 percent low density (6,580 units) and 5 percent medium/high density (375 units) for a total of 6,955 units.

Council has expressed a desire to achieve a County wide overall housing mix in 2036 of 90 percent low density and 10 percent medium and high density. In order to achieve this desired housing mix, the 1,910 projected housing units to 2036 would have to be distributed as 1,398 low density units and 512 medium/high density units. This means that to the year 2036, 27 percent of new dwelling unit construction would be required to medium/ high density and 73 percent of new dwelling unit construction would be required to be low density.

This document does not identify specific locations for intensification within Settlement Areas, however, potential intensification opportunities can be found on the maps contained in Appendix 3 of the Draft Growth Management Strategy Background Study.

2.0 MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY HOUSING ALLOCATION

This Section identifies various options for medium and high density housing allocation in the County of Haliburton. In accordance with the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement, the County of Haliburton must establish housing mix targets for the lower tier Municipalities.

Not all Settlement Areas in the County of Haliburton are capable of accommodating medium and high density housing, primarily due to servicing limitations. In the preparation of this Report, we have been directed to focus medium and high density housing allocation to the Settlement Areas of the Village of Minden (Minden) and Haliburton Village (Haliburton) while providing for a limited amount of medium and high density development to be targeted for the hamlet of Wilberforce. In accordance with this direction, four medium and high density housing target options are provided in the following sections.

2.1 Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 1 – Existing Distribution

Table 1 summarizes the current distribution of medium and high density units in the County based on the information derived from Table 9 of the Draft Growth Management Strategy Background Study. Based on this information, it has been assumed that all of the medium and high density housing development in the Municipality of Dysart et al has occurred within Haliburton Village. It has also been assumed that all high and medium density development in The Town of Minden Hills has occurred in the Village of Minden.

Table 1: Option 1 - Allocation Based on Existing Distribution

| Med/High Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 120 | 32% | 164 |
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 200 | 53% | 273 |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce) | 55 | 14.6% | 75 |
| TOTAL | 375 | 100% | 512 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 9)

The information contained in Table 1 indicates that 32 percent of existing medium and high density development in the County exists in Minden, 53 percent of existing medium and high density development exist in Haliburton, while 14.6 percent exist in Highlands East.

Based on the historic distribution of medium and high density units in the County, Option 1 would allocate 164 dwelling units to Minden Hills, Haliburton will be allocated 273 units and

Highlands East will be allocated 75 units. It is anticipated that these uses will be directed to the Settlement Areas of Minden, Haliburton and Wilberforce.

2.2 Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 2 – Haliburton and Minden Focus

The medium and high density housing distribution that has been identified in Option 2 has been based on allocating Wilberforce with a target of 50 units through to the year 2036, while establishing targets for Minden and Haliburton based on the historic distribution of medium and high density housing within each of these communities.

Table 2: Option 2 - Allocation Based on Recent Development Rate 2009-2013 (Haliburton & Minden Focus)

| High/Medium Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 120 | 37.5 | 173 |
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 200 | 62.5 | 289 |
| TOTAL | 320 | 100% | 462 |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce) | 55 | N/A | 50 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 8)

The Option 2 allocation would see a focus of medium and high density development in Minden and Haliburton and provides a breakdown of units between these two communities based on current unit distribution. Based on Option 2, Minden would be allocated 173 units, Haliburton would be allocated 289 units to the year 2036 and Wilberforce would be allocated a target of 50 units.

2.3 Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 3 – Balanced Approach

Option 3 is similar to Option 2 in that Wilberforce has been allocated a target of 50 units to the year 2036 while the remaining amount of medium and high density development has been targeted toward Minden and Haliburton. In this scenario, Minden has been allocated 45 percent of the additional medium and high density development while Haliburton has been allocated 55 percent of the additional medium and high density development.

