



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review, *Citizen's Committee Speaker Series* *Environmental Protection Workbook Responses*

This document presents the community's responses to the questions and policy options presented in the workbook on environmental protection. The workbook is available on the Official Community Plan review project website at www.asharedcommunityvision.ca, by emailing a request to areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca, or by contacting the Regional District of Nanaimo planning department at (250) 390-6510

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Continue to support the Fish Habitat Protection Development Permit Area

1. Enhance fish habitat protection - this also will help protect other life forms.
2. YES We should continue to support the Fish Habitat Protection DPA because it is not only is a requirement, but a necessity to protect water courses, ponds, etc. and the flora and fauna that reside there. The community vision supports sustainable development and protecting fish habitat would further that goal. It would be great if the RDN began to collect stream and water course data.
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. No. According to the map all of Cedar appears to be in the Development Permit Area this is far to inclusive.
6. Yes I think we should continue to support the Fish Habitat Development Permit Area. They are important environmentally, and as stewards of the environment we have an obligation towards their protection and against damage for generations to come as is our mandate in the Community Vision.
7. Yes but this must also consider enhancement and corrective actions. Coordinate and cooperate with: Ministry of Transportation and Highways, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Ministry of Community Development, and Nanaimo First Nations.
8. *This is an absolute must do. The added benefit is that rigorous protection of this resource constitutes default protection for a number of other values.*
9. Yes to this option.
10. Yes.
11. Yes. Policy 13 needs more definition." Policy 13 supports aquaculture along the coastal foreshore only where a Board-approved public consultation process has been completed and the community supports such uses." Public consultation in my experience has been disappointing. more a formality where everything stays the same rather than an actual opinion gathering, option weighing, idea generating exercise that actually affects policy. I think 'public consultation' needs to be reviewed and defined especially in regards as to how feedback will be actually be considered and implemented.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: "minimize the impacts of human Activities" "managing natural resources" "conservation of biodiversity". Recommend supporting a program to first capture the data related to Stream / Watercourse inventory and geocode that into RDN's geographic information system (GIS) based on the 3 typical classes of watercourses (A,B,C) thereby categorizing the risk to fish habitat.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Continue to support the Fish Habitat Protection Development Permit Area

13. Yes, because this Development Permit Area meets principles 3,4,5,6,8, and 12.
14. Yes. Fish habitat protection is important in Area A and should not be hampered with for the sake of development.
15. I honestly don't have time to read all this and comment. Its farming and gardening time and I work part time. I am all for providing protection of our environment. It is of paramount importance. Looking at how so much of the world has been overdeveloped, over used, overly damaged for resources, I think we should have learned by not to look ahead and change what we are doing. In Europe, which is more densely populated, they have had to learn to be less wasteful, to recycle, to protect what little wilderness they have left. It feels almost naked there, no large forests anymore.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Provide Incentives for green development

