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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **Project Background**

The Rural Village Centre Study is an implementation project of the Regional District of Nanaimo’s (RDN) Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) to help better inform decisions regarding future land use and development in the region. The RGS’ key strategy for managing growth and development is to focus it within designated growth areas; within the Electoral Areas (i.e. outside the urban centres), these designated growth areas are called Rural Village Centres (RVCs). Since adoption of the RGS, questions have been raised about the ability of some of the RVCs to evolve into compact, complete communities that warrant investment required to serve them with community water and waste water facilities. As such, the objective of the Rural Village Centre Study is to identify the RVCs that have the most potential to evolve into complete, compact communities.

The RGS specifies that compact, complete communities should:

- Be planned and designed as pedestrian-oriented and transit supportive;
- Be compact, complete and compatible in character with local context;
- Attract and support local commercial development;
- Attract and support local commercial services and amenities;
- Support regular transit service; and
- Demonstrate how their development will contribute to the goals of the Regional Growth Strategy.

There are 14 RVCs in the RDN:

- Electoral Area A - Cedar and Cassidy
- Electoral Area C - Extension
- Electoral Area E - Fairwinds and Red Gap
- Electoral Area F - Bellevue-Church, Errington, Coombs, Hilliers, and Qualicum River Estates
- Electoral Area G - French Creek
- Electoral Area H – Dunsmuir, Qualicum Bay, and Bowser
French Creek has been excluded from this study because it is considered to be largely completely developed, with most of it already serviced by community water and sewer, and transit. Two other areas were included in the study that are not currently RVCs (but will be referred to as such for convenience and purposes of this report): Deep Bay and Dashwood. Similarly, Bellevue-Church is officially designated as a Rural Service Area (RSA) but will be referred to as an RVC in this report.

*Map 1: Rural Village Centres in the Regional District of Nanaimo (source: RDN)*
1.2 Purpose of Public and Stakeholder Input

While this project is intended to be a quantitative study that aspires for a high degree of objectivity, it has been recognized that there is a role for public and stakeholder input into the process. Engagement/consultation objectives are:

- To inform about the study;
- To obtain information from residents and stakeholders about:
  - values and assets around RVCs/SAs (perceived strengths);
  - unmet needs and wants around RVCs/SAs (perceived weaknesses or opportunities); and
- To provide the opportunity for residents and stakeholders to engage in a discussion that matters to them.

While public and stakeholder input do not impact the outcomes of the study, this summary will be provided as context for discussion by the RDN in determining how to use the results of the study.

1.3 Public and Stakeholder Engagement Process

Public and stakeholder engagement included the following activities, which largely took place in June 2012:

- Site tours and discussions with Directors of Electoral Areas F and H;
- Market research interviews with local stakeholders;
- Public on-line survey; and
- Public and stakeholder open houses in each Electoral Area.

All Board Directors were individually contacted by phone, and invited to open houses and to contact the consulting team should they wish to discuss the study. Stakeholders identified by Board Directors were also invited to contact the consulting team should they wish to discuss the study.

Advertising efforts for the survey and open houses included: multiple advertisements in newspapers in each of the Electoral Areas; emails to RDN contacts, Board Directors, and community listserves; and posted information on the RDN’s website.

This report summarizes the outcomes of the on-line survey and open houses.
2. PUBLIC INPUT OVERVIEW | EMERGENT THEMES

2.1 Low Participation Rates

With the exception of the input received during the Electoral Area H Open House (namely regarding Bowser and Deep Bay) and possibly the input received in the survey for Qualicum River Estates, there was very low participation in engagement activities. In the cases of some RVCs, public input reflects the perspectives of just a handful of residents.

As such, much of the information in this report should be understood within this context. Outside of Electoral Area H, the input contained in this summary may not necessarily represent the general perspectives of residents living in the region’s RVCs.

2.2 Themes Across RVCs

While there certainly is diversity of options within and across RVCs, there are some common themes that emerged during consultations. They are as follows:

- **Rural lifestyle and character** (which is often understood to be low-density residential), environment and natural areas, and sense of community are greatly valued across the study area’s RVCs, and there is a strong desire to preserve these qualities;

- **Non-existent or insufficient transit service has been identified as a strong negative**, either in terms of meeting existing needs or as a barrier preventing RVCs in becoming compact, complete communities;

- **Residents wish to have more destinations, services, and social gathering places, and improved pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure**. Participants feel that these improve their RVCs, encourage active transportation, and make RVCs more viable as compact, complete communities.