Table 3: Option 3 - Allocation Based on Balanced Distribution (Haliburton & Minden)

| High/Medium Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | Allocated New Development % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 120 | 45% | 208 |
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 200 | 55% | 254 |
| TOTAL | 320 | 100% | 462 |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce) | 55 | | 50 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 9)

Option 3 has been provided to illustrate a more balanced distribution of medium and high density development between Minden and Haliburton. In this scenario, Minden's percentage of medium and high density allocation is increased over current rates while Haliburton's percentage of medium and high density allocation is decreased. Using Option 3, Minden would be provided a target of 208 units, Haliburton would be provided a target of 254 units and Wilberforce would have a target of 50 units.

2.4 Medium and High Density Allocation – Option 4 – Haliburton Focus

Option 4 uses a similar approach to Options 2 and 3 in that Wilberforce is allocated a target of 50 units to the year 2036. This Option differs in that it identifies Haliburton as the focus of future medium and high density development. Under this scenario, Haliburton would be provided a target of 70 percent while Minden would be provided a target of 30 percent of additional medium and high density development.

Table 4: Option 4 - Allocation Growth Focus - Haliburton

| High/Medium Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 120 | 30% | 139 |
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 200 | 70% | 323 |
| TOTAL | 320 | 100% | 462 |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce) | 55 | | 50 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 9)

In recent years, Haliburton has seen more growth than Minden and Option 4 has been provided to illustrate a scenario where Haliburton is the focus for medium and high density growth in the County. Using Option 4, Minden would be provided a target of 139 units, Haliburton would be provided a target of 323 units and Wilberforce would have a target of 50 units.

3.0 LOW DENSITY ALLOCATION

Low density housing refers to detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and duplexes. Unlike medium and high density housing, some forms of low density housing styles can be accommodated in all municipalities in the County, both within Settlement Areas and rural areas. In terms of establishing allocations for low density housing, consideration is to be given to the policies of the PPS which direct growth to be focused within the Settlement Areas. In establishing allocation targets for low density development, development has been allocated based on municipality and not to specific Rural Areas or Settlement Areas.

Based on a housing target of 90 percent of housing in 2036 being low density, there is a requirement to allocate 1,398 low density units between the municipalities in the County.

3.1 Low Density Allocation – Option 1 – Existing Distribution

In accordance with the information contained in Table 5, the current allocation of low density units in the County identifies Algonquin Highlands as having 13 percent of total low density housing, Dysart et al as containing 32.5 percent, Highlands East as having 20 percent and Minden Hills as having 34.5 percent.

Table 5: Option 1 - Allocation Based on Existing Distribution

| Low Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 865 | 13% | 182 |
| Dysart et al | 2,140 | 32.5% | 454 |
| Highlands East | 1,315 | 20% | 280 |
| Minden Hills | 2,275 | 34.5% | 482 |
| TOTAL | 6,595 | 100% | 1,398 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 8)

If the existing distribution of low density units is maintained, Algonquin Highlands would be allocated 182 low density units, Dysart et al 454 units, Highlands East 280 units and Minden Hills 482 units.

3.2 Low Density Allocation – Option 2 – Recent Development Rates

Table 6 summarizes Option 2 which identifies an allocation strategy that is based on recent development rates provided by the lower-tier municipalities. These rates have been established using building permit data however the building permit data that was used considered new dwelling unit construction and did not distinguish between low, medium or high density housing styles.

Table 6: Option 2 - Allocation Based on Recent Development Rates 2009-2013

| Low Density Distribution / Allocation | New Units 2009-2013 | Current # of Units | % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 17 | 865 | 4% | 61 |
| Dysart et al | 158 | 2,140 | 41% | 569 |
| Highlands East | 81 | 1,315 | 21% | 292 |
| Minden Hills | 132 | 2,275 | 34% | 476 |
| TOTAL | 388 | 6,595 | 100% | 1,398 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 8)

Between 2009 and 2013, Algonquin Highlands experienced 4 percent of the dwelling unit construction that occurred in Rural Areas and Settlement Areas while Dysart et al had 41percent, Highlands East had 21percent and Minden Hills had 34 percent. Using these percentages to establish allocations to 2036, Algonquin Highlands would be provided an allocation of 61 units, Dysart et al would be provided an allocation of 569 units, Highlands East would be provided an allocation of 292 units and Minden Hills would be provided an allocation of 476 units.