1. Yes - green development in itself should be an incentive and a benefit. But we shouldn't always have to give up something to get something.
2. Incentives for green development would benefit our community. A sustainability checklist combined with incentives like waiving of rezoning and development permit fees would likely promote green development. I also like the ideas expressed about waiving other fees and costs if the builder can show that he can meet or beat certain green standards. It would be nice to see the manufactured home industry adopt green standards. They have an ideal situation where they could lead the way in having inexpensive green features standard in their construction of homes.
3. Yes , would support providing there is a commitment from the Region to enact incentives . If there is no desire to do so , then this is just another 'feel good' statement that means nothing and will lead the community to unfulfilled expectations in their Official Community Plan.
4. Develop cost charges are in place to cover many issues for the future. NCID could not forfeit DCC's and maintain the water system. I am opposed to the removal of DCC's. DCC's also eliminate every homeowner from becoming a developer. From a financial perspective for local governments this is not a good option. I do support incentives and fast tracking of applications where development exceeds certain standard. All development must meet the current standards in the first place so there would be no reward for than. Developers can not meet the standard is in place then they don't get to develop. DO not support incentives for green development, its very expensive which is why so many don't do it.
5. No. People should have the option of choosing building materials and designs that suite their needs and desires. Incentives could pose a threat to imposing more regulations for building choices.
6. Absolutely. I think this is the link between talking about making changes and actually providing the mechanism for change to happen by supporting those whose development support the Community Vision.
7. Yes, Also, consider rewards/recognition of landowner's currently doing the right thing which foregoes development opportunities.
8. Agree but incentives should also be other than monetary. Do it for the right reasons so the culture continues to support the actions long after the money is gone.
9. A qualified yes to this option. I'm not supportive of a revenue neutral fee structure. Green Developer / Owner - Yes to a reduced fee structure (is doing more than minimum . Status Quo Developer / Owner - Normal fee structure (should not be penalized for doing everything asked).
10. Yes. The entire Area A should be included in a "Green DPA". 1. Require all development and building permit applicants to complete a checklist as part of the approval process. A Sustainability and Green Development checklist should be integrated into all residential, commercial and industrial development. This should include all rezoning applications. 2. Use triple bottom line assessment to achieve sustainability goals.
11. Yes, but green development needs defining. A reduction in consumption is required as well. So even if a 10,000 square foot house is built 'green' it still ain't green. Innovative, resource saving, healthy alternative, non polluting, community enhancing development can actually occur if encouraged and supported.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: "smart growth" "opportunities for local employment which have minimal impact on the environment" "per capita greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced" Recommendation: Establish a local bulk rebate /grant program whereby groups of neighbours/ enclaves, acquire less carbon emitting (cleantech) wood burning replacement stoves and/or bulk orders of flexible solar hot water panels and/or bulk orders of water reuse systems.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Provide Incentives for green development

13. Yes. I support all the incentives for green development.
14. For the most part I do agree with the exception of the waiving of Development Permit fee for all new development within the UCB.
15. Yes.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Protect Sensitive Ecosystems and rare species with both policy and Development Permit Areas

1. Definitely.
2. I think the OCP should definitely protect sensitive ecosystems and rare species through policy and DPAs. Development must not interfere with eagle and heron nest sites. Development must not encroach upon sensitive ecological features and rare species habitat. It is important that we protect these living legacies for the future.
3. Yes
4. No. There are enough regulations now!
5. Yes I support protection of sensitive ecosystems and rare species with both policy and Development Permit Areas. They are important in achieving the Community Vision as our mandate in keeping with good stewards for our children's environmental future means setting policies in place now.
6. Agreement in principle. Needs to provide compensation/incentives/protection for landowners where these values are located.
7. *Agree with protecting sensitive ecosystems. Protecting habitat should be enough to protect species in the area. Targeting specific species can be very punishing to land owners. Use federal and provincial guidelines only. How landowners would be compensated if new restrictive standards/policies are applied to their lands by other than government agencies. Be wary of special interest parties that wish to impose restrictions on others that do not directly affect them personally.*
8. I believe that the current OCP goes far enough.
9. Protection should primarily be done through DPA's, and a natural area protection covenant program should also be implemented as a covenant provides long term protection and is not open to DPA variance applications. For example the Islands Trust has implemented a "Natural Area Protection Tax Exemption Program" . Under a standard covenant the land owner continues to own the land, the covenant simply prevents current and future owners from doing anything to the covenant area that may harm its special values. This includes restrictions on: removal of native plants; use of herbicides and pesticides; alteration of natural watercourses or water bodies; grazing of animals; and, modification of the soil or geological features. Tax incentives on land values should be provided to encourage land owners to protect sensitive ecosystems and rare species.
10. Yes.
11. No unfortunately, Experience in these planning exercises and implementation on this topic has taught me that rare species protection really is just given lip service and courtesy silence. When one has to trade off hard choices between policies and program initiatives (as we inevitably have to do), this might be one to consider de-emphasizing in favour of more pressing issues and responses at this juncture. We cannot do it all or we won't be successful at anything.
12. Yes. These options are very relevant to our sustainability principles.
13. This would be a very commendable thing for Area A to do - what an excellent example for other areas to follow.
14. Yes. Limit development to 5 acre lots. Need to know more.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Encourage Environmental Stewardship

