



# *A Shared Community Vision*

## **Electoral Area ‘A’ OCP Review,**

*Citizen’s Committee Speaker Series*

*RGS, UCB, and Village Centres Workbook Responses*

This document presents the community’s responses to the questions and policy options presented in the workbook on the RGS, the UCB, and Village Centres.. The workbook is available on the Official Community Plan review project website at [www.asharedcommunityvision.ca](http://www.asharedcommunityvision.ca), by emailing a request to [areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca](mailto:areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca), or by contacting the Regional District of Nanaimo planning department at (250) 390-6510

## Options for the Cedar UCB

### **Do you support a main street concept in Cedar? Why?**

1. Yes, Cedar does not require the large box store and associated parking lots. Having on street parallel parking, landscaping, street scaping and such will dramatically improve the Village Centre and Main Street concept.
2. Not really , but since there is very little commercially zoned property in Cedar , this would be an appropriate place for it to be .
3. I support a main street concept because it would add to the cedar identity and it would give the community the services and amenities the community deserves. A main street may make travel to Nanaimo less necessary because residents could shop and receive services locally. A main street designation would encourage businesses and services to locate in a specific area instead of spreading throughout the community.
4. Yes. The mixed uses creates diversity and will provide residents with a pedestrian oriented Main Street is also preferred with through traffic being slowed to 50kph. Facilities should be provided for cyclists. A building scheme should be developed to set a theme for the building designs, landscaping, open spaces, etc. The scale should be small, (and comfortable - human).
5. Yes. I think the Main Street concept is very attractive. Cedar’s main street is currently quite unattractive in some spots and then has newer facilities such as the 49th Parallel mixed in. Not sure this could be accomplished in a timely manner as there is a large number of residences along Cedar Road. Our current “look” on Cedar Road creates a false impression of the rest of the community, many buildings are very old and unattractive like the cedar bakery area.
6. No, I do not support this concept at all because we should leave things the way they are, how our ancestors had it. All of those properties between Friesen’s and the Wheatsheaf are privately owned. The street is already lined with homes and yards except the gas station, old fire hall and 49th and ball diamond area. Who’s land would you build these additional stores and houses?
7. Yes it defines the commerce area and condenses amenities. I believe a main street is positive socially as shopkeepers are united and interact frequently with residents.
8. Yes. By developing within the UCB, we can increase residential, retail, professional, and recreational areas and not erode the agricultural rural properties that must be protected.

## Do you support a main street concept in Cedar? Why?

9. Yes, absolutely. Gut reasons are, it recognizes/honours the community sense of self found in this part of Area A. Historically, the main road from Victoria to Nanaimo followed this Main Street, and it remains a focal point in the present-day. From a practical standpoint re planning, the Main Street concept hits strongly on the first 7 of the RGS's goals; this is very good bang for the buck in planning terms.
10. Yes – put everything in one central location for efficiency and convenience. If it's not full service and convenient it won't be used. If people have to leave the area for a specific service they will be tempted to do everything else they need to do that day at the alternate location. Pack it all into one general area and do it right using a strict building scheme that considers public spaces.
11. Yes. This concept would have the potential to satisfy concerns about an increase in commercial space, additional residential and ultimately result in increased density to support improved transit service to the area.
12. YES. Adheres to best practice of "PLACEMAKING'. Vision Relevance: "highly desirable place to live,work, and play and as a result has become more socially, environmentally and economically sustainable" "enhances the quality of life""diverse culture,artistic talent and excellent multi-modal transportation" "young families and seniors are now attracted to and staying within the community" "there are opportunities for local employment which contribute to the local economy and have minimal impact on the environment" "growth is directed to well-defined village and neighbourhood centres" "the community is a vibrant place to live where a diversity of residents from all economic levels and ethnic backgrounds are welcomed and have an enhanced sense of community pride".
13. Yes. Centralization of services into well defined area resulting in reduced travel distances.
14. I don't have enough information to attempt to answer the following questions regarding Cedar and I don't have enough time to do the research.

# Options for the Cedar UCB

---

## If you support a Cedar Main Street Concept, under what conditions?

1. There must be an option to move traffic around this area. We do not want to design a traffic jam. Place traffic circles at Hemer and MacMillan Roads to provide an entrance to a slower moving area of cars, bikes and foot traffic.
2. A possible condition could be that newly built main street buildings have residential suites or apartments located above the retail or service area. This could create a more dynamic main street. Perhaps a theme or design style would add to a main street concept??
3. Rezoning would have to take place. Zoning properties up from residential to commercial would be the only way to create a main street as there are no vacant lots. Only negative is this concept could take a very long time to create. When would be the best time to up zone? Could up zoning help to speed up the process by automatically creating higher property values so current owners would sell off older houses therefore creating a lot that could be developed under new concept? Very hard to predict.
4. Who would pay for all this?
5. That there be a common theme aesthetically. Commercial amenities provided.
6. 1) Clear strong wording in the OCP to protect and encourage it, and to deter uncomplimentary growth and development which would weaken the Main Street concept. A good main street, as a service and residential node, enables various other sustainability objectives, such as use of alternatives to private cars for transport.  
2) Definition of supporting localities for Mainstreets in each of Area A's traditional community centres (Cassidy, South Wellington, Cedar). These are analogous to watersheds, they allow each centre to flourish, if they are managed in a complimentary way to support the Mainstreet. A Mainstreet in Cedar is a good beginning, but not sufficient; the other traditional centres need them too.
7. Confidence is the Key. Provide an area large enough for lots (50 years) of future growth. This time frame provides confidence to businesses that their investment is secure and will grow or at least be stabilized by new businesses coming in. Larger centralized/nodal type development is preferred versus scattering these services all over the area. This facilitates transportation and encourages people to come to and stay in the community. To provide 50 years of growth, it will be necessary to include properties that are currently residential. The wetlands on the east side of Cedar Rd, can be developed for multi use, including; wildlife reserve with walking trails and boardwalks.
8. Perhaps the area could be expanded as far as the Cranberry Arms if needed. Adequate parking would be critical as Cedar Road is extremely busy with not only a large volume but also vehicles ranging from autos, trucks, transport truck/trailers, gravel trucks and farm vehicles.
9. All establishments and residences in the core village should be on common sanitary, storm, and water systems. All properties should adhere to defined new development and/or infill subdivision building guidelines. Place-making practices successfully used by many jurisdictions should be used. One group I am familiar with who offer courses and counselling on this is Project For Public Spaces, [www.pps.org](http://www.pps.org)
8. Main Street needs careful planning and design so there is an overall look/ambiance suitable to the Cedar Area. Policy and design guidelines are definitely needed. Most importantly, no franchises eg. McDonalds, Tim Hortons, Walmart, etc. Qualicum has kept its charm by regulations against franchises. Businesses need to be owned and operated by local people. Policy could also include green designs and the Cedar Village could be a model of an environmentally friendly community development.
9. Commercial development in keeping with the existing pleasant design of the 49th parallel store complex.

