STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT REPORT

S.H.O.U.T. – Sustainable Housing Opportunities for Urban Transformation (BH-L1064)

Pinecrest II (Clifford Darling Estates) Public Consultation

Prepared by: Special Projects Unit, Ministry of Housing & Land Reform, The Bahamas
Date: 6th October 2026

1. Purpose of the Report

This report documents the public consultation for the proposed Pinecrest II housing investment in New Providence under the Sustainable Housing Opportunities for Urban Transformation (S.H.O.U.T.) Programme (BH-L1064). It records the information disclosed, stakeholder participation, questions and concerns raised, responses given during the meeting, and issues requiring consideration during subsequent project preparation and implementation

2. Engagement Objectives

- Provide information on the proposed $50 million S.H.O.U.T. Programme, in particular, the Pinecrest II investment.
- Disclose the Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA), Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), including potential risks and mitigation measures.
- Provide an inclusive opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions, identify local conditions and offer recommendations.
- Consider relevant stakeholder input in the further design, environmental and social instruments and implementation arrangements.
- Explain the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) and channels for continuing engagement.

3. Consultation Details

Item	Details
Consultation in series	**First** SHOUT public consultation, focusing on Pinecrest II (Clifford Darling Estates).
Date and time	Tuesday, 6 October 2026; advertised meeting window 6:00–8:00 p.m.
Venue	C. V. Bethel Senior High School, New Providence.
Format	In-person public meeting, presentations, moderated questions and answers, and closing remarks.
Presenters / participants	Ministry of Housing & Land Reform representatives, including housing leadership and the Minister; environmental and social presentation by the project consulting team.
Attendance	116 entries on register.
Supporting records	MOHLR SHOUT public consultation slide deck; Pinecrest II sign-in register; consultation Q&A transcript.

4. Stakeholder Groups Represented

a) Members of the public, prospective housing applicants and residents interested in Pinecrest II and surrounding communities.
b) Ministry of Housing & Land Reform officers and programme representatives.
c) Development-partner and environmental/social consulting representatives.
d) Other government, civil-society or institutional stakeholders as indicated in individual register entries; many attendees did not specify an affiliation.
e) Media houses.

5. Consultation Methodology

The consultation followed a town-hall format. Ministry representatives introduced SHOUT, its housing and institutional reform objectives, and the proposed Pinecrest II development. The presentation described a working 38-lot concept with single-family and lower-density multifamily/duplex uses, as well as two proposed 12-unit medium-density buildings; the concept was described as subject to final technical design, rezoning and approvals. The programme also presented its other investments in Abaco and Grand Bahama, public rental rehabilitation, and proposed homeowner microloans.

The environmental and social session addressed construction and operational risks, relevant management instruments, and mitigation responsibilities. The SEP and GRM were presented, including MOHLR's programme channel and alternative IDB grievance avenues. Participants were then invited to raise questions and comments; Ministry officials and consultants responded orally. The meeting closed with ministerial remarks on the broader housing agenda.

The presentation identified the programme GRM at https://new.moh-ur.com/grievance and alternative channels through the IDB Grievance Protocol and the Independent Consultation and Investigation Mechanism (MICI). The discussion clarified that the channels are alternatives rather than mandatory sequential stages.

6. Limitations and Observations

While the consultation provided a valuable opportunity for public engagement, several limitations were observed that should be considered in evaluating the feedback received and planning subsequent stakeholder engagement activities.

i. Stakeholder Composition and Representation: The consultation attracted a broad cross-section of participants, including prospective housing applicants seeking affordable housing opportunities, residents of Pinecrest II and surrounding neighbourhoods, and individuals interested in the wider S.H.O.U.T. Programme. Consequently, the discussions were not limited to persons directly affected by the proposed Pinecrest II development. The significant interest from prospective beneficiaries also meant that some project-specific environmental, social and neighbourhood concerns received less attention than broader questions about access to housing.

ii. Existing Grievances and Broader Housing Concerns: Given the presence of the Minister and senior Ministry officials, several participants used the opportunity to raise longstanding concerns regarding the Ministry's existing housing programmes, including application processing,

eligibility requirements, allocation procedures, affordability and the status of previous applications. Although these concerns were relevant to the Ministry's broader mandate, many fell outside the immediate scope of the Pinecrest II investment and its environmental and social assessment. This broadened the discussion and reduced the time available for detailed consideration of the proposed development and its potential impacts.