- **Residents are generally open to adding either a “few” (preferred) or “many” more homes to their RVCs.**

- **Residents are generally open to adding either a “few” (preferred) or “many” more shops, services, and job opportunities (i.e. commercial and industrial development) to their RVCs.**

- **There is some interest in enhancing water and/or sewage infrastructure.**

Emergent themes from individual RVCs are detailed throughout the rest of this report.
3. ON-LINE SURVEY

Two surveys were posted online and advertised for a few weeks in June: one for residents living in or near RVCs; and a second for visitors. A total of 147 respondents participated in the resident survey, with 99 completing every single question (i.e. 67% completion rate). Overall, the response rate was not strong, with fewer than 2% of the official RVC study population providing input.

Demographic Information of Respondents:

- **Age** – Over 40% of respondents were between 60-69 years old. There was little representation from residents between the ages of 25 and 59, and no representation from residents younger than 24.
- **Household Size** – 64% of respondents live in a household size of two people. 13% live alone, and 19% live in households of 3-4 people. Less than 5% live in households of five or more.
- **Sex** – More females (58%) participated in the survey than males (42%).
- **Place of Work or Study** – 43% of respondents are retired, and therefore do not work or study/train in the RVC in which they live or live nearby. 34% of respondents do not study/work in the RVC, while 21% do.

Note:

French Creek results are not included in this summary as only four respondents participated in the survey and the RVC is outside the scope of this study.

Only 10 respondents completed the visitor survey; as such, this input is not summarized or discussed here. An automated report that was generated from the on-line visitor survey has been submitted under separate cover to the RDN.
3.1 In which RVC do you live or live nearest to?

The overwhelming response came from Qualicum River Estates (i.e. 61 respondents or 41.8% of total respondents indicated that they live in or near this RVC), which is surprising given the relatively low attendance at the Public Open House and small population. There was a disproportionately high response from Dashwood, Deep Bay, and Bowser (relative to the total number of respondents), and an even more disproportionately low response from Bellevue-Church, Cassidy, Dunsmuir, and particularly Fairwinds.

Chart 1 - Survey Respondents and Relative Population by RVC
3.2 Think about what makes your RVC special. What do you most value about living in or near it?

Across the RVCs, well over half of respondents selected “rural lifestyles” and “environment and natural areas” as RVC characteristics that they most value. Chart 2 outlines the results.

Likewise, within each individual RVC – with the exception of Coombs (which only had two respondents) – “rural lifestyle” was identified as a top value. “Environment and natural areas” were also generally popular in all RVCs, with Bowser and Red Gap being the only two RVCs (excluding those receiving five or fewer responses) with fewer than 50% of respondents identifying it as a top value.

Note: Respondents were asked to select their top three values for this question, as well as others with multiple options.
Other emergent themes from individual RVCs that are not captured in Chart 2 include the following relative emphases (i.e. where “greater” refers to a significantly higher response rate, and where “weaker” refers to a significantly lower response rate, relative to Chart 2):

- Bowser – Sense of Community (greater) and Affordable Housing (weaker);
- Cedar – Proximity to Urban Centres (greater);
- Dashwood – Friends and Family (greater) and Shops and Restaurants (weaker);
- Deep Bay – Friends and Family (weaker);
- Extension – Community Amenities and Recreation Opportunities (weaker);
- Qualicum River Estates – Sense of Community (weaker), Affordable Housing (greater), Unique Character (weaker), Community Amenities and Recreation Opportunities (weaker), and Shops and Restaurants (weaker); and
- Red Gap – Walking and Cycling Opportunities (weaker), Affordable Housing (weaker), Friends and Family (greater), and Proximity to Urban Centres (greater).

3.3 Think about what is missing in the RVC where you live or live nearby. How are your needs not being met?

While the responses are more evenly dispersed across survey options than in the previous question, the majority of responses focus on: insufficient transit service; insufficient infrastructure for active-modes of transportation; and a lack of destinations for socializing, shopping, recreating, and accessing services. Chart 3 presents these results.