3.3 Low Density Allocation – Option 3 – Service Settlement Area Focus

Option 3 provides for an allocation of future low density housing in the County with a focus on directing low density growth to Municipalities that contain serviced Settlement Areas. Option 3 also provides for some levels of low density development to occur in those Municipalities that do not contain serviced Settlement Areas.

Table 7: Option 3 - Service Settlement Areas Focus

| Low Density Distribution / Allocation | Current # of Units | Allocated Development % of Total | Allocated # of Units |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 865 | 10% | 140 |
| Dysart et al | 2,140 | 35% | 489 |
| Highlands East | 1,315 | 20% | 280 |
| Minden Hills | 2,275 | 35% | 489 |
| TOTAL | 6,595 | 100% | 1,398 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 9)

Option 3 allocates 35 percent of the low density housing to Dysart et al and Minden Hills. This results in each community receiving an allocation of 489 units to the year 2036. Algonquin Highland would receive 10 percent of the allocation, or 140 units and Highlands East would receive 20 percent of the allocation or 280 units.

4.0 HOUSING ALLOCATION SUMMARY

The following tables summarize the various housing allocation options outlined in Section 2 and Section 3 of the Report. The County has a number of options to consider when determining the most appropriate means of allocating residential growth targets for the lower tier municipalities to 2036.

Table 8 - Option 1 – High/Medium Density Combined with Low Density Options

| Allocation Summary | Option 1 High/Med Density | Option 1 Low Density | Option 1 High/Med Density | Option 2 Low Density | Option 1 High/Med Density | Option 3 Low Density |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 0 | 182 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 140 |
| Total | 182 | | 61 | | 140 | |
| % of Total | 10% | | 3% | | 7% | |
| Dysart et al | 273 | 454 | 273 | 569 | 273 | 489 |
| Total | 727 | | 842 | | 762 | |
| % of Total | 38% | | 44% | | 40% | |
| Highlands East | 75 | 280 | 75 | 292 | 75 | 280 |
| Total | 355 | | 367 | | 355 | |
| % of Total | 18 % | | 19% | | 19% | |
| Minden Hills | 164 | 482 | 164 | 476 | 164 | 489 |
| Total | 646 | | 640 | | 653 | |
| % of Total | 34% | | 34% | | 34% | |
| TOTAL | 1,910 | | 1,910 | | 1,910 | |
| % of TOTAL | 100% | | 100% | | 100% | |

Table 9 - Option 2 – High/Medium Density Combined with Low Density Options

| Allocation Summary | Option 2 High/Med Density | Option 1 Low Density | Option 2 High/Med Density | Option 2 Low Density | Option 2 High/Med Density | Option 3 Low Density |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 0 | 182 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 140 |
| Total | 182 | | 61 | | 140 | |
| % of Total | 10% | | 3% | | 7% | |
| Dysart et al | 289 | 454 | 289 | 569 | 289 | 489 |
| Total | 743 | | 858 | | 778 | |
| % of Total | 39% | | 45% | | 41% | |
| Highlands East | 50 | 280 | 50 | 292 | 50 | 280 |
| Total | 330 | | 342 | | 330 | |
| % of Total | 17% | | 18% | | 17% | |
| Minden Hills | 173 | 482 | 173 | 476 | 173 | 489 |
| Total | 655 | | 649 | | 662 | |
| % of Total | 34% | | 34% | | 35% | |
| TOTAL | 1,910 | | 1,910 | | 1,910 | |
| % of TOTAL | 100% | | 100% | | 100% | |

