



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Nanaimo Airport

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. I am disappointed to hear that a road is being considered to be built from Haslam Road to the Airport to avoid accidents on the Highway. I understand that it involves the cutting of trees in what appears to be a lovely riparian area, instead of adjacent to the runway. To curb accidents, build lights at the corner of Haslam and the Highway instead of destroying more of what's left of our natural environment. Mike Hooper told the public at the Bastion Hotel presentation that the most/highest number of large 737 aircraft that would ever possibly fly into Nanaimo airport, if at all, would be one per week. I am wondering what aspects of the airport are going to grow that a water supply and waste water system are being proposed. What will be done with the treated water? More of that from Island Timberlands proposed development, people will be drinking recycled water from the aquifer. Odd direction for us to be taking. We need a more thorough presentation that what was given on June 15.
2. I learned next to nothing about development plans in CEO's presentation. This development is a model of unsustainability. Example of how best to avoid community vision and input. Has created community divisions and anger.
3. Since we are told that Regional District of Nanaimo has no say in the airport plans, why are we still at it!! As the speaker was nearing the end of his spiel at the meeting he said something to the effect 'that leaves a strip along the highway for commercial/industrial development'. So along with Island Timberlands there would be two commercial/industrial developments on either side of the highway.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Where is the aquifer management plan? Who has jurisdiction of the Nanaimo Airport?

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

No comments received

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. Despite the not for profit and serve the needs of the community claims of the NAC this project receives political gateway support. The NAC pretends to care and plays the game while being fully aware they have no

one to answer to other than those who support airport development. The Management of this development has been shoddily shameful considering its environmental impact in this day and age. The denial of honest and open assessment of the project despite repeated requests from many of those who will bear the brunt of the lifestyle and health impacts has created mistrust, disrespect, and awareness of the self serving motivations of those who purport to serve. I can not emphasize that enough.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Boat Harbour

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. Their presence is a step forward. However, the plans as shown have no depth.
2. This development will enhance our community.
3. Absolutely onside with green area plan. Meets needs that are evident. Working within guidelines. No mass destruction like Cable Bay. Thank Goodness.
4. Tourists come here to see the big forest, big trees, old growth. They are disappointed when they see clear-cut or trees washed up on the shore. So for tourists, development is not a thing they are looking for.
5. Lack of transportation alternatives. How is this project considering sustainability?
6. I really like the lot averaging principle being applied. Instead of 5 acre lots we get clusters of houses on residential lots surrounded by public green space. Get this approved before the developer gets it into his head to bring sewer onto his property and do an urban style small lot subdivision like you have approved behind the Wheatsheaf.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. It looks perfect.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

1. It will create opportunity for possible better services including water, roads, and fire protection.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

No comments received.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Cedar Estates

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. I would like to see walkways for wheelchairs and sitting areas. Green roofs are important in high density areas.
2. Is Robert Boyle Architects a 'Green Builder'?
3. It is a good idea to have senior's supportive housing in the area. When so many projects have consultants, planners, etc, I'm surprised the reason for this request was not foreseen much earlier in the process. Each year a few cases hit the news lines about seniors couples not being able to share a room in various assisted living residences. I'm not sure from the wording in their request if some other problems might develop eg. couples who are not yet in need of supportive housing but may wish some meal and house cleaning services who will take up room needed by some less able residents. Could restrictions be placed on how many units should be allowed for couples leaving the other residences as is? When the developer made his presentation it sounded okay but when I read the brochure more carefully, I began to wonder if possibly this would allow a movement from supportive to private retirement.
4. I dislike density that will change the rural nature of Cedar forever. Bringing in sewer to service this development and support the density will end the rural nature of this community. You cannot stop a sewer line with capacity like this one from extending further on demand from developers. Small lot subdivisions will grow along the extended sewer lines. An Urban Containment Boundary cannot stop this orderly progression of development once it is started. I dislike senior's complex in rural area. Hard to get ambulances in, no sidewalks outside immediate development so seniors will be using walkers and automated carts on narrow busy roads, no facilities like malls, casinos, doctors that are regularly transported to in Nanaimo, seniors complexes should be in urban areas accessible by main transportation routes to medical facilities.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Areas should be units not residents.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

No comments received.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. I question placing seniors assisted living so far from urban centre of Nanaimo where doctors, hospitals, art and culture, theatre, shopping, and restaurants are located. Rural living means you cannot have it all. Opposed to providing urban services in rural community and continuing sprawl.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Kipp Road