1. Yes - walk the walk talk the talk.
2. I wonder whether policy is enough with respect to some of the environmental protection ideas listed. Ideally most citizens would voluntarily comply by limiting use of pesticides, maintain native vegetation, control invasive species, etc. Education and support would encourage many people to do the right thing, but there are people who burn almost daily including burning compostables. There are people who use pesticides on a regular basis. Policy would be great for most, but there should be something with more teeth to guide those who are chronically disregarding best environmental practices. Perhaps where the ground water is highly vulnerable regulations should dictate the use of pesticides, use of impervious surfaces, etc.
3. Yes
4. All communities should encourage environmental stewardship.
5. No environmental stewardship should not become policy. The majority of people are taking steps to care of the environment.
6. Yes I support this policy, but I am not sure how we can be enforcing individuals on their own land use.
7. Yes.
8. Use education as the primary tool. Employ the RDN/A in-house expertise to educate land owners and residents. RDN/A could recognize/reward performance through a highly publicized recognition program – again not relying on monetary rewards.
9. In my opinion there is no need for a policy such as this in the OCP. It implies that property owners are not responsible and need to be told what is & is not acceptable. My concern is that such a policy would be the ammunition some people would love to have in the OCP to create issues whether there was any foundation or not.
10. Yes. The RDN and Area A community groups should form formal working relationships to support and implement Environmental Stewardship programs.
11. Yes and in order for this concept to become everyday practise environmental stewardship must be taught to children so they can learn and teach their parents. supporting local schools and initiating local stewardship and awareness programs should be reflected within the OCP. Will we get down to some actual basic zoning and by-law issues within the OCP review? For example re assess the 'rights' of owners buying a property, should not give you the 'right ' to remove trees that may have been growing for many years defining the character of a neighbourhood and providing noise barriers, nesting sites, shade etc. There are all kinds of ways this could be accomplished. An example of a bylaw that requires immediate change... it is permissible to use asphalt as fill! you need a permit if you're planning to dump it close to a stream but we know it will get to the water eventually. asphalt is refined residue from the distillation process of selected crude oils, potentially coated with heavy metals and other toxic materials. It's being used here today in Area A as fill. Just above Thatcher Creek in fact, despite the fact that we also have an asphalt recycling plant nearby. Another problem backyard burning...we need to find a way to reduce the cost of hauling and disposing wood waste away. it is too expensive so people burn everything. Light pollution has become an increasingly obvious concern. we are losing our night sky. this is unnecessary and bylaws or codes should be introduced outlining appropriate alternative lighting fixtures and lights.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: "showcased as a model community due to its environmental stewardship".
13. Yes. All the ways suggested support sustainability education and awareness are great tools.
14. Yes. Education and support is invaluable. Strongly support. Should bring the communities together with a very strong focus.
15. Yes.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Protect groundwater through policy and Development Permit Areas