Table 10 - Option 3 –High/Medium Density combined with Low Density Options

| Allocation Summary | Option 3 High/Med Density | Option 1 Low Density | Option 3 High/Med Density | Option 2 Low Density | Option 3 High/Med Density | Option 3 Low Density |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 0 | 182 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 140 |
| Total | 182 | | 61 | | 140 | |
| % of Total | 10% | | 3% | | 7% | |
| Dysart et al | 254 | 454 | 254 | 569 | 254 | 489 |
| Total | 708 | | 823 | | 743 | |
| % of Total | 37% | | 43% | | 39% | |
| Highlands East | 50 | 280 | 50 | 292 | 50 | 280 |
| Total | 330 | | 342 | | 330 | |
| % of Total | 17% | | 18% | | 17% | |
| Minden Hills | 208 | 482 | 208 | 476 | 208 | 489 |
| Total | 690 | | 684 | | 697 | |
| % of Total | 36% | | 36% | | 37% | |
| TOTAL | 1,910 | | 1,910 | | 1,910 | |
| % of TOTAL | 100% | | 100% | | 100% | |

Table 11 - Option 4 – High/Medium Density combined with Low Density Options

| Allocation Summary | Option 4 High/Med Density | Option 1 Low Density | Option 4 High/Med Density | Option 2 Low Density | Option 4 High/Med Density | Option 3 Low Density |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 0 | 182 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 140 |
| Total | 182 | | 61 | | 140 | |
| % of Total | 10% | | 3% | | 7% | |
| Dysart et al | 323 | 454 | 323 | 569 | 323 | 489 |
| Total | 777 | | 892 | | 812 | |
| % of Total | 41% | | 47% | | 43% | |
| Highlands East | 50 | 280 | 50 | 292 | 50 | 280 |
| Total | 330 | | 342 | | 330 | |
| % of Total | 17% | | 18% | | 17% | |
| Minden Hills | 139 | 482 | 139 | 476 | 139 | 489 |
| Total | 621 | | 615 | | 628 | |
| % of Total | 32% | | 32% | | 33% | |
| TOTAL | 1,910 | | 1,910 | | 1,910 | |
| % of TOTAL: | 100% | | 100% | | 100% | |

5.0 EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION

This Section of the Report summarizes the projected employment growth for the County to the year 2036 and provides allocations to each of the lower-tier municipalities based on the existing distribution of employment as summarized by the Statistics Canada National Household Survey, 2011.

The Growth Management Strategy Background Report (May 20, 2014) provided a summary of the Statistics Canada Census data and reported that the County had an employment base of 6,870 jobs in 2011, which was equal to 0.4 jobs per person. Based on the assumption that this ratio would continue to 2036, it was calculated that an additional 1,772 jobs would be required in the County to support the projected population increase.

Table 12 - Employment Allocation to 2036

| | A | B | C |
|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Employment Allocation | Employment 2011 | Percentage of Total | Job Allocation Based on Existing Employment Distribution |
| Minden Hills | 2,336 | 34% | 602 |
| Dysart et al | 2,473 | 36% | 638 |
| Highlands East | 1,237 | 18% | 319 |
| Algonquin Highlands | 824 | 12% | 213 |
| TOTAL | 6,870 | 100% | 1,772 |

(Source: Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014) Table 6)

Table 12 summarizes a strategy of employment allocation based on the historic distribution of jobs in the County.

Column A provides the County's employment base in 2011 and Column B outlines the historic job distribution in the County as a percent of total employment. These percentages were used to calculate the employment allocations to each of the four municipalities as identified in Column C.

The majority of employment growth would be allocated to municipalities with serviced Settlement Areas, but it is also recognized that a number of new jobs will likely be developed through resource-based employment. Rural municipalities have been provided with employment allocation in anticipation of resource-based employment growth.

6.0 ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Residential Allocation

Residential allocation refers to the distribution of housing to each of the municipalities in the County. In accordance with the policies of the PPS, the County is responsible for allocating housing units to each of the lower-tier municipalities.

Total Allocation Available

Using the current average household size of 2.3 persons per household, 1,910 additional permanent residential dwelling units will be required by the year 2036 to support the population growth of 4,394 persons. Given Council's stated desire to achieve a County wide housing mix of 90 percent low density and 10 percent medium and high density by the year 2036, this distribution would result in a target of 1,398 low density units and 512 medium and high density units.