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. Do not like zoning changes that benefit developers to buy cheaper residential property. No more industrial commercial sprawl.
2. I know he didn't make a presentation, but the South Wellington community has repeatedly said they did not want any expansion of industrial zoning. The argument that the adjoining land is industrial so we should be allowed to rezone is just not valid as you well know. It's an argument that developers like to use and others.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Infill existing.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

No comments received.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. No, I am not from England or Europe, but to make a misquote 'Ah to be in England, France, and Holland where somehow they have preserved so many rural areas, small towns, etc. in a smaller land area with a much larger population.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Kirkstone Way

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. I like its environmental addresses.
2. I like that is it for only 10 homes. Is this the best location for seniors, or would it be better closer to the hospital, clinics, and therapeutic facilities? Is it going to stop at 10 homes, or expand again? We need to have limits to growth, according to what the area can sustain. Also it's expensive to dispatch ambulance and fire trucks so far from the hospital.
3. Do not like land removed from the ALR (2006). Appreciate LEED standards. Priority to green developers. Most honest presentation.
4. The environmental, social, and economic characteristics as listed on their brochure sounds positive and worthy of consideration. AN improvement on the more traditional housing areas. But on the second sheet under the shared principles it states ... "Maintaining affordability". It would seem that they would be more high end and exclusive.
5. It fits with surrounding subdivision.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Generally it sounds good.
2. Like to see public green space with trails linking with Colliery trail and Hemer Park.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

1. I believe it will enhance the community.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. In the literature presented a reference to Mill Creek Developments was included. Unfortunately I did not inquire about this when speaking to Emanuel. Thus the connection or relationship is not known. I did question him on the exclusion of the 9 acres from the ALR. If his explanation was forthright, it would seem to add additional credence to his plans for this acreage.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Options for Cassidy

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. I don't like that it proposes to rezone forestry land. We need to keep areas where trees can grow. If forestry land gets rezoned it should be rezoned to agricultural lands. I don't like that it would alter the landscape turning it into a bedroom community in the middle of rural-residential, agricultural land. I don't like the idea of this large development atop an aquifer. While they claim that the aquifer level has not changed over the past years, the population and other uses have not either. Once the population is increased, usage will increase and the water levels may go down. If Cassidy residents sharing the upper aquifer with Harmac et al find their source of water depleting, perhaps they will need to access the lower aquifer. Long range studies would need to be thorough in order to project and protect, not just one aquifer, but all of them and the inter-related communities. I don't like population densification. The area does not have adequate resources to indefinitely sustain growth. The Nanaimo hospital can't handle the traffic it gets now. The police can't keep up with the level of crime now. I don't like the idea of replenishing the aquifer with reconstituted water, sewage, and especially don't like the idea of private ownership of water and sewage treatment. Walkerton comes to mind, as well as private control of prices for access/services. Cassidy already has a village centre of sorts with the farmers market and tempo gas station. I dislike the idea of light industrial in the area, more trucks, more noise, more traffic, particularly if a train station were to create the hub. And why build residential areas across from an airport that could get noisier than it already is. And why did they take down the trees at the corner of Timberlands Road and the Highway, that provided a buffer to the noise of aircraft. It seems that development has its own financial purposes and creates some selling points that in truth do not tell all and are nor in the best interest of local people. This year we farmers are irrigating our crops and watering our gardens much more and earlier than last year. Our neighbour's well smells in mid June 2 months earlier than usual. Each year the weather becomes more extreme. This year we have insects that have destroyed plants that have never been attacked before. Pay attention to the farmers who live close to the land. Keep in mind the need for water for growing local produce. What will Vancouver Islanders do for food when

California, already, already experiencing water shortages cannot supply food we need and the cost of imported food rises out of the reach of more people. With the economy suffering, we need to put a stop to large developments until we have our own food security and medical and social services in place.

2. Rural Resource land should not be rezoned. No more development on aquifer. No to commercial and industrial sprawl. No more far-flung communities dependant on cars.
3. Dislike extent of development. Do we need another large commercial industrial site there?
4. I am philosophically opposed to forest companies turning into land developers. However, you have to be careful where you draw the line in the sand. This proposal can be made to fit into the surrounding area. Development proposals for the Nanaimo Lakes never fit a wilderness area.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Development already approved such as Sandstone and Cedar Village. Should be completed and filled before considering more development.
2. Very seriously question the density of the residential areas. How would such development preserve the rural atmosphere or characteristics tat we repeatedly say we wish to maintain?
3. More trees. Less commercial and/or industrial development.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

1. Consider project once rail line is back in full service as proximity to rail is an asset. Rail road first, until then plant trees.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. Ignoring the wisdom of those who forecast that forestry industry practices are unsustainable, society has failed despite tremendous opportunity for the future. Having confidence in timber companies to build communities would be short sighted.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Other Comments