Within specific RVCs, responses usually align with local available services within the RVC. For example, there were proportionately more responses identifying social gathering places and transit service as being unmet needs in Dashwood and Extension. Conversely, there were fewer such responses in Cedar and Red Gap.
Chart 3 – Overall Unmet Needs

- Insufficient or no bus service: 45% of Survey Respondents
- Insufficient infrastructure or unsafe conditions for pedestrians: 40%
- Insufficient infrastructure or unsafe conditions for cyclists: 35%
- Not enough places to gather and socialize: 30%
- Not enough shops and services nearby or within walking distance: 25%
- Not enough amenities and recreation opportunities: 20%
- Not enough opportunities for youth: 15%
- Other: 10%
- Insufficient infrastructure or unsafe conditions for wheelchair users: 5%
- Not enough job opportunities: 10%
- Insufficient water and sewage infrastructure: 15%
- Not enough opportunities for seniors: 20%
- Not enough affordable housing: 25%
- Housing is inappropriate: 0%
3.4 Think about the places you visit that don’t include work or school. This includes destinations where you meet your weekly needs and participate in cultural and recreational activities. Are they primarily in the RVC where you live or live nearby?

Chart 4 identifies responses to this question by RVC. (RVCs receiving fewer than three responses are not included.) Approximately half or more than half of respondents who indicate that they meet their weekly needs locally live in or near Bowser, Cedar, and Deep Bay. Most respondents do not meet their weekly needs in RVCs, particularly in Dashwood and Extension, which generally aligns with the availability of non-residential destinations and services.
3.5 What would make you do more of your shopping, socializing, and recreating in the Rural Village Centre where you live or live nearby?

Chart 5 identifies responses to this question, in which there is an overall emphasis on the need for more destinations and services. Pedestrian infrastructure also ranks high.

Responses for individual RVCs do not necessarily align with existing availability of services or destinations, suggesting that even in those RVCs that already have services and destinations (e.g. shopping choices, gathering places, etc), there is a recognition that a greater amount of such amenities would serve to encourage more local shopping, socializing and recreating.

Respondents indicating that they prefer to shop, socialize, and participate elsewhere cite the main two reasons: a desire to see no change, including no commercial development; and satisfaction with visiting nearby urban centres.

**Chart 5 – Overall Potential Factors Encouraging Use of Local Destinations and Services**
3.6 What would most encourage you to travel to work or school by means other than a car?

Chart 6 identifies responses to this question. This question is not applicable for 45% of respondents, who indicate that they are retired, not employed or not studying/training. The majority of the remaining respondents identify transit service and “nothing” as factors that would encourage them to travel to work or school by means other than a car.
3.7 Would you like to see more residential development in the RVC where you live or live nearby?

Chart 7 indicates preferences for degree of residential development. In all the RVCs except for Extension, the majority of respondent think it would be positive to add either a few or many more local homes / housing choices.

**Chart 7 – Views on More Residential Development**

- No. Adding any new local homes would be negative.
- Yes. A few more local homes and housing choices would be positive.
- Yes. Many more local homes and housing choices would be positive.
3.8 Would you like to see more commercial or industrial development in the RVC where you live or live nearby?

Chart 8 indicates preferences for degree of commercial and industrial development. In all the RVCs, the majority of respondent think it would be positive to add either a few or many more local shops, services, and job opportunities.

Chart 8 – Views on More Commercial and Industrial Development

- **No.** Adding any new shops, services, and job opportunities would be negative.
- **Yes.** A few more local shops, services, and job opportunities would be positive.
- **Yes.** Many more local shops, services, and job opportunities would be positive.
4. **OPEN HOUSES**

Six 3-hour open houses – one in each Electoral Area – were held in mid-June. In an effort to accommodate different levels of interest, the events were comprised of two components:

- A 1.5 hour discussion that began with a short presentation by the consulting team; and
- A 1.5-hour come-and-go / drop-in format that provided participants to review and comment on interactive panels/boards.

The turnout numbers greatly varied but were generally quite low. Attendance was:

- Extremely low (i.e. approximately 5 people or less) in Electoral Areas E, F, and G;
- Low to medium (i.e. between 12 and 15) in Electoral Areas A and C;
- Very high (i.e. approximately 85 people) in Electoral Area H.