Medium/High Density Allocation

Section 2.0 of this Report provides four options for medium and high density housing allocation in the County of Haliburton. These options have taken into consideration servicing limitations, vacant lot data, existing housing mix distribution, and recent development rates.

It is recommended that Option 1 be utilized to assist in the development of policy to direct growth in the County. Option 1 was developed based on the existing distribution of medium and high density housing in the County and recognizes that most of the existing medium and high density development exists in Dysart et al (Haliburton), followed by Minden Hills (Minden) and Highlands East (Wilberforce). Algonquin Highlands does not contain medium and high density development. The recommended Option is shown in Table 1 and is summarized in Table 13 below:

Table 13: Option 1 - Allocation Summary

| Med/High Density Distribution / Allocation | Allocated # of Units | % of Total |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 164 | 32% |
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 273 | 53% |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce) | 75 | 14.6% |
| TOTAL | 512 | 100% |

Option 1 has been recommended for the following reasons:

1. The allocation follows the historic growth trend and location of medium and high density development in the County.
2. Haliburton and Minden provide the most services to County residents.

3. Medium and High density development should occur in areas with municipal services.
4. The serviced Settlement Areas with capacity to accommodate the greatest amount of growth are allocated the greatest number of units.
5. Directing development to established Settlement Areas provides the most cost effective means of service delivery to County residents.
6. The PPS provides direction to make efficient use of servicing and direct growth to Settlement Areas, with serviced Settlement Areas being the focus.

Low Density Allocation

Three Options for the allocation of low density growth have been provided in Section 3.0 of this Report. Similar to the above, these Options have taken into consideration the existing distribution of low density residential units, recent development rates and servicing capacity in Settlement Areas. It is recommended that the County of Haliburton implement policies guided by the allocation provided in Option 3. This Option provides an allocation for future low density residential units focused on directing low density growth to Municipalities that contain serviced Settlement Areas. While the focus is Municipalities with serviced Settlement Areas, low density growth has also been allotted to Municipalities with un-serviced Settlement Areas. It should be noted that limited residential development is also anticipated and permitted in rural areas. The allocation distribution is illustrated in Table 7 and summarized in Table 14 below:

Table 14: Option 3 - Low Density Allocation Summary

| Low Density Distribution / Allocation | Allocated # of Units | Allocated Development % of Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 140 | 10% |
| Dysart et al | 489 | 35% |
| Highlands East | 280 | 20% |
| Minden Hills | 489 | 35% |
| TOTAL | 1,398 | 100% |

This Option has been recommended for the following reasons:

1. This Option follows the current growth trend based upon the recent development data provided for the period of 2009-2013.
2. This Option is consistent with the existing distribution of low density units in the County.
3. The supply of designated and vacant lands in Settlement Areas can accommodate growth projections to the year 2036.
4. Settlement Areas, particularly serviced Settlement Areas are to be the focus of growth in accordance with the Growth Management direction provided in the PPS.
5. The serviced Settlement Areas with capacity to accommodate the greatest amount of growth are allocated the greatest number of units.

6. Directing development to established Settlement Areas provides the most cost effective means of service delivery to County residents.

6.2 Residential Allocation Summary

Based on a projected population increase of 4,394 persons, 1,910 permanent residential units will be required in the County to accommodate the projected growth. To achieve the desired housing mix of 90 percent low density and 10 percent medium and high density, 1,398 low density units and 512 medium and high density units will be required. Table 15 provides a complete summary of the recommended low density and medium and high density housing unit allocations to each of the Municipalities. Dysart et al has the highest growth allocation at 40%. Minden Hills is next with 34% of the allocation, followed by Highlands East at 19% and Algonquin Highlands to account for 7% of the future allocated residential growth.