# Options for the Cedar UCB

---

**If you do not support a Cedar Main Street Concept, what are your concerns, and how could they be addressed? Is there a more suitable location where additional local services and a range of housing could be provided? Are there other ways to build community identity?**

1. The concepts and pretty pictures of a ' Main Street ' would probably never fully develop along this stretch of road , so it would be a misleading concept to give to the community. A commercial centre is not a community's identity . Any additional commerce will have to compete with the major centres that will be developed in the Sandstone project , so the reality is that commercial opportunities are going to be limited.
2. A community farmers/crafts market was mentioned several times at the community workshops as was the possibility of a Cedar Fair. Both these concepts would add to community identity.
3. Cedar Road has water and now sewer, it would require both for the main street concept. There is a large opposition to having lights (red&green) in Cedar. The main street concept would require it, it already is very hard to turn onto Cedar Road at certain times of the day. Traffic has increased with growth and higher density would create more of an issue in this regard.
4. We have all the services we need already. Trailer parks could be built somewhere out of sight. Don't need to be right on Cedar Road. We already have community identity as it is. Everyone is happy with what we got. Why ruin it?
5. I like the choice of location based on what is already in existence, it can be enhanced with a high density residential commercial mix utilizing the Cedar Cultural centre as well.
6. My concern would be not to have a strip mall.

# Options for the Cedar UCB

---

## What amenities would you consider important if you support the Cedar Main Street concept?

1. Similar to Ladysmith in that there is no Neon Signs, a Town Square (clock etc) would be a nice addition.
2. I think health care offices, doctor, dentist, pharmacy would be important, but it would be ultimately up to the community to lobby for the services and amenities it deems important.
3. Pedestrian and Cyclist facilities, social gathering places, personal services, live/work developments, recreation facilities (but not large scale such as hockey arenas). Amenities should accommodate all age groups. Open spaces, large and small are important for all.
4. It already has the amenities it needs with water and sewer. I would like to see recreational sports like soccer and baseball supported with funding to create decent fields. Sports is very popular and well attended in this area.
5. None. We have everything we need already. Things are so overpriced at these stores (like Friesens or the 49th) its not worth getting anything out here anyways. They should be more community oriented and at least have compatible prices, not double everything.
6. Butcher, Baker, Laundromat, garden centre, banking, restaurants, vehicle service, feed/tak, sports recreational supply outlet, active transportation accessory stores (biking, kayaking, camping, riding, hiking, etc.).
7. Probably mostly people-services, places where residents can get to know familiar faces and access various daily things they need, e.g. health care, personal wellness, lifestyle services, computer repair and training etc. But the best approach is to poll residents and take the results to marketing/retail experts; we can make all the wish lists we like, but only the amenities which make business sense or fill a stated need will survive. A showcase Mainstreet is no good if it's economically struggling or dead.
8. At minimum it must include the full range services required for the daily life of the local population including medical offices, banking, food staples, restaurants, farmer's market, art shops, travel accommodation, and some recreation opportunity.
9. Space for a central park or outdoor meeting area / farmers' market, V.I. regional library branch, pharmacy, local bakery / coffee shop (not Tim Hortons or Starbucks style.).
10. Cultural gathering spots, benches , bike racks, pergolas, winding sidewalks, street lamps with colourful seasonal branding banners. See [www.pps.org](http://www.pps.org) Streets as Public Spaces concept.
11. In the long term, it would be wonderful to have a small medical clinic, even if it was a satellite of a larger in-town office.
12. Medical services (family doctor, pharmacy, laboratory).

# Cedar UCB Option 1: Maintain the Status Quo

---

## Do you support this option and if so under what conditions?

1. No. Although I live in the area on a 0.6 acre parcel
2. No
3. I don't support this option because it allows for little growth which is inevitable and it doesn't include a large part of Cedar which already has the same density as the Cedar UCB.
4. No.
5. No.
6. Yes. No need for community sewer no need for more transit. Leave us alone as is.
7. No.
8. With reservation, yes, but only if we can't agree on changes (Option 2). Option 1 is still a good start, but we should try to do better.
9. No There is a need to make the area more diverse to be attractive to new residents and visitors. Status Quo will not keep people in the community especially older folks. Some will want to stay near their families but need additional services and varied accommodation provided by younger professionals. Family values in this area are probably high and the tendency for seniors will be to stay in the area if possible.
10. I could support this option if we believe that the residents who live within the UCB see this as their definition of a rural lifestyle i.e. 2000m2 lots.
11. No.
12. Yes. DO not increase the local population. Increase amount of rural lands for food production. Stop cutting trees for development projects.
13. No.
14. No.

# Cedar UCB Option 1: Maintain the Status Quo

---

**If you do not support this option, please explain what could be done to address your concerns.**

1. There are no means to plan anything of the future. There is no additional park, trail and better road system. This can not continue.
2. The current UCB is inconsistent with the development that has taken place . A complete review of this UCB is in order to really plan for the future .
3. Expand the UCB to boundary to include the surrounding denser populated properties.
4. The UCB should be reworked to include the existing higher density developments adjacent to the existing boundaries. Redevelopment within the new UCB should occur to the maximum to maximize the land use and servicing.
5. The UCB needs to include the areas that are just outside of it that are identical in size and scope in most instances.
6. Abandon the concept of maintaining the status quo. My believe is that the concept is unrealistic as growth is inevitable.
7. Make the necessary policy changes to accommodate enough growth to keep pace with the demographic transformation. Not change for the sake of change but just enough to accommodate the Community Vision.
8. I see this as ticking time bomb if a community sewer system does not become a reality in the near future.
9. Concerns: Ministry of Transport maintenance of the current Cedar Village roadway and approaches leaves much to be desired. This throughway is quite unsafe particularly to pedestrians and cyclists. Even the median island at the commercial centre has chunks of cement broken off jutting out into the roadway . I recently shuddered to think of the outcome if a vehicle were to bounce off that obstruction just as 2 young mothers were navigating their strollers through mudholes on the roadside shoulder. And this is the centre of the Urban Containment Boundary?
10. There will be growth so we need to get our design/planning/and management strategies in place.