This section offers a summary for each Electoral Area’s Open House and, where there is sufficient input, a summary on specific RVCs.
4.1 Electoral Area A – Cassidy and Cedar

Approximately 15 participants attended both components of the open house. The following themes emerged from the interactive panels and discussion:

**CEDAR**

**Interactive Panels**
- *Values* – Top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: shops and services; unique character; rural lifestyle; and sense of community.
- *Meeting Needs and Desires* – Top identified options were: shops and services within walking distance; safe walking environment; and convenient transit access.
- *Becoming a Compact, Complete Community* – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: lack of business interest (i.e. shops); insufficient transit; and cost of transit infrastructure.

**CASSIDY**

**Interactive Panels**
- *Values* – The top identified value around living in or near this RVC was: unique character.
- *Meeting Needs and Desires* – Top identified options were: amenities and recreation opportunities; job opportunities; and more appropriate housing (i.e. size, type, etc).
- *Becoming a Compact, Complete Community* – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: not enough amenities; and not enough people.

**CEDAR AND CASSIDY**

**Discussion**
While the discussion was open to both Cedar and Cassidy, what follows are points from mainly Cedar residents and stakeholders:
- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - Enhanced pedestrian, cyclist, and riding/horse infrastructure;
New services including restaurants and cafes, but particularly a pharmacy and community centre;
A central gathering place;
More frequent transit;
Strong sense of community;
Maintained Rural character (e.g. nature, quiet);
Protection of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR); and
Safety.

4.2 Electoral Area C – Extension

Approximately 12 participants attended both components of the open house. The following themes emerged from the interactive panels and discussion:

EXTENSION

Interactive Panels
- Values – Top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: rural lifestyle; sense of community; and friends and family.
- Meeting Needs and Desires – Top identified options were: convenient transit access; and more appropriate housing (i.e. size, type, etc).
- Becoming a Compact, Complete Community – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: insufficient transit; and local desire for no change.

Discussion
- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - Provision of public transit;
  - A Farmer’s Market;
  - Enhanced pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
  - More opportunities for youth engagement;
  - Maintained rural character and lifestyle;
  - Strong sense of community; and
  - Access to nature.
4.3 Electoral Area E – Fairwinds and Red Gap

Approximately 5 participants attended the come-and-go/drop-in component of the open house. There was no presentation/discussion as there were no participants at the event at that time. The following themes emerged from the interactive panels:

**FAIR WINDS**

There was no specific input provided for Fairwinds.

**RED GAP**

**Interactive Panels**

Very minimal input was provided, with only one category receiving more than one “vote”:

- *Meeting Needs and Desires* – Two dots identified the following: more appropriate housing (i.e. size, type, etc).
- *Other Comments* – A handful of comments were provided that indicated support for more residential development in Red Gap.

4.4 Electoral Area F – Bellevue-Church, Errington, Coombs, Hilliers, and Qualicum River Estates

Approximately 5 participants attended both components of the open house. With the exception of one “vote” for “a few more” shops in Errington, participants did not offer input on the interactive boards. The following themes emerged from and discussion, which was not specific to any particular RVC in Electoral Area F:

**BELLEVUE-CHURCH, ERRINGTON, COOMBS, HILLIERS and QUALICUM RIVER ESTATES**

**Discussion**

- The overarching theme of the discussion focused on the lack of applicability of the study to Electoral Area F. Two of the four participants felt strongly that the Electoral Area should have jurisdiction over itself, and that the Regional Growth Strategy was not appropriate for this area. They strongly opposed some of the characteristics of a “compact, complete” community identified by the RDN, noting that they are not appropriate for Electoral Area F, including transit service and small lots.
- The other two participants represented food and development stakeholders, and did not reside in Electoral Area F.
4.5 Electoral Area G – Dashwood

Approximately 5 participants attended one or both components of the open house. The following themes emerged from the interactive panels and discussion:

**DASHWOOD**

**Interactive Panels**
- *Values* – Top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: gas station/convenience store; community amenities and recreation opportunities; and friends and family.
- *Meeting Needs and Desires* – Top identified options were: convenient transit access; and more appropriate housing (i.e. size, type, etc).
- *Becoming a Compact, Complete Community* – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: lack of business interest (i.e. shops); and physical barriers to growth.
- *Other Comments* – Other values include development of a village character and existing proximity to amenities.