1. If too much development comes our way the farmers will come under pressure and finally move. Then you don't have any producers here.
2. Since I read Rachel Carsons' 'Silent Spring' in the early 1970's, I have watched the world disregard her advice about using pesticides. I have seen an abundance of processed, denatured, genetically modified foods fill our supermarkets. I have seen our oceans depleted, and species threatened. I now observe the effects of climate change, diminished water supplies, polluted water, world famine on the increase, strained medical resources, a huge increase in the rate of cancer, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, etc. We no longer live in harmony with nature. Forests are cut down, taking up to 80 years for trees to grow to replace the lungs of the earth that have been depleted. Growth has become the mantra of our present day society. It is beyond sustainable, yet the word sustainable is attached to every project to make it ok. When I was a teenager "cancer" was an unknown word to me. When I was in my 20's it hit the news. When I was in my 30's, everyone knows at least one person who has cancer. I'm in my 40's I know of more and more. Now almost half the population is scheduled to develop cancer. It is mystifying to me that our society fails to take in the big picture, see the cause and effect. Perhaps, our growing agricultural industry, factory farming, and medical life saving measures, has allowed us to increase to the current 6.7 or so billion people, too many to keep track of, so violence and discontent grow. This is the trend and see all over. We are moving in the same direction on this island. Do we really want to spoil the beauty that remains on this island? DO we really want to increase density of the population? Higher population and higher taxes do not lessen the problems, they continually increase. This Official Community Plan offers us a turning point, a time to hold back and assess the bigger picture, rather than go forward developing, beyond our means. The changes I have witnessed over the past 40 years make me wonder what changes will bring over the next 10, 20, 30, or 40 years.

From: Alec J. McPherson, 2768 Nicola Road
To: Electoral Area "A" OCP Review Committee

Page 1 OF 4

**A Shared Community Vision
Comments on the Community Development Forum of June 15th 2009**

I understand that comments relative to the eight (8) development ideas, proposals and projects need to be in the RDN on or before Monday, June 22nd. 2009. Accordingly, please accept the following as my comments on two of the proposals. I have chosen not to comment on the other proposals as I have only so much time and energy and it is more appropriate that people directly affected by the proposals deal with them.

General Comments

I do not believe that the Community Development Forum was appropriate. This particular Forum provides proponents with an opportunity to influence the OCP Review through hurried comments received by a few individuals who were able to attend the event. It was inconceivable to me to imagine that anyone could formulate their thoughts on the same night that they were confronted by these proposals. In my opinion, the Forum provided comfort to those who presented their projects as the Welcome to the Forum handout indicated that the comments received would be used to determine which of "developments ideas, proposals, and projects may be supported in the first draft of the new Official Community Plan". It was my understanding that there were to be no changes considered to zoning, et cetera until the OCP Review was complete. The statement that the comments received would be used to determine those projects that may be supported in the first draft suggests that the OCP will be manipulated in order to include one or more the proposals. This seems to be a perversion of the process that was supposed to be underway. If this is not the case then perhaps staff preparing such documents should choose their words to reflect the actual situation. Personally, I was surprised to see that most of the people making presentations didn't seem to have a grasp on what 'sustainability' actually means. To have one of the proponents remark that the Economic aspect of such projects was usually overlooked and then to describe how the project has to be economically efficient for the developer was unbelievable. Sustainability should be one of the principles that governs all development proposals and it should be given priority. There are some factors that cannot be overlooked. For example, one of these factors is water. Water is finite and whether or not the RDN, some other quasi-government body such as the NCID or some private individual drills a well, it is the same finite water resource that is being depleted.

I would also suggest that it is incumbent on the RDN to consider all of proposals – not only those presented at the Forum but those currently underway on adjoining lands within the City (e.g. Sandstone and Cable Bay) – in terms of their effect on residents within the area. It has been my experience that local government considers each project in isolated rather than the cumulative effect of all projects. The current 'in isolation' approach results in many of the objectives of the OCP or Regional Growth Strategy being ignored.

I believe that it incumbent upon the RDN to lobby the Ministry of Transportation to recognize that cumulative effect of these developments is significant so that costs for future road improvements are assigned to the developers and not downloaded to the general electorate.

The proposals that I will specifically deal with are the “Boat Harbour Development” and the “Kirkstone Way” proposals.