iii. Time Constraints: The level of public interest and the range of questions raised exceeded what could reasonably be addressed within the scheduled two-hour consultation period. As a result, opportunities for more detailed discussions on site-specific matters, including drainage, traffic, infrastructure capacity, accessibility and potential construction impacts, were limited. The time available also constrained the extent to which participants could engage directly with the technical team on the proposed mitigation measures.

iv. Targeted Stakeholder Engagement: The consultation highlighted the need for more focused engagement with residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods, community leaders, relevant government agencies and other stakeholders whose interests or responsibilities are directly connected to the proposed development. While the public consultation provided an important platform for general participation, it may not have fully captured the perspectives of all potentially affected groups or the technical concerns of relevant agencies.

v. Preliminary Nature of Project Information: The development concepts, proposed housing configurations and programme arrangements presented during the consultation remain subject to further technical assessment, detailed design, statutory approvals and applicable environmental and social requirements. Accordingly, some questions could not be answered definitively, and the information presented should not be interpreted as final approval of the proposed development or confirmation of individual housing eligibility.

7. Recommended Approach for Subsequent Engagement

Based on these observations, direct and targeted engagement with community leaders, surrounding residents and relevant agency stakeholders should be incorporated into the next phase of project preparation, consistent with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP).

These engagements should provide opportunities to examine site-specific concerns in greater detail, particularly drainage and flooding, traffic circulation, infrastructure capacity, public health, accessibility and construction-related impacts. Consultation with the relevant technical and regulatory agencies should also be undertaken to identify potential constraints and inform appropriate mitigation measures.

Additionally, consideration should be given to establishing separate opportunities for prospective housing applicants to obtain information on application procedures, eligibility, financing and allocation processes. This would allow future project-specific consultations to remain focused on the proposed development and its environmental and social implications, while ensuring that broader housing concerns are appropriately documented and referred to the responsible Ministry units.

These observations should inform updates to the SEP and subsequent engagement activities, with particular emphasis on improving stakeholder representation, allowing sufficient time for meaningful participation, and ensuring that community feedback is appropriately considered during detailed project design and implementation.

8. Key Issues Raised

Key Issue	Question / Concern Raised	Response Provided	Suggested Action/Follow-up
1. Lot size, outdoor space and landscaping	A participant questioned whether new homes would have sufficient yard space for trees, children's play and future improvements, observing that some developments appear closely spaced.	Officials described constraints on lot dimensions, plans for landscaping and tree planting, and open-space/buffer provisions. They referred to maintaining required open space as part of subdivision approval.	Verify final setbacks, usable private outdoor areas, tree-planting locations and public open-space provision in the approved layout.
2. Accessible housing	A participant asked whether homes would be accessible to persons using wheelchairs.	Officials indicated that accessible units would be provided and asked applicants to disclose accessibility needs so these could be considered during allocation and design.	Confirm accessible-unit targets, universal-design provisions, accessible routes and allocation procedures.
3. Existing applications and SHOUT eligibility	A participant asked whether existing Ministry applicants must submit a new SHOUT application.	Officials advised that existing applicants would not need to reapply solely because of SHOUT; applicants would continue through Ministry assessment and selection processes.	Issue a clear public notice explaining whether and how existing applications will be considered, updated and assessed.
4. Application status and communication	Participants described difficulty checking their application status and obtaining timely updates from the Ministry.	Officials acknowledged the volume of applications and staffing constraints, and indicated that service and process improvements would be considered.	Assess an applicant-status inquiry mechanism and publish consistent response/contact procedures.
5. Flooding, drainage and mosquito concerns	A participant identified recurring flooding, standing water and mosquitoes in the surrounding area and asked whether the development would improve drainage.	Officials described existing and planned drainage works, including a trench/outfall arrangement, and consultants noted that storm water concerns would inform environmental and social mitigation and nature-based measures.	Validate drainage capacity, outfall connections, maintenance responsibilities, flood pathways and mosquito-control measures; reflect findings in engineering design and ESMP.
6. Green infrastructure and water management	Participants and speakers discussed landscaped buffers, permeable areas and approaches to reduce runoff and heat.	The team referenced landscaping, planted areas and approaches that help absorb rainfall and support resilience.	Consider rain gardens, shade trees, permeable surfaces and water-conservation measures where feasible.
7. Traditional Bahamian design and resilience	A participant urged the Ministry to consider Bahamian building traditions and culturally appropriate forms alongside hurricane resilience.	Officials described adherence to building standards, inspections and resilient construction considerations.	Record the recommendation for architectural design review, including climate suitability and local character.