# Cedar UCB Option 1: Maintain the Status Quo

---

**How would this option help us work towards achieving the community vision? Please answer this question even if you don't support this option.**

1. It doesn't as it is simply a cop out over the idea of planning for the future. There needs to be a master plan of capital projects for the area and how every year the area can plan to achieve parts of the plan for the greater good.
2. It may not because I'm sure most of the residents living outside the UCB feel as if they are already part of Cedar Village. It would allow possible greater density if people subdivided their lots or built additional suites, etc.
3. I don't see that it does help.
4. It does nothing to the community vision. The community vision would not be affected by having the UCB changed to reflect what already exists, it is there now.
5. Build more trailer parks and there's your affordable housing for the young families.
6. This option would not help us address, less vehicular traffic, higher residential density, provision for housing for young and old, or any other amenities supported by higher density to become economical.
7. Although it predates this OCP review, it still achieves good progress on many of the vision/sustainability points, including nos 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 thru 12, and maybe 15.
8. It would not support it. The Status Quo is already obsolete.
9. Idea that residents have that this is their version of a rural lifestyle.
10. Not relevant to the vision statement.
11. Increase local food production. Shouldn't this be one of the RGS and Official Community Plan principles? Smaller communities asdn population have the benefits of people able to know their neighbour and pull together to help each other. Neighbours watch out for neighbours properties. When populations increase considerably, people tend to be unable or unwilling to maintain many connections - they isolate (as in cities) and the nature of the community change. We do not need to or want to see increases in population densification.
12. To think Area A can maintain the status quo totally lack and community vision.

# Cedar UCB Option 1: Maintain the Status Quo

---

**Is this option consistent with the direction provided by the sustainability principles? Why or why not?**

1. No, it is not consistent with the direction. The UCB in this case is nothing but a farce simply because there is so much development outside the existing boundary and the results are ill conceived planning that mirrors the zoning and nothing more.
2. No.
3. No. I believe it fails on 7 out of 15 principles.
4. It does nothing to the community vision. The community vision would not be affected by having the UCB changed to reflect what already exists, it is there now.
5. Yes because to sustain something is to leave it all the same. Do not take more than you can replace. No more developing.
6. It is not consistent: principle # 3, #5, #7,#9,#11,#12 are largely ignored in attempting to maintain status quo.
7. Yes, Although it predates this OCP review, it still achieves good progress on many of the vision/ sustainability points, including nos1, 2, 3, 5, 7 thru 12, and maybe 15.
8. No – no diversity)
9. Only if sewers are provided.
10. This option is unsustainable.
11. Yes. Maintain rural landscapes. Consider local food needs of future generations and prevent overuse of diminishing resources on an island. Commit to environmental stewardship, protection of water supplies, less pollution with smaller population. Keeping community small, keeps people connected to each other. People who know each other watch out for each other and keep community safe. The local economy, being rural should be related to family. If we dont maintain and increase farming in Area A, where else will we develop farming fr local produce? Regarding efficiency in transportation and services, the price for optimism is an expense that is not worth looking the intrinsic value of a rural landscape and small communities. We would do better to pressure governments to focus on solar powered vehicle production and do it now rather than later. There are options.
12. Nope! It misses ‘em all...

## Cedar UCB Option 2: Support a limited amount of additional residential growth

---

### Do you support this option and if so under what conditions?

1. Yes, there should also be an increase around the area of the Woodridge street. Adding suites to some residences and some areas inside the UCB area a great idea in reducing the sprawl and potentially increasing the use of transit and so on which is part of our plan. Not everyone will want or will need to have a suite but providing the option is a step in the right direction.
2. Yes , but the UCB needs to be re-examined.
3. Yes so long as the additional building are not obtrusive and keep the rural feel.
4. Yes, New development and redevelopment must maximize land and services, while creating a healthy, liveable village.
5. Yes.
6. No.
7. Yes, I support this option, provided residential growth were kept confined to the UCB.
8. Yes, but on the basis that existing developed lands now outside the UCB (shaded in the map) are brought in. I don't support boundary expansion into unsettled new areas, or into land suitable for purposes other than settlement (e.g. agriculture, light industry, recreation etc). It would appear that a significant amount of extra capacity is gained by more fully using the existing lot inventory in the current UCB, and after that is occupied, the thinking should be starting to go upward (modest high-rise), not sprawling horizontally.
9. I support the maximum growth allowed under the sustainability principles in this specific area only. The current boundaries of the UCB must be reviewed and potentially increased to meet the growing population.
10. This is the more realistic option but I can see some concerns from the residents who presently live in the UCB - namely additional buildings on properties and moving to a noisier neighbourhood with increased density.
11. YES. With enforceable development and building guidelines.
12. No. This option would alter the rural nature of our community and turn it into a north Nanaimo.
13. Yes. I also feel the UCB should be amended so we can contain growth that will happen in the future.
14. Absolutely with proper controls well established creating a vibrant living community where people are proud to live, work, and play.

## Cedar UCB Option 2: Support a limited amount of additional residential

---

**If you do not support this option, please explain what could be done to address your concerns.**

1. Have no concern, it already exists.
2. Nothing can be done to address my concerns. No more building of houses. We do not need to attract more families.
3. It helps us work towards achieving the community vision by providing a variety of housing options at a variety of price ranges, therefore providing opportunities for the greatest range of people living or wanting to live in Area A.
4. Growth must be tied to sustainability. To avoid stagnation the area must “grow or change”. Alternatively it must “grow and change”.
5. Dont allow for small parcels of residential housing. Keep it at five acre minimum and encourage production of farm food with tax incentives for those who do.

## **Cedar UCB Option 2: Support a limited amount of additional residential growth**

---

### **How would this option help us work towards achieving the community vision?**

**Please answer this question even if you don't support this option.**

1. It works only because the zoning has made it so. We must further plan and build this idea for additional space for the future needs of the people in the area or future areas within the UCB.
2. It would help work towards the community vision because it would protect the pressure on the land outside the UCB by encouraging growth in the UCB.
3. This option employs smart growth and respects the rural nature of Area 'A'.
4. Does nothing to the vision, it is already there. Properties outside the area in blue are already zoned different than areas in blue.
5. A key to vibrancy and sustainability is population density and tax-dollar generation in the right place's). A node with some encouraged population density can drive the community vision elements forward strongly and tangibly.
6. A critical mass of workers is required to operate the businesses that are required to keep old and young people in the local community. Every business and institution needs workers. Make room for more families.
7. It might be viable.
8. It would detract from community vision. It would change the rural landscape, increasing the population increases need to deal with more issues, more infrastructure, more facilities, more services, more taxes, more commercial clutter. If we want transportation with a wide range of options, we would need to increase the population so much that we may as well move to Vancouver and its suburbs.
9. It would definitely manage growth of a well-defined village and neighbourhood centre. It also allows for a diversity of residents and uses while maintaining/protecting the rural integrity of Area A.
10. Cedar would be a socially, environmentally, and economically area.