**Discussion**
- A major point of discussion is the local desire to rethink the RVC boundary in order to permit additional development. This point was countered by another participant who likes the rural character of Dashwood and desires no change.
- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - A desire for the whole community to participate in future planning processes;
  - A strong sense of community and neighbourliness;
  - An increased number and variety of services;
  - Community connectivity (i.e. pedestrian connections); and
  - Safety.
4.6 Electoral Area H – Dunsmuir, Qualicum Bay, Bowser, Deep Bay

Approximately 85 participants attended both components of the open house. While it is not the objective of the study to weigh the merits of specific developments, most participant input was in response to the proposed master plan development in Deep Bay. The following themes emerged from the interactive panels and discussion:

DUNSMUIR

Interactive Panels

- **Values** – Top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: environment and natural areas; affordable housing; rural lifestyle; and walking and cycling opportunities.
- **Meeting Needs and Desires** – Top identified options were: safe cycling environment; amenities and recreation opportunities; convenient transit access; and affordable housing.
- **Becoming a Compact, Complete Community** – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: insufficient transit; and not enough people.

QUALICUM BAY

Interactive Panels

- **Values** – The top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: unique character; rural lifestyle; sense of community; and walking and cycling opportunities.
- **Meeting Needs and Desires** – Top identified options were: water and sewage infrastructure; amenities and recreation opportunities; and convenient transit service.
- **Becoming a Compact, Complete Community** – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: not enough services in general; not enough nearby jobs; and not enough people.
- **Other Comments** – A walk-in clinic would help meet local needs.

Discussion

- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - Low-density residences in a rural setting; and
  - Better sewage and water systems.
BOWSER

Interactive Panels
- **Values** – The top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: shops and services; environment and natural areas; and walking and cycling opportunities.
- **Meeting Needs and Desires** – Top identified options were: safe cycling environment; opportunities for seniors; and safe walking environment.
- **Becoming a Compact, Complete Community** – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: Not enough services in general; local desire for no change; cost of sewage infrastructure; and insufficient transit.
- **Other Comments** – A pharmacy or medical services is strongly needed. Other barriers to becoming a compact, complete community include: unpredictability of zoning process and requirements; and walking paths to the village centre. There is concern about too many street lights.

Discussion
- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - Strong sense of community;
  - Historic centre, including a coffee shop and library; and
  - Maintaining a rural character.

DEEP BAY

Interactive Panels
- **Values** – The top identified values around living in or near this RVC were: rural lifestyle; unique character; sense of community; environment and natural areas; and walking and cycling opportunities.
- **Meeting Needs and Desires** – Top identified options were: safe cycling environment; water and sewage infrastructure; and safe walking environment.
- **Becoming a Compact, Complete Community** – Top factors that were identified as preventing this RVC from becoming a compact, complete community include: local desire for no change; cost of sewage infrastructure; and insufficient transit.
- **Other Comments** – Additional parking at the marina is needed. Interconnected pathways including waterfront access is needed. Zoning / a community plan is a barrier to becoming a compact, complete community.
Discussion

- Priorities for the future include the following:
  - Maintained rural, quiet character;
  - Strong marina; and
  - Strong sense of community.

DUNSMUIR, QUALICUM BAY, BOWSER, and DEEP BAY

Discussion

- Emergent concerns that are more general across the RVCs not already mentioned include:
  - Concerns regarding new development, particularly as it relates to cost, sewage infrastructure, sprawl and undesirable forms of growth, lack of amenities, and impacts on existing village centres.
  - Concerns about water management, including considerations for the elimination of septic systems, pollution control, aquifer protection, and maintaining the waterfront as an asset.

Interactive Panels

- **Would you like to see more residential development?** Chart 9 presents participant responses. Generally, respondents are open to seeing a “few” more residential units in their respective RVCs.
- **Would you like to see more commercial or industrial development?** Chart 10 presents participant responses. Generally, respondents are open to seeing a “few” more local shops, services, and jobs in their respective RVCs.
- **Note:** Charts were not developed for other Electoral Areas because input was so sparse or non-existent.
Chart 9 – Views on More Residential Development

- Yes. Many more local homes and housing choices would be positive.
- Yes. A few more local homes and housing choices would be positive.
- No. Adding any new local homes would be negative.