Key Issue	Question / Concern Raised	Response Provided	Suggested Action/Follow-up
8. Multifamily tenure and purchase options	A participant asked whether multifamily buildings would be purchased as entire buildings or as individual units.	Officials distinguished the proposed 12-unit rental buildings from other housing forms, including duplexes and single-family ownership opportunities; final configurations remain subject to design.	Publish a site-specific schedule of proposed housing types, tenure and eligibility once confirmed.
9. Down payments and purchase costs	Participants asked about required deposits and estimated prices for single-family or smaller units.	Officials referred to prevailing mortgage/down-payment arrangements, potential BMC reform and prequalification; no definitive SHOUT price list was established in the discussion.	Publish verified price ranges, financing terms and deposit requirements when approved; avoid implying a fixed rate or price at this stage.
10. Prequalification letters and applicant priority	Participants asked whether mortgage prequalification could be used and whether long-standing applicants would receive first preference.	Officials indicated that prequalification information can assist assessment; they noted the large application backlog and that suitability and mortgage readiness require review.	Clarify selection criteria, waiting-list treatment, prequalification validity and any prioritisation policy.
11. Contract workers and mortgage access	A participant asked about housing eligibility for government employees on contracts who may have repayment capacity but cannot obtain conventional mortgages.	Officials recognised this barrier, indicated that cases could be considered individually, and referred to ongoing exploration of possible solutions.	Examine underwriting barriers and feasible options for contract employees; do not promise approval before criteria are adopted.
12. Rent-to-own programme	Participants asked how the rent-to-own option operates and whether it supports persons unable to qualify immediately for a mortgage.	Officials described a 36-month arrangement intended to build equity or reduce the outstanding principal, improving the prospect of later mortgage qualification. Figures cited were illustrative.	Provide a separate written explanation of contractual terms, eligibility, payment allocation and mortgage transition.
13. Rental payment history as affordability evidence	A participant asked whether years of consistently paying high private-market rent could count toward mortgage qualification.	The discussion acknowledged rental payment records as potentially relevant to demonstrating payment capacity, but no formal revised underwriting rule was confirmed.	Discuss treatment of documented rental history with BMC and relevant financing partners.
14. Road access and emergency egress	A participant asked whether another road or exit would be provided from the Pinecrest area.	Officials referred to road planning and the requirement for suitable ingress and egress, but the precise final arrangement was not established in the transcript.	Verify road network capacity, secondary access, emergency-vehicle access and traffic impacts in final plans.

Key Issue	Question / Concern Raised	Response Provided	Suggested Action/Follow-up
15. Construction and allocation timelines	A participant asked how long it would take to receive a home if eligible.	Officials stated that allocation depends on completion and availability of homes and ongoing applicant assessment; no fixed individual waiting period was promised.	Communicate indicative construction milestones and allocation processes once confirmed.
16. Wider housing supply and land acquisition	During closing remarks, the Minister discussed other planned housing subdivisions, additional land and redevelopment of derelict properties.	These statements described the wider national housing agenda, rather than commitments specific to the Pinecrest II SHOUT investment.	Keep broader ministerial announcements distinct from SHOUT-financed scope and verified project outputs.
17. Grievance channels and continued participation	The project team explained how residents could raise project concerns beyond the meeting.	The Ministry GRM, IDB Grievance Protocol and MICI were identified as available channels; relevant feedback would be recorded and reviewed during project preparation.	Keep contact channels visible, log consultation feedback, assign follow-up responsibility and disclose subsequent updates.

9. Lessons Learned and Recommended Follow-up

- Local flood history, drainage routes and mosquito conditions are material design inputs and should be checked through engineering and environmental/social review.
- Housing applicants require clearer information on application status, eligibility, prices, selection, mortgage prequalification and rent-to-own terms; SHOUT-specific rules should be communicated only once approved.
- Accessible housing needs and adequate usable outdoor space should be considered at the design and allocation stages.
- Stakeholders value traditional Bahamian design, tree cover and neighbourhood character alongside climate resilience.
- Road access, traffic circulation and emergency egress should be verified and communicated in an understandable site plan.
- The consultation record should be used to update the relevant design/ESMP/SEP materials where warranted, with documented follow-up and continued GRM availability.
- Future consultation records should capture speaker names/affiliations where voluntarily supplied, questions, responses, responsible persons and action status, while protecting personal information.

Annexes

Annex A – Public Consultation Invitation
Annex B – Pinecrest II Public Consultation attendance register (controlled copy, redacted personal contact details).
Annex C– MOHLR SHOUT Public Consultation presentation, including Pinecrest II ESA/ESMP/SEP/GRM slides.
Annex D – SHOUT Public Consultation Program for Pinecrest II