## Cedar UCB Option 2: Support a limited amount of additional residential growth

---

**If you feel that the UCB should be amended to accommodate this option, please indicate on the map where you think it should go.**

1. The UCB should contain everything up White Rd., the West side of Woobank to Canin including Nairne. Extending to the North of Cedar Rd. to include all between that and Woodridge for future growth.
2. Can't do it on the computer, but some lands should be added and some should be deleted. Rational needs to be provided on how and why the existing boundaries were determined in order to properly consider re-alignment.
3. I agree with the suggestions already laid down on the map. Question: Why is the Woodridge Road development not included in the UCB.
4. The blue area should be added.
5. Include BlueJay (the shaded area to the east); it's little or not at all different from the current UCB lands, and would benefit and suit further servicing.
6. Yes – add all reasonable perimeter areas.
7. RDN staff and politicians should determine the extended UCB placement. In doing so, do not exclude the possibility that subsequent OCP reviews may require new or infill subdivision to take place at 50% higher density ie 1000m<sup>2</sup> (1/4 acre) in the extended boundary. This is still very low density for a UCB, but it may be necessary to support the infrastructure to make this option economically viable. My guess is the future demand projections stated in the background material are quite underestimated.
8. I agree with the proposed changes. However, UCB lands along Nanaimo River need careful and environmentally best practices to protect farm land and valuable water resources.
9. Quail Grove Place, Kirkstone, Hemer, Morland.

## Cedar UCB Option 2: Support a limited amount of additional residential growth

---

### Is this option consistent with the direction provided by the sustainability principles? Why or why not?

1. Yes, the UCB represents existing properties. We should however add more allowance for future use.
2. Yes, main increase is growth contained to UCB.
3. Yes I believe that this option is consistent with most of the sustainability principles especially if combined with a main street concept. It would protect surrounding lands, create a sense of community, strengthen the local economy, etc., etc.
4. Yes, I believe this option allows us to include all 15 principles.
5. It doesn't change anything, it is there now.
6. Rural areas are sparsely populated. Future generations don't want to live like its Hong Kong. A healthy community is now. If it gets bigger it'll get sick - sick of each other.
7. Yes, I think it addresses the majority of sustainability principles.
8. Yes. By enabling nodal development, efficiencies for various sustainability goals/objectives become achievable. If we don't choose this option, we hamstring the RGS and the sustainability principles, they will struggle and never flourish.
9. Yes- supports the local economy and considers the needs of future generations. In order for a land management model to remain in place, it must meet the social, environmental and economic needs of the community.
10. Meets most of the sustainability principles, with heavier weighting towards the following: "consider the needs of future generations in today's decisions" and, "provide services in an efficient and cost effective manner".
11. Yes.
12. Growth will be directed into well-defined neighbourhood areas that have existing buffers therefore preserving existing rural areas.

# Cedar UCB Option 3 - No more growth pull back the UCB

---

## Do you support this option and if so under what conditions?

1. No. We must plan for the future growth of this area otherwise it becomes haphazard.
2. No
3. I would not support this option unless there was a large decrease in population and I don't think that's likely.
4. No.
5. No.
6. Yes, I do. We are full. No more people are needed or wanted out here. There are many places in the world that are full. Cannot move there. Why cant we be like it?
7. No under no condition.
8. No, not under any circumstances. There is growth energy in Area A, and if an OCP attempts to stifle it, it will pop the gasket and inspire political action. It is far preferable to channel that energy and steer it in good directions.
9. No. I support the notion of large development areas and large non-development rural areas. A no growth plan will send all the young people and seniors to other areas. A range of living accommodations and services is required to reach the desired demographic levels and achieve the "community vision".
10. Not a practical option - still leaves a problem with sewage treatment.
11. No.
12. Yes, keep this area primarily rural residential, as it is, and encourage the use of farmland for local food production.
13. No.
14. No.

# Cedar UCB Option 3 - No more growth pull back the UCB

---

**If you do not support this option, please explain what could be done to address your concerns.**

1. No opportunity for our children to continue to live in the community they grew up in.
2. A combination of option 1&2.
3. Major redevelopment would be required to provide for increased densities and new business and personal services for existing residents.
4. Nothing, I do not support this option at all. This area has grown way past this option and do not see why this would even be looked at as an option. I do not support no growth whatsoever.
5. My concern is that the concept of no growth is not realistic and we have our best chance at sustainability by careful cautious governed growth now for our future.
6. I don't see anything by way of mitigation or making it palatable; this seems regressive, and almost certain to cause a lot of trouble.
7. In my view "change or perish" applies. "No growth" is counter to the objectives of the Community Vision. But if the decision is to wait then provision should be made to revisit the decision in the near future.
8. I believe the vast majority of residents in Area "A" agree that some growth is inevitable.
9. Concerns: Impractical option.
10. Nothing.
11. Establish procedures for controlled growth to meet population requirements in the future.

# Cedar UCB Option 3 - No more growth pull back the UCB

---

**How would this option help us work towards achieving the community vision?  
Please answer this question even if you don't support this option.**

1. It does not. By sticking your head in the sand the Zoning takes over and the developers do what they can make fit into the existing regulations.
2. This option hobbles improvement of the village and will create stagnation of our vision.
3. This option of no growth at all supports nothing including the community vision. I do not see this concept achieving anything other than no change at all which is not realistic.
4. An over populated community is not healthy, its stressed. A stressed community is not healthy. More people = more crime = not safe (principle #8).
5. It does not.
6. It will not. Any possible gains in environmental/agricultural goals will be overwhelmed by resident dissatisfaction in the densely settled areas. Population pressure and ballot box power will prevail
7. It would not.
8. I doubt that it would. In fact, there will be increased pressure to develop land outside of the UCB contrary to the Vision.
9. This option is contrary to the Community Vision.
10. The community will be farm-based and increasingly be able to provide local needs for food. As California dries up we can develop food production in an environmentally sustainable fashion with small farms and a larger farm work force.
11. It only helps points 1 and 2.
12. Area A would be a desirable area to work, live, and play.

# **Cedar UCB Option 3 - No more growth pull back the UCB**

---

**If you support this option, please indicate on the map where you think the amended UCB should go.**

1. Don't know which is private or public land. Cant answer this one.
2. Yes – add all reasonable perimeter areas.
3. I don't know enough about the UCB boundary at this time to comment.

# Cedar UCB Option 3 - No more growth pull back the UCB

---

## Is this option consistent with the direction provided by the sustainability principles? Why or why not?

1. No because it does not allow for controlled growth in an UCB. It would put more pressure on surrounding properties.
2. Generally, yes, in that the majority of the principles could be included.
3. No.
4. Yes because we don't want Cedar to become a Nanaimo north end with cookie cutter houses and manicured lawns with poodles and lapdogs everywhere.
5. No it is not consistent as it is not sustainable, socially, environmentally, or economically.
6. Any argument claiming consistency is open to a lot of solid criticism. UCB rollback is regressive and is likely to increase uncertainty and reduce ability to manage growth well.
7. No – it will force people to look elsewhere for other options and possibly leave the area altogether.
8. I don't think the sustainability principles are effected positively or negatively by this option.
9. This option is simply unsustainable.
10. Not if it means building housing developments on less than 5 acre lots of land.
11. No we cannot stop growth but we can plan/manage it.
12. Does not consider the needs of future generations.