1. Only way you are going to protect ground water is to minimize development (Pandora's box). Any development is detrimental to ground water.
2. Ground water protection is a priority for the people of Cassidy. Protection through DPAs and policy is a necessity. Is a policy strong enough to enforce groundwater protection? I agree that new commercial and industrial development must have measures to ensure that contaminants don't enter the aquifer. What about existing commercial and industrial developments? Are they covered by regulation. Looking forward to the presentation from Mike Hooper with regards to airport expansion and their groundwater protection measures.
3. While I support protecting our groundwater , I think this possibly goes too far. When we still have large live-stock operations ,industrial operations ,and the Regions largest mobile home park without sewer on the Cassidy aqua fir ,intruding into very small homeowner functions is going too far .
4. Co-ordinated with NCID for parts of Cedar. NCID already has ground water protection policies in place and monitors its wells. Quantity is already monitored for water system, including new development. No need to overlap in this area. NCID already doing that for some of Area A. Support measures for contaminants to not enter aquifer.
5. No. People have the right to use their wells as they see fit.
6. Of course I agree with the protection of groundwater. In the case of development I would need to know the cost of the reviews and studies, as it impact affordable housing being able to be offered.
7. Strong yes.
8. Agree with the notion of a DPA depending on the restrictions to be imposed. Generally Support stringent groundwater protection measures. Regional District of Nanaimo-A needs to find a way to actively engage the public in this issue - possibly through the schools. Require each new development to conduct a developer funded water quality monitoring program to ensure things are functioning as they should and being maintained as planned.
9. My concerns are similar to those expressed for environmental stewardship.
10. Yes. A Groundwater Protection DPA should be developed and applied to the entire Area A. The DPA should incorporate as a minimum the recommended BMP's as outlined in the Area A Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment. The RDN should act immediately to address the information gaps identified in the Area A Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment. Apply the precautionary principle into policy.
11. Yes. A Groundwater Protection DPA should be developed and applied to the entire Area A. The DPA should incorporate as a minimum the recommended BMP's as outlined in the Area A Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment. The RDN should act immediately to address the information gaps identified in the Area A Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment. Apply the precautionary principle into policy.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: "managing natural resources" "strongly supported by members of the community" "does not diminish the ability of future generations to meet their needs". Recommendation: The excellent consultant findings presented to us, inclusive of his recommendations should be actioned as a priority. Groundwater protection has to be a critical success factor in the viability of this community especially achieving much of it's Vision.
13. Yes. I agree with all the options.
14. Absolutely. Ground water protection is paramount.
15. Limit development to 5 acre lots. Yes I support the policy. No more light industrial business or heavy, for that matter, atop aquifers or by any water sources. Something needs to be done to protect the Cassidy Aquifer from business like Can Am, the Airport, the propane shop, Teresen Gas, and the like. No new housing developments/subdivisions in the area.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Protect groundwater through policy and Development Permit Areas

16. Yes. I can not find an area for general comments on environmental protection so I will write mine here. I do NOT agree with the following statement" Principle 10 Economic, social and environmental factors are interdependent and must be considered together. "Everything is subsidiary to the environment. Without an environment we have nothing, there can be no further compromise. This is stated above along with "The concept of environmental protection is enshrined in all levels of Regional District of Nanaimo policy and regulation from the highest level, the Board Strategic Plan, through the Regional Growth Strategy, the Official Community Plans, and the Zoning Bylaws." However the concept doesn't seem to become the reality. The environment must be considered above all else, even if there is a perception real or imagined of an economic windfall. Take for example the expansion of the Nanaimo airport. no matter how much propaganda is produced this is a very short sighted and flawed plan. We all know it. I don't care how much 'protection' is provided in the form of catchment systems etc etc we all know the truth. Expanding runways, parking lots, buildings on a highly vulnerable aquifer is courting disaster. We should instead be putting the same resources into the rail system that will remove cars, trucks and planes and all their inherent pollution from our water and air. we won't do that, in fact we can't even talk about it, because the economy and self serving social interests of the minority is protected at the expense of the environment. Furthermore the environment can be given all kinds of protection, but without monitoring and enforcement it means nothing and that is the situation we have now. there are virtually no resources allocated to actually 'protecting' the environment so it means nothing. how can this OCP recognise and allow for this fact? The RDN, the ministry of the environment, ngo's etc do not have the staff or budget to address even a fraction of the issues that need analysis and/or mitigation if we are going to give the environment equal footing with the economy. The MONEY is in development. At least it will be until we realise you can't drink that direct flight to Mazatlan. The Area A community has said that it wants this OCP to ensure this area is the most sustainable in the district. This will only happen if the OCP truly reflects environmental protection as it's number one priority, and enforces it.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Manage rainwater as a resource rather than a waste product