Table 15 - Residential Summary - Recommended Options

| | Option 1 High/Med Density | Option 3 Low Density |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 0 | 140 |
| Total | 140 | |
| % of Total | 7% | |
| Dysart et al | 273 | 489 |
| Total | 762 | |
| % of Total | 40% | |
| Highlands East | 75 | 280 |
| Total | 355 | |
| % of Total | 19% | |
| Minden Hills | 164 | 489 |
| Total | 653 | |
| % of Total | 34% | |
| TOTAL | 1,910 | |
| % of TOTAL | 100% | |

6.3 Employment Allocation Recommendation

The Growth Management Strategy Background Report (May 20, 2014), provides a summary of Statistics Canada Census data which outlined that the County has an employment ratio of 0.4 jobs per person. For the purposes of the Growth Strategy and land budgeting, it has been assumed that this ratio will remain constant throughout the projection period. As a result, the Growth Strategy and future planning documents should Plan for an additional 1,772 jobs to support the projected population increase.

The employment allocation has been based upon the existing employment distribution. This is illustrated in detail in Table 12 of this Report and is summarized in Table 16 below:

Table 16 - Employment Allocation to 2036 Summary

| | Job Allocation | Percentage of Total |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Minden Hills | 602 | 34% |
| Dysart et al | 638 | 36% |
| Highlands East | 319 | 18% |
| Algonquin Highlands | 213 | 12% |
| TOTAL | 1,772 | 100% |

The rationale for the employment allocation is as follows:

1. Employment growth is expected to occur near areas of population and housing growth.
2. Serviced settlement areas have sufficient designated land to accommodate projected employment growth to 2036.
3. Encouraging employment growth to occur in serviced Settlement Areas provides Municipalities with the most efficient means of servicing new development.
4. Resource-based recreation, and resource management development are important economic drivers in the County and will contribute to employment growth outside of Settlement Areas.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information contained in this Growth Strategy as well as the Growth Management Strategy Background Study (May 20, 2014), the following conclusions are made:

1. The County must plan for a population increase of 4,394 persons and 1,910 dwelling units to 2036.
2. The Settlement Areas of Minden and Haliburton offer opportunities for significant intensification and medium and high density housing options because of the presence of municipal servicing systems that have reserve capacity.
3. The County would like to achieve a County-wide housing mix of 90 percent low density and 10 percent medium and high density by 2036.
4. A 90:10 low density: medium/high density housing ratio results in 1,398 additional low density units and 512 medium and high density units to be allocated throughout the County.
5. It is recommended that a medium and high density target of 512 units be used and the distribution be based upon the existing distribution of medium and high density units. The allocation would result in the following:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Dysart et al (Haliburton) | 273 units |
| Highlands East (Wilberforce). | 75 units |
| Minden Hills (Minden) | 164 units |

6. It is recommended that the low density allocation of 1,398 units be predominantly directed to serviced Settlement Areas. The recommended allocation is as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Algonquin Highlands | 140 units |
| Dysart et al | 489 units |
| Highlands East | 280 units |
| Minden Hills | 489 units |

7. Designated land in Settlement Areas could accommodate 5,268 low density dwelling units.
8. There is sufficient land in the Settlement Areas of the County to accommodate projected residential growth to 2036.

9. The Haliburton Sewer System is operating at 35% capacity and currently has 486 residential users and 73 non-residential users. The Minden Sewer System has reserve for an additional 373 dwellings. The Minden water system has reserve capacity 490 additional dwellings. The Municipalities and the County should monitor the reserve capacity on a yearly basis to confirm that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the growth projections and the growth allocation outlined in this study.
10. There are 1,499 vacant lots in the Rural Area of the County that have access to a municipally maintained road and are less than 4.1 hectares (10 acres) and that are not subject to constraints.
11. The County must plan for an employment increase of 1,772 jobs which will require a land base of approximately 60 hectares to 2036.
12. There is sufficient designated land in Settlement Areas to accommodate projected employment growth to 2036.
13. The Official Plan of the County should be updated to include policies that will direct and allocate growth and development in accordance with the conclusions of this Report.