# Options for Cassidy UCB

---

## Is Cassidy currently providing for the needs of its residents? Why or why not?

1. No. There is a lack of services i.e. Transit, employment, shopping (no or little employment).
2. No - the community is shrinking and so are the services. An indicator that Cassidy is not sustainable. Lack of services because the community is not large enough, lack of transit, lack of employment activities, lack of commercial and light industrial, schools.
3. Not. Requires better transportation services. Better commercial services.
4. No. Cassidy is lacking many amenities, services, and opportunities that many other communities take for granted. There is no access to public transit, no local school, no field for sports, no park for children to play, no community building for people to meet, no trails, no public access to Haslam Creek, no walk signal/crosswalk at the Timberlands Road light, etc. It does offer a variety of housing options, many of which are affordable. It does offer a relaxed, rural life-style. There is a sense of community in Cassidy.
5. No it is not. There is a lack of services and there is not a public transit service, as well as a lack of employment opportunities.
6. As a non-resident of Cassidy I am unable to answer this question, but it seems that the residents lack services and amenities.
7. Difficult to answer. I do not live in the area. I would think the lack of water and sewer is a big problem now and will be into the future. Sitting on the aquifer requires careful consideration with regards to what kind of growth that should take place, certainly not industrial.
8. No.
9. No, there are few amenities provided to Cassidy's community.
10. It's doing ok, but not great. The relative lack of community services (banking etc) is unfortunate, and cannot entirely be excused on the grounds that there is a large "sunset" sector of retirees resident there; this population density could just as well be a reason to have such additional services and sense of community
11. It is very close to the best it can do for a while. Cassidy residents have other options close by, they are more likely to use venues in Ladysmith and Chase River for most of their household purchases.
12. I believe that it probably is. Most of the residents of the mobile home parks moved there knowing what the area had to offer and were satisfied that it met their needs.
13. NO. Clearly the area has not been given even the basic amenities such as a park.
14. It's a rural community. Does not need 4 major airports, unlike most large Canadian cities that have only 1 for 200+ radius, villages don't need an abundance of services that exist. Increasingly these amenities will turn the community into a suburb. Might as well move to the suburbs of Vancouver if people want what the city provides.
15. Considering the number of dwellings over the Cassidy aquifer, this community definitely needs a community sewer service.
16. No - no transportation.
17. There are more parks required. Cassidy like S Wellington would benefit greatly by restored rail service.

# Options for Cassidy UCB

---

**Is there a desire to make Cassidy a more complete community with a more diverse range of uses and housing types as well as parks, trails, and recreational opportunities, and more viable options for transit? If so under what conditions?**

1. Yes, Cassidy should be a more complete community. All the above is missing.
2. Yes, a more complete community is desired. All of the above should be provided. The conditions need to balance economics, environment, and society.
3. Yes. More structured recreational services and diverse housing.
4. Many community members would like to see all of the above and I'm sure some would like to see no change. However, based on the community members I talked to their main concerns are: protect the aquifer, that there is a desperate need for transit, preserve the rural atmosphere, and many residents express a fear that as land prices rise they could be evicted from the manufactured home parks. Local businesses, of course, would embrace more housing and increased population.
5. Yes there is a desire to make a more complete community by providing all of the above.
6. I believe that Cassidy should be provided the same facilities as Cedar to achieve 'complete community' status. The scale may be smaller or rate of change slower, but improvements should still occur to meet the residents needs and desires. All decisions and actions should be taken with protection of the aquifers as the number one priority. Perhaps community sewer should be first on the list of facilities.
7. Without some kind of community water and sewer treatment plant of some kind recreation buildings do not seem like an option. Park and trails could be developed but I doubt there are enough residences or tax base in the area to support this financially. Same with transit, would need larger ridership to support it. Is there a desire for all of the above, don't know, I don't live there.
8. Yes.
9. Yes, I think there is a desire to make Cassidy a more complete community. Under the condition that it be done within the UCB, perhaps also, increasing.
10. I think so, and to anticipate the obvious, under conditions of no increase in taxes. Which should not be that difficult a proposition to satisfy. Given that OCPs and the accessory bylaws are able to change the rules landscape, improvements can happen driven by business interests.
11. Yes – the UCB is already close to maximum capacity. The UCB needs to be enlarged and additional community services must be nurtured. Land options for expansion should be considered and set aside for the future growth of Cassidy which may be primarily light industrial and residential.
12. There may be a desire expressed but the reality is that the challenges are unlikely to be addressed.
13. YES. Engage the area more fully following an OCP recommendation to conduct a more detailed Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) . The results of which could amend this OCP in subsequent year(s).
14. Because there is no sewer system, it is not desirable to increase housing. Within 10 years, there should be transit service to Cassidy and the Airport.
15. Yes but the population can not support it.
16. I haven't had enough opportunity to discuss or hear the residents of the Cassidy area concerns.

# Options for Cassidy UCB

---

**If so, with limited vacant land and limited additional development potential, do you think Cassidy can work towards becoming a more complete community within the current village boundaries?**

1. No. Not at all. The boundaries need to be stretched in order to have the required vacant land available.
2. No-the boundaries need to expand to get more people so we can support more services. Stay off the ALR.
3. No. Increase Boundaries to accommodate.
4. I don't. The opportunities would be limited unless the minimum lot size was decreased and even then this would allow only a few more lots to be available if people even desired to subdivide. There is no room for real substantial development, housing, business/services, green space, trails, etc.
5. No this cannot be achieved because there is very limited vacant land. The current boundaries would need to expand.
6. No.
7. To me Cassidy seems fine as it is, a sleepy rural area. I do not live there and have no idea what those who live in the area might want.
8. Perhaps a review of the UCB is necessary here.
9. Yes for sure. The third dimension (upward) has not been exploited well at all; Cassidy's manufactured home sector is an example of making poor use of settlement "footprint", even compared to simple 2-story detached homes. Some apartment buildings could be a good element to permit.
10. No - Land options for expansion must be considered and set aside for future growth of Cassidy. The location of the community positions it for a number of options in transportation and light industry.
11. No. Not unless ways are found to address the major challenges.
12. If the neighbourhood so desires, they might explore the feasibility of mixed use commercial-residential development in the potentially underutilized utility corridor to advance their economic and social sustainability. On a much grander scale than would be contemplated in Cassidy, but maybe worth looking into for other ideas is the example of one section of a development in the South Surrey/White Rock peninsula that has been developed under the Hydro utility and adjacent highway corridor . If desired, I could provide specific information regarding that type of land use as I was the Community Association chair representing landowners of 1300 acres while living in that area.
13. No need for big box stores. Cassidy has a gas station, post office, and seasonal market. More could mean a bank, hospital, drugstore, major grocery store, clothing store, library, liquor store, school, fire hall, etc. Then Cassidy is no longer a village. It's a town competing with other major towns/cities. The population would have to change dramatically/drastically and again Cassidy is no longer a village. Its developed like Duncan a City that deceptively expands in all directions - spread into bedroom communities that no longer have the rural agricultural feel.
14. No.
15. Not within its current population.
16. Yes.