A. Boat Harbour Development

General

The term “Boat Harbour Development” seems to be a misnomer. This proposal appears to be the opening gambit in what will ultimately be a residential development. The majority of the development has nothing to do with a “destination resort development”. The initial residential development is primarily away from Boat Harbour. The features that usually are associated with a “destination resort” are lacking. I have attended many destination resorts and I can’t envision that this so-called “destination resort” fits the definition.

Vehicular Traffic

The consultant planner’s presentation states “There are numerous access points to the subject lands; however he fails to note that these “access points” are over narrow, winding roads – most without the benefit of a marked centreline. These roads lead past land that is primarily within the ALR. Widening these roads to accommodate increased traffic would require expropriation of land now in the ALR. Any road improvement will result in further pressure to develop more parcels in the area and thereby place more pressure on the agricultural lands in between the existing Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) and this proposed development. What ever happened to the food security principle?

The City has recently moved forward on the Oceanview (Cable Bay) development. The Oceanview development will add approximately 7,000 residents to the area adjoining Cedar-by-the-Sea. The Oceanview representative at the Development Forum when asked about access to the development deliberately tried to downplay the access through Holden-Corso, Barnes and Nicola Roads. He stated that they didn’t need this routing as they intend on linking up with White Road – the most western boundary of the Cedar-by-the-Sea area. He went on to indicate that they didn’t have any need to utilize the Nicola Road access; however, it was his understanding that neither the City of Nanaimo or the RDN would permit this routing to be closed to vehicular traffic headed to the development. Those residents who are familiar with the area recognize that the most likely routing for vehicular traffic – other than that originating or ending

at the B.C. Ferry Duke Point Terminal – is via the Holden-Corso/Barnes/Nicola Roads routing as it is both less problematic and quicker way to access the Oceanview development. Given that we have at least two proposed developments – Kirkstone and Boat Harbour – that will, if approved, further increase the traffic on Holden-Corso Road, it is time that municipal government started to consider these development proposals in concert rather than considering each in isolation.

Water

Water supply is a very serious issue throughout the RDN and, in particular, Area “A”. While it is noted that there is a connector main at the junction of Yellowpoint Road and Tiesu Road to which the marina side of the proposed development could connect, there is NIL such convenient connector for the Lofthouse-Shasta-Holden-Corso Road side of the development. Extending the community water supply to these areas will put more pressure on the area to accept further development along the routings. In addition, water supply is the most serious of the ‘sustainability’ issues facing Vancouver Island. Having the North Cedar Improvement District (NCID) drill more wells doesn’t recognize that the water is a finite resource. Each time that a new well is drilled further ‘mining’ of this finite resource occurs. Farmers and others within the area who are dependent on wells are finding that dug well that have served them well for generations are experiencing seasonal dry periods. This necessitates trucker water to their residence and/or drilling new wells to meet the agricultural needs. These new drilled wells need to be increasingly deep and the quality of the resulting water is decreasing.

Averaging and Open Space

The planning consultant document refers to “open space”; however, the only ‘open space’ marked is a Wetland area where development is not permitted and access is non-existent. It is indicated that using the provincial ‘averaging’ policy results in approximately 108 hectares of “open space”. Since there is no explanation as to what “open space” is, a number of questions are raised. Is it public open space? Will restrictive covenants be placed on the “open space” to prevent the landowner from ‘nibbling away’ at the lands in the future for additional residential properties?

Engineered Sewage System

Island Timberlands presented a proposal for a development in the Cassidy area. Their proposal does include an ‘engineered sewage system’. Their system is self-contained and provides secondary and/or tertiary treatment of the waste before discharging on the land. The one proposed for this Boat Harbour proposal is nothing more than a ‘septic system’ with effluent able to seep over time into the

surrounding water ways and aquifers. The one to the southeast of Holden Lake is situated directly between two large Wetland areas. In my opinion, any sewage facilities that are so close to wetlands and waterways should have treatment facilities built-in to the waste system. Septic fields should be avoided for these large scale developments.

B. Kirkstone Way Proposal

General

The developer has requested that the UCB be extended to include the proposed residential development. If this is acceded to, further pressure will be placed on the adjoining lands which are in the ALR. If we are to ensure that existing lands within the ALR are protected, then the RDN needs to adopt a policy of commenting on exclusion applications rather than simply sitting on the sidelines waiting to see which way the Agricultural Land Commission will rule.

Vehicular Traffic

Access to Kirkstone Way will be along Wobank Road with traffic from the south accessing via Cedar Road and traffic from the north accessing via Holden-Corso Road. These roads will also be utilized by the proposed Boat Harbour development and the City's Oceanview (aka. Cable Bay) development. Wobank Road is currently a very dangerous road for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. When two vehicles pass each other on this road, pedestrians need to head for the ditch. How this 'cow trail' was ever chosen as a bus route remains a mystery. The only place where the roadway is sufficiently wide is near the Woodbank Elementary School close to the Cedar Road access point. Adding more vehicular traffic will only lead to more mishaps.