Chart 10 – Views on More Commercial and Industrial Development

- Yes. Many more local shops, services, and job opportunities would be positive.
- Yes. A few more local shops, services, and job opportunities would be positive.
- No. Adding any new shops, services, and job opportunities would be negative.
5. ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

5.1 Deep Bay

Dozens of emails and letters were received by the RDN and/or consulting team pertaining to the proposed master planned community in Deep Bay. While several individuals and groups indicated opposition to the development at the Public Open House, the majority of emails and letters indicated support for the development.

Key points from messages supporting designation of Deep Bay as an RVC and/or the Baynes Sound Investment application are:

- 8 emails were received indicating support for Deep Bay in becoming an RVC, but offering no additional information.
- 7 emails or letters were received indicating support for Deep Bay in becoming an RVC. Key points are as follows:
  - Desire for more residents, services within walking distance, new amenities, diverse housing, development with appropriate character, and the possibility of infrastructure improvements, including the development new paths for pedestrians and cyclists;
  - Support for development (i.e. Baynes Sound Investment project specifically) that supports the local shellfish aquaculture industry, including considerations around water quality, stormwater management, friendly adjacent land uses, infrastructure, and opportunities to better accommodate growing tourism.
  - Support for Baynes Sound Investment and establishment of Deep Bay as an RVC (one email from the Vancouver Island University research station and a letter from the Office of the President) for the following reasons: benefits associated with shared development opportunities (i.e. roads, infrastructure, etc); the “leadership” demonstrated in the development application, which proposes uses that are reportedly more supportive of the marine ecosystems and shellfish industry; and an overall emphasis on the shellfish research station and more generally Deep Bay as a green destination for tourists, students, and others.
  - Concern that a “few very vocal individuals” dominated the discussion at the Open House, not permitting many residents to provide the input they hoped to offer.
- A submission was received that included 65 letters (from 40 residents and 25 others in Area H, according to the submission) supporting the Baynes Sound Investment application and/or establishment of Deep Bay as an RVC. The letters were collected by a resident in 2011 and submitted to the RDN at that time.
A second submission was submitted to the RDN in 2011 supporting the Baynes Sound Investment application. It is a letter signed by 63 people: 39 residing within the Deep Bay peninsula area; 21 residing in parts of Electoral Area H; two residing in Electoral Area F; and one residing in Electoral Area G.

Key points from messages not supporting designation of Deep Bay as a RVC:

- 4 emails were received indicating:
  - support for the existing village node, and a desire to not have another one developed;
  - concern about increased traffic, competing businesses, insufficient parking, potential long term negative impacts on environmentally sensitive areas; and new development not fitting with the scale and character of Deep Bay; and
  - desire to avoid being urban.

A handful of other emails and letters were received offering other input. Key points include:

- A number other emails were received from two sources, indicating that information in the RDN RVC Inventory is incorrect and/or misleading. Concern was expressed that the RVC Inventory is slanted toward pro-development.
- There is concern from an agricultural landowner about intensive agricultural production on coastal waterfronts. There is desire to allow agricultural lands to be removed from the Agricultural Land Reserve.

5.2 Other RVCs

Two other emails were received pertaining to other RVCs:

- **Errington** – There was desire expressed to “invigorate the downtown area” through: a community recreation facility; increased speed limits; support for existing businesses and services; and support for enhanced and new services.
- **Coombs** – There is need for better collective marketing and the provision of water and septic infrastructure to support this “tourist gem”.
- **Dunsmuir, Extension, and Qualicum Bay** – It was indicated that these are not practical or sensible options for RVCs for reasons including: watercourses need to be protected and the basic Riparian Area Regulations are insufficient; some RVCs do not have a rural village character (i.e. Fairwinds looks more like a wealthy suburb); there are vulnerable aquifers and a lack of sewer infrastructure; there are environmentally sensitive and hazardous areas; and there is a need to focus resources on specific RVCs such as Bowser.