# Options for Cassidy

---

**Some of the lands identified for potential village expansion are private managed forest lands which have been harvested. Does the community, in this particular case, support the conversion of these lands to accommodate additional development to meet the needs of the community?**

1. Yes as it relieves the pressure on conversion of ALR lands. It is suitable. Get off the forest land company bashing hobby horse.
2. Yes - This land is suitable and will enable us to meet several of the communities needs.
3. Yes. No point in having forest land in this area.
4. Many of the community would support this conversion: business, families, young people. Some of the elderly residents may not support this option. It is hard to accurately gauge the feeling of the community as a whole. The people I spoke to are generally supportive. They are more vocal about what they don't want to see: subdivision with sidewalks, street lights, increased taxes.
5. The plan to create an industrial/commercial site (warehousing) adjacent to the rail node is a good one - save for its fixation on being a link to YCD. The better aim - as no warehousing exists to facilitate agricultural shipments from Area 'A' to the outside world - would focus on overcoming the obstacle presented by Haslam Roads feeding of traffic towards Cassidy's other rail node.
6. Yes, these lands are suitable and will enable us to work towards meeting some of the community needs as previously mentioned.
7. Yes, However, the zoning should be set up to ensure compatibility between different neighbouring zones.
8. I have no pulse on what this community might want.
9. No.
10. Yes, I support the conversion of these lands.
11. Don't have enough background to answer this.
12. Yes – absolutely. Indicate interest to government and if possible tie up the options now.
13. I don't support this unless there is a community water supply and primary & secondary sewage treatment facilities developed for the existing and expanded Cassidy UCB.
14. More input is needed from the neighbourhood and more options need to be envisioned. One observation is that if these lands have been harvested for speculative purposes there is already a different land use targetted for this space. The community needs to get in front of this and influence the direction or be left reacting to the emerging new uses. Transparency is a sustainability principle that comes to mind here.
15. No. People in these villages cannot expect to have all amenities in such a small areas/small population. South Wellington and Cassidy folks support South Gate and Ladysmith. This keeps adjacent centres viable and keeps the villagers and surrounding areas rural. The idea of expanding residential development to create a need for business does not seem to be generated from the community members, who chose to live in the country because of its rural characteristics.
16. We need more representation from the residents in Cassidy. The airport is represented, the people are not.
17. I would strongly doubt that.
18. NO. managed forest lands should be managed as forests. What are the needs of the community?

# Options for Cassidy

---

**Do you support an expansion to the Cassidy Village to include some or all of the areas identified on the right? Why of why not and under what conditions? Which lands do you consider appropriate for expansion. Feel free to draw on the map.**

1. Yes. They are perfectly located. They are all adequate for expansion. See map.
2. Add 100 acres low impact light industrial commercial (warehousing, mini-storage, churches, log home building, outdoor sales, business park, garden centre, bus stop, park and ride, and rail stop. Yes we support the expansion, need to manage the environmental but this is possible because the site is large enough.
3. Yes. Good for combination of residential and commercial (across from airport).
4. Stronger tourist-based approach to include airport support, golf course, and recreational.
5. I support an expansion to the Cassidy Village to include all the areas identified. I feel they should be added and perhaps developed one section at a time (see map 1,2,3) but I may be wrong. It would be great if parkland, green buffers, and trail development be included in these areas. I also believe that a certain area be zoned or designated for a commercial retail area (perhaps the corner of Timberlands and Hallberg Roads). People have questions about lot sizes and certainly would like to keep the rural appeal of the area. (No vinyl style subdivisions).
6. The identified lands can support our needs. Why is this piece not included?
7. If the UCB is fully developed then an expansion is required. Development should be compact to maximize land use and be part of a master village plan. Open spaces should be integral to all development.
8. If the majority in this area support expansion I have no issue. Expansion must consider that this area sits on an aquifer. No industrial development. Allow for agricultural development or a nice walking outside market, whiskey creek style.
9. No.
10. Yes I support an expansion, including the areas to the right in order to accommodate growth within the community and an ability to provide amenities within the community. I consider all blue areas appropriate for expansion.
11. It could be useful to consider especially the parcel between the UCB and the airport.
12. Yes – provide as much as is possible and reasonable and additional lands along the highway corridor should also be added.
13. I don't support this unless there is a community water supply and primary & secondary sewage treatment facilities developed for the existing and expanded Cassidy UCB.
14. You only have to look at airports like Abbotsford which started small and now are expanding, including customs entry point status and gobbling up ALR lands. These lands depicted adjacent to the Cassidy airport and highway and utility corridor will take on a different land use. What best use will Cassidy benefit from?
15. No. Expansion over the aquifer adds risk to the largest most vulnerable source of water mid Vancouver Island. To encourage population growth increases social problems and changes the nature of the area we were drawn to live in.
16. I could see development of light industrial in these areas, but the conditions would have to deal consciously with the sustainability principles. I would rather see light industrial development in the expanded area of Cassidy than South Wellington.
17. No I do not think there is adequate infrastructure for this. I do not support expanding the Cassidy UCB. Cassidy Village consists of what? Perhaps there needs to be a Cassidy Village townhall meeting organised to receive feedback from the residents. I don't feel we have heard from many residents during this process, though there seems to be development plans in the works.

# Options for Cassidy

---

**What other opportunities do you see that Cassidy could take advantage of to help it become a more complete community? How do you see the airport and surrounding lands fitting in with the future of Cassidy?**