Water

My comments relative to sustainability and the finite quantity of water apply equally to this proposed development. Climate change is a fact of life. The 'unusually' dry spell that we are experiencing is not so unusual given the situation experienced in two of the last three years.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Cedar General, Millway, and Ruckledge Stores

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. Caution. If this (Ruckledge Store) goes ahead, it opens up the area along the Highway to more of the same. Then South Wellington starts looking like Cedar. South Wellington is not a village - it is an agricultural, rural residential area.
2. Ruckledge General Store needs to deal with current negative community image. It needs to work with community vision i.e. SWACA Presentation.
3. I don't like any of it. Just what does he see with a new Cedar General Store? (49th shopping area is one block away). So what does he intend? He suggests expanded store sizes, more commercial business, and apartments. I see no reference made to any effect this would have on the Anglican Church across the road.
4. Macmillan Store. Do car washes really use less water than when you wash your own car? Expanded space for local entrepreneurs to set up shop. What say would residents have on who/what might be set up? With the local high school ½ block away is he going to develop things that would have an adverse affect on the students? Do the students need a fast food outlet, a place to play machines, etc?
5. Ruckledge General Store. I certainly have not heard that residents are clamouring for expansion. Eight new gas pumps? For whom? Certainly not needed for South Wellington residents. The Co-op bar has 10 new pumps a few kilometres away. As well as highway traffic they have a much larger population and getting bigger on Extension Road and Cinnabar and other developments in that area are to draw business from. South Wellington does not have a huge increase in population so the expanded gas outlets and new liquor store would not be for the community.
6. In all three proposals he is planning glorified convenience stores, generally prices are higher and selection smaller. Even with his expansion they would not meet the grocery shopping needs and residents would still need to travel a relative relatively short distance to the 49th Parallel or to Country Grocer in Chase River. With regards to South Wellington how does he expect to compete with South Gate expanding with many services and the developments planned by Sandstone. In South Wellington development the increase in vehicle ins and outs on the short stretch of

- Morden Road between the Trans Canada and South Wellington Road would just add to the traffic problems that exist there now.
7. South Wellington traffic aspects: The 4 way stop intersection at Morden Road and South Wellington Road has problems now. Any expansion that would add to these is undesirable. The residents would like to keep their set of lights on the Highway. If this was changed where would Proctor's plans be then? Also with the fire hall there I don't think firemen would appreciate more people going on and off that Morden Proctor stretch when they have to access the highway or Morden Road on the other side of the highway.
 8. General comments: On all the developments, but especially those near the highway. Do you think the majority of residents really want a commercial/industrial stretch all the way from Southgate to the airport/Cedar Road junction? How does all this development fit in with preserving rural areas and rural atmosphere? Surely to goodness we don't need a Vancouver City centre, Kingsway, etc. development or a Langley, Cloverdale, Surrey, etc. development or a Nanaimo centre to Woodgrove, Lantzville sprawl.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. Adding a grocery store (Ruckledge Store) creates competition for local farmers who want to sell their produce at the farm gate. We don't want to sell it wholesale to a store. We want people to come directly to our farm to buy our complete variety of produce.
2. Its time to start filling up cars less. Going to 8 pumps?

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

No comments received.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

1. We would like to see the focus of development in Area A to be on developing small farms not residential subdivisions and light commercial/industrial.



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Community Development Forum

June 22, 2009

Western Maritime Institute

What is it about the development that you like and/or dislike?

1. I like that it's small. Will this location suit the Institute for many years to come or should they consider another location? Seems a maritime institute would be better located by the ocean. Cable Bay?
2. Impossible to assess where this project is heading. Concerned about any continued development on the Cassidy Aquifer until management plan is complete via water study approved by referendum at the last election.
3. Their area for accommodation for out of area students seems to have some merit. But the number of units set up should be very carefully controlled. These buildings should not be used for anything other than accommodation for students actually attending the institute. In other words, it must not be a back door way of building accommodation for tourists, travellers, workers on some nearby project, etc.
4. Love this institution. What an opportunity for the School District to get needed cash for an underutilized facility and the citizen's of BC to get training in a field that provides jobs. Win Win.

What would you like to see more of/or less of in the development?

1. I think the swiss chalet student housing is a great use of the land and a perfect fit for the surrounding community. Bravo.

What opportunities do you see this development bringing to the community?

No comments received.

Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have?

No comments received.