1. In rural areas with poor ground water supply most of us do that. Urban areas with provided water source are way behind and should be educated to conserve.
2. Definitely agree with this policy and feel that most of the people in the area I live in already conform to many of the policies that support the use of rainwater as a resource. The use of permeable paving should be required for large developments and encouraged with regular homeowners. All of the suggestions in the workbook are doable and important for a healthy aquifer and river system.
3. Support controls on runoff and sediment controls .Support other options , but only thru education and incentives .
4. By the time all these workbooks are assessed and if every options you propose were to be implemented no one could ever afford to do anything in area a. Some points contained in this option I support, but many I do not.
5. Yes, of particular interest in Area A. Perhaps managed as rainwater can factor in with groundwater policy as a means of meeting needs or even improving water vulnerability, which is important in Area A as it related to our commitment to quality and volume of water for those to come.
6. Strong Yes.
7. Agree with: a. Erosion control during construction, b. Regulate Impervious surfaces,. Rainwater management plans, Encourage re-use and recycling, Depending on each person's interpretation strictly trying to replicate natural water flows could prove to be very onerous. Support a process of using natural flow structures where reasonable and controlling additional over flows with good engineering designs and practices.
8. I can support this option.
9. Yes. A requirement that drainage for all new development, (residential, commercial and industrial) be designed to replicate the function of a naturally vegetated watershed, maintain the hydrological regime of surface and groundwater and pre-development flow rates, minimize interference with groundwater recharge; not introduce contaminants into the aquifer, and not introduce or remove materials where it would cause erosion of or the filling in of natural watercourses and/or wetlands.
10. Yes.
11. YES. Vision Relevance: "leader in local food production and sustainability" "managing natural resources" "innovative use of alternative technologies, green building programs". Recommendation: Establish incentives to startup/incubator/established businesses that retain or reuse storm drainage flows. Identify large vacant unused fields on properties which are natural watershed receptacles, but which drain by ditches directly into the ocean. That water should be allowed to instead percolate into the aquifer (Case-in-point, the 5 acre vacant mostly cleared property across the street from me purportedly owned by a physician in Alberta).
12. Yes. All options promote sustainability.
13. Yes with emphasis on training and support for existing residents and businesses as well as requirements for new development.
14. Sure. No new subdivisions.

Policy Options for Environmental Protection in Area A

Policy Option: Encourage water conservation through policies and Development Permit Area Guidelines

1. Encourage is not a strong enough term, it should be a requirement.
2. The OCP should support water conservation. I definitely feel that since Harmac is the biggest user, by far, of water in the area that they should be included in discussions about water conservation. Most of the measures suggested would be great. Rebates, gray water use, green building, rainwater recycling, etc. all make sense. I must say that I have a not so broad expanse of lawn/dandelions/clover which is extremely drought tolerant. I've never watered my lawn. Some summers it goes dormant and turns a nice shade of brown which means no more lawn mowing and the fall rains revive it every year. Just because you have a lawn does not mean you have to water it. Of course a natural landscape would be ideal.
3. Nearly everywhere has a water deficit in the summer months . Most people in rural areas are water conscious , particularly well users . Statistics show that users of the NCID water system consume less water than any other area of the Region . We do not need more regulations . Education and incentives should be supported .
4. How about the first options that is looked at is to get Harmac to reduce its use. Residential use is only 1% of Harmac use. Bringing all these policies is not going to make any difference as these users are not the problem. Do not understand only looking at residence for conservation when industry is the main user in Area A. The water deficit is created by Harmac not residences. Water should not be made difficult to obtain for homes. Gardeners have known how to capture rainwater for years and those who want to do it. This is not anything new or something that the public does not already know.
5. No. We have enough guidelines in place.
6. I agree with the example policies listed as a means to implement changes for the future of water conservation and less waste. Again it ties in with the Community Vision and addresses water shortages in Area A.
7. Strong Yes.
8. Agree with policies and DP restrictions as long as they are reasonably applied, (ie. not all sediment is bad), and there are no monetary rebates. Rebates do not change thinking. Green buildings and water conserving landscapes should be a given in the higher density development areas as new projects are undertaken. RDN can provide motivation through education and promoting a culture of doing it for the right reasons as well as some enforcement.
9. I can support this option.
10. Yes, encourage through policies and DPA's. In addition to drought tolerant landscaping, use of native plants should be a priority.
11. Yes. Educate and reward clean water is likely the most important component of any community. Decommission golf courses, highways, industrial activity, and airports that have a direct impact on waterways, including wetlands, streams , rivers and aquifers. Phase out chemical cleaners and cosmetic pesticides.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: Same as rainwater resource one's above.
13. Yes, especially a water-conservation rebate program.
14. Yes - the water conservation rebate program in particular could be very effective.
15. No new subdivisions/development projects. No development that involves mitigation after accidents. Don't create a situation where the risk of accidents or overuse of water is involved.