1. Pedestrian walkway to airport
2. E&N stop at airport
3. Flatten rock hump and use for development. Fill old highways pit.
4. Hook light industrial areas into rail cargo stop.
5. Provide employment where people live.
6. Hooking up the airport to the railroad.
7. Increase employment and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
8. Cassidy could definitely take advantage of its proximity to several eco-tourist sites/activities: Wild play, Cross Canada Trail, Nanaimo River, ATV Trails, horse riding trails, etc. People do come into Cassidy looking for places to stay and places to eat. People that attend the Western Maritime Institute could be looking for accommodation. The airport expansion could obviously have a huge impact on Cassidy creating a need for increased services. The 100 acre light industrial site is a mystery to most Cassidy residents. Will it have a frontage road? What kinds of industry will be allowed, etc, etc. It does offer exciting job possibilities for residents, but no communication about the site to locals has occurred and it certainly should follow the principles of smart planning.
9. Dare we hope that the Airport lands - over which the Regional District of Nanaimo has no jurisdiction - don't continue to squander land and resources that could otherwise be a boon to Cassidy's well-being in the not too distant "re-localized" future, within which the rail corridor will be a much more important transportation asset than the airport could ever hope to be, an airport, the expansion of which, can only increase the Regional District of Nanaimo's production of greenhouse gases.
10. The expansion of the airport will provide a greater need for a transit station. As well as the railroad lines could work in conjunction with the airport and the community.
11. Airport related businesses could be encouraged to locate in Cassidy to create employment and a tax base.
12. There could be an advantage to a walking outside type of market, similar to Russels which is closer to Duncan. With the airport, tourists could take advantage and it could be quite viable.
13. None. They already have a pub. Airport expansion should have not been authorized. This was done for pure profits no consideration for farm animals and wildlife being terrified every time a low flying aircraft goes by (daily x8).
14. Cassidy could take advantage of the rail system and rapid transit to encourage commuters and a commuter interchange between Victoria and Duncan facilitating air travel and rail between these communities and Qualicum Beach and Campbell River with Nanaimo being the hub.
15. Airport support services, housing for various personnel etc could be factored into the objectives of the UCB. Bob Lapham developed a constructive realignment proposal for the highway to reduce traffic lights and safety risks, as well as improving access for some of the industrial park sites. This should be looked at to foster more interaction between the airport and Cassidy; at present, the highway serves as a moat separating the two.
16. The location of the community positions it for a number of future options in transportation and light industry. The airport enhances future prospects as a transportation hub. It has excellent highway exposure and access to support a light industrial park and possibly traveler accommodations.
17. It might be a good fit to piggy back with the Airport in the future on sewage treatment and water supply.
18. The highway, airport, railway will create pressure to develop industrial and commercial uses. Where are the Cassidy residents? What do they want?
19. Transportation hub possibility.

# Options for Cassidy

---

**What other opportunities do you see that Cassidy could take advantage of to help it become a more complete community? How do you see the airport and surrounding lands fitting in with the future of Cassidy?**

1. Expansion of the airport, increase air traffic will further diminish the value of rural residential living. Expansion of land development increases risk to the aquifer. Cassidy is basically rural, small farm properties, and stands to loosing its beauty and character. Do not rezone forestry lands. Allow tree seedlings (plant first) to grow to a mature forest. We've lost so much forest land, it is affecting our climate (water recharge, etc.).
2. No I do not see the airport fitting into the future of Cassidy. Repeatedly, the same themes emerge within our current OCP discussions, the need to protect the Cassidy Aquifer, the importance of agriculture, the recognition of environmental integrity, uncertainty due of global climate change, and a desire to tackle the goal of sustainability for our area. The NAC claimed to consult with the 'community'. They must have meant the 'business community' not the people livng nearby. Despite many requests from residents to be heard fairly, and a third party independent assessment be considered, 'consultation' was reduced to Nanaimo Airport Commission (NAC) controlled open house format with no meaningful opportunity to debate or discuss issues. This has certainly not helped the airport 'fit' into the community. Many of us hoped that the OCP process would have allowed an opportunity for discussion of airport development to address claims of potential benefit and to answer community concerns. We have been told that the airport is a transportation hub and economic driver of our area. This claim has not been substantiated to the public, outside of information produced by the NAC. The Cassidy community living adjacent to the airport will bear the negative effects of airport development - traffic, increased air and noise pollution, and threat to drinking water. The NAC and the RDN are missing an important opportunity for cooperation by ignoring community concerns. Trust in the RDN and "due process" has been jeopardised by the refusal of the RDN and staff to publicly disclose the information that would support the RDN claim that a regional government has no jurisdiction at the Nanaimo airport. The NAC, supposedly serving the community is undermining our ability to shape our future, it certainly is not helping us to become a complete community, in fact it has been negative and divisive. It is not possible to answer the question , '\_How do you see the airport and surrounding lands fitting in with the future of Cassidy? What are the plans? Who has jurisdiction? Who do I talk to with my concerns or comments? I have been told by the RDN they have no jurisdiction, same with MOT. The Premiers office advised me to and speak with the CEO of the NAC. This is so unacceptable and frustrating that it is difficult to have faith in any further process.

# Options for Cassidy

---

**What other opportunities do you see that Cassidy could take advantage of to help it become a more complete community? How do you see the airport and surrounding lands fitting in with the future of Cassidy?**

1. With Regards to the Airport: I want to know what significant and measurable: frontend moneys ; land in lieu; or public amenities has the Airport Authority been required to undertake that will directly benefit Area A as a result of the airport expansion? If such development charges or contractual commitments do not benefit or directly reduce taxes for all Area A residents considering the forthcoming jet plane noise and hydrocarbons about to be forced on this area, there is something wrong with this picture. Speaking from experience (and as a private pilot) I for one believe this community has no idea of the negative impact the airport expansion will have on us. Recently It took 3 large communities (of which I was one of the community chair's) and full political pressure on the mainland to finally convince NavCanada et al to reroute jet landing and takeoff approaches due to incredibly annoying noise levels over residences. No amount of marketing spin and paid consultants' reports can mitigate the loss of rural quiet; black soot dropping on your animals and children; jet fuel dumping over the ocean; loss of property value; and the impact on the Cassidy aquifer. The horse is already out of the barn on this one. The antithesis of the Community Vision.

# South Wellington Overview

---

**Do you think the Official Community Plan should recognize South Wellington's past? If so, what should the Official Community Plan do to preserve and/or enhance South Wellington's coal mining history?**

1. I do think the Official Community Plan should recognize S. Wellington's past. Its history is well documented. Perhaps some highway signage could direct people to the Morden Mine site and an on-site museum could be developer. Perhaps certain historical building could be designated as heritage sites.
2. Yes! Designate it as an historical node? Rather, designate them as historical sites! Emphasize the historical amidst parks aplenty!
3. Yes, the Official Community Plan should support the interpretation of South Wellington's history for residents and tourists. Point of Interest should be included on walking and biking trails if possible.
4. Yes, museum.
5. I think the park is sufficient as funds to maintain a more enthusiastic effort remain elusive.
6. It is a shame not to; it's a rich past, quite recent, and before long people will wish they did a better job in tending it. At the least, the OCP should recognize it, with some specific comment and some imagination, a nod to the future options.
7. Yes – preserve existing history to some degree but it should not be overdone or preserved at great expense. Save and market existing key sites only. The historical context will be part of its future development prospects, in a supportive role, but the community will not be particularly noted for its coal mining history which it shares with many other areas in the surrounding region.
8. I don't think so. If South Wellington is singled out then Granby also needs to be considered.
9. YES. If it has not done so already, why not become one of BC's funded "Spirit Park" destinations?
10. That's up to the people of South Wellington.
11. I find the history of SW interesting and enjoy learning about it, however I am not personally interested in 'preserving' it as such. However, I am willing to support those such as, Friends of Morden Mine(FOMM)to whom it is important . Don't know where else to put the following process comments. I appreciate the work that the RDN staff has put into the OCP process. Greg Keller and others have worked hard to help our large and varied community come together and envision a future. The workshops held have generated much interesting discussion and excellent ideas to this point. These workbooks contain a lot of information and obviously much time and effort has been dedicated. However, I know I speak for many when I say that I there is concern that the Area A OCP is in danger of falling far short of meeting many of the challenges the community has identified. A lot of stamina is required to participate fully in this review, especially if planning, environmental studies, and global climate change are not within your scope of practical knowledge. Due to the enormity of the task many felt overwhelmed, and it has been hard to attract more community members so there are far too few shouldering the task. It is one thing to have a sense of where the problems lie, but quite another to suggest ways of mitigating past mistakes and avoiding future pitfalls. There are very few participating, qualified or trained to understand the big picture or to evaluate the tools available. The RDN staff, understandably , must navigate a path that attempts to satisfy all stakeholders, yet stakeholders with a vested interest, have a much narrower focus of concern. Area A faces increasing pressures and unique challenges, and it's great that the RDN staff have given so much background and so many options, but how can the actual decisions that will create the Area A OCP be made less onerous and more effective? It seems to me residents could benefit from having an advocate/consultant to help sort through all this information if we are to actually make the real changes that are required to become the community model of sustainability. Are there independent consultants with expertise who could help us apply concepts, give advise, and warn of unsuspected omissions or implications? Specifically what has been used successfully in other communities that may be applied or adapted to fit ours? Or/and if programs mentioned such as 'Smart Growth', 'The Natural Step' and 'Develop with Care' already solve many of the dilemmas we are facing, let's just adopt them.

# Options for South Wellington

---

## **Do you support the creation of a neighbourhood centre where a range of local services could be provided? If so under what conditions?**

1. Yes because it is overdue and given the state of global economic/environmental affairs, the future well-being of Area 'A' very much depends upon the future well-being of South Wellington.
2. I would only support it if it is proven to be economically viable i.e. self-sustaining. It should be small-scale and off the highway.
3. What kind of services? Do not see how this area can be supported by water and sewer, nor how it would ever be affordable.
4. Yes, but there is no space.
5. Yes, under the condition that a containment boundary be designated.
6. Yes; it seems to be desired, so enough said.
7. Yes – it should be remembered that full services are readily accessible and close by. It may duplicate existing and planned services from nearby venues. Additional services are planned for development in the Snuneymuxw First Nation territory near the Cedar Rd turnoff.
8. No. When the Sandstone Project is built all services will be less than 5 minutes away. If the school is ever closed I believe that it would be useful as a formal community centre.
9. Residents of South Wellington should make that determination through a separate Neighbourhood Concept Planning (NCP) process.
10. Difficult to say. A good concept to avoid travel, but would have to be developed to such an extent as to spoil the rural area. Folks would still have to travel for many unavailable services, so they may as well continue to keep the viable services in Southgate, Cedar, Ladysmith, and South Nanaimo. Probably a No, unless its only one building, not several.
11. No South Wellington can use Southgate and its services.
12. Yes - properly planned and designed.
13. No.

# Options for South Wellington

---

**If so, where would it go? Is there an area that already act as a village centre that could be expanded and/or improved. Please draw on the map.**

1. 3 part Village Centre/"node": 1. The historical village centre: Minto and Dick Avenues. Many (most?) don't want this area to change. Nor, perhaps should it to any great degree. 2. The current residential core that has grown between the old South Wellington Village and the highway, 3. The Development Permit Area - which needs much more oversight to mitigate its negative affects.
2. It should be located so as not to cause conflict with existing residents and commerce, and in such a way as to serve the majority of residents easily. It should be done with a view to creating an UCB either now or in the near future. Plan it with foresight.
3. Why does a community the size of South Wellington require a village centre? South Wellington is very rural and should remain that way.
4. Rutledge Store. Maybe get rid of the school and put it there. There's not enough kids in it anyway.
5. This is difficult, given the highway's bisection of the area. The west side appears to have better merits (store, maritime institute etc)
6. I would like us to have a community hall/centre for recreation, meetings, etc. Fire hall is hard to hear in because of echo. Back behind the fire hall there could be room for another building.
7. The school currently acts as the village centre for many residents. Therefore, it is important for the Official Community Plan to support the communities efforts to keep the school.
8. Yes along highway/Morden Road intersection where industry exists.

# Options for South Wellington

---

**If you do not support a village in South Wellington, What are your concerns and how might they be addressed?**

1. I do not support any more industrial development in South Wellington. Duke Point is half empty - enough eye sores out on our main highway and on top of the aquifer.
2. As above - There would be no need for services as they could be obtained nearby.
3. One community centre, not a bunch of shops that can barely be supported by a small population. And please no increase in population.
4. There is not enough population in South Wellington to sustain small business. However, having access to transit would give young people more options than hanging out in the highway underpass.
5. Sandstone is already slated for development. No further services are required.

# Options for South Wellington

---

## Would creating a village centre in South Wellington help us achieve the community vision?

1. How do you satisfy the objectives of the RGS without a village centre and how else do we access services without an automobile?
2. I believe it would, if done well.
3. While I do not live in this area, I do not see why it would need a village centre. I'm not in opposition of a village centre if this is what the majority who live in the area would want.
4. Yes, providing condensed growth management, providing amenities and addressing greenhouse gas emissions much like the model for Cedar I believe Cassidy and South Wellington Community Centres should be encouraged.
5. Yes; encouraging people to cluster enables various sustainability objectives.
6. Partly - use the hwy corridor for economic gain and leave the remainder as rural and green.
7. I think creating an expanded community centre would be the practical way of establishing a meeting place where residents may develop a sense of community.
8. Better transportation services to Ladysmith, Southgate, Cedar, and Nanaimo. Electric cars are the promise of the future, so let's build with that in mind. Maintain rural quality. Do not rezone agricultural or forestry lands.
9. More development would erode the rural landscapes. I support South Wellington's residents in their fight to stop more industrial land in their area.
10. Yes - job creating, less travel distances, etc.
11. NO. The South Wellington and Area Community Association has proven the value of local , grassroots activism and community building to attain community vision. Community organisations need support. Too much time and energy is spent raising money in order to function rather than working on all aspects of the community vision. The value of the in-kind work and community health is not adequately recognised. This is a topic which needs addressing as all 15 sustainability principles are most effectively, and inexpensively, handled locally. (with the exception of #10 which is flawed in principle.)