Coastal Shoreline Uses

What types of uses, buildings, and structures should be allowed on the coastal shoreline?

1. Boat houses are a no. They are ugly, block views. More public access should be available at all large water front developments - ample room for shore birds and creatures - leave them plenty of room and privacy.
2. This is a difficult question for me because I can appreciate that someone who owns waterfront property would like to access it and enjoy it. The main requirement should be that any use, building or structure should have as small an ecological footprint as possible. Beach access pathways using natural material would be great. Boat ramps should be limited to certain designated Areas for public use. Docks should be aesthetically pleasing and not interfere with beach access. Boat houses should be kept in marinas.
3. While the promotion of boat ramps seems to be discouraged in this book. Area A is solely lacking. There is only one ramp between Nanaimo and Ladysmith. One more boat ramp is needed in this area. I have no issue with homes on the shoreline properties and obviously discourage high rises or apartments, or condos in this area. Most in Area A keep beach front properties in immaculate condition I support access to the beach being constructed in the most 'green' way possible but again do not support regulating people to death. I was not opposed to the boat harbour resort. Only required the removal of 8 trees and was being constructed in a very environmentally friendly way. Not all development is bad and some are top notch, as was this one. Would much rather see this resort than another 120 houses which can go in down in boat harbour without rezoning.
4. None. There are already building requirements.
5. Beach access stairs, beach access pathways, boat ramps with an emphasis on provision for active transportation. I do not agree with docks or boat houses.
6. No comment at this time.
7. Strict guidelines should apply to all structures near the shoreline especially those visible from the water. Restrictions should consider: setbacks, height, size, shape, and color. One only has to look at some of the Gulf Islands shoreline development to see why. No building should be excessively high and it must blend with the landscape.
8. Beach access stairs - Policy should stipulate that a land owner will be held liable for all environmental impact restoration costs, as well as all costs for clean-up and removal of damaged stair systems that fail for whatever reason (storm damage, erosion, etc). No lighting systems should be permitted on stair systems. Beach Path Access should be the preferred choice. Boat ramps - should not be permitted. Other Boat Launching Systems - should only be permitted if there is no alterations to the natural features of the shoreline and they are not visible from neighbouring properties. Docks - should only be permitted on shoreline that is adequately protected from weather damage. Policy should stipulate that the dock owner will be held liable for all environmental impact restoration costs, as well as all costs for clean-up and removal of damaged dock systems that fail for whatever reason (storm damage, erosion, etc). Boat Houses - should not be permitted.
9. A difficult question to answer without further information. Generally speaking respect set backs- do not allow changes, eliminate practises which have a detrimental affect on the foreshore. Build awareness and recognise the need of shorebirds that need forage on lower tides for relatively short periods of time on the same beaches as dogs and people. Do not allow the removal of truckloads of seaweed which is sold for fertiliser. Support public access.
10. Beach access pathways are preferable to beach access stairs. There needs to be a very environmental approach to protect the shoreline from the impacts of development, quality of the foreshore, public access, view corridors, and erosion and sediment control. Structures (e.g. houses, boat houses, and boat ramps) need the same restrictions as beach access stairs.
11. This assumes development. No new subdivisions.

Coastal Shoreline Uses

What types of uses, buildings, and structures should be allowed on the coastal shoreline?

12. Encourage Blueway access via provincial right-of-ways (ROW). Locate and open up public ROW's which were previously built as sound boat ramp structures, some may have been blocked to the public by adjacent property owners. Encourage whistle blowing and by-law enforcement to property owners who block walk-on waterfront access including those who dump green yard waste and invasive species as intentional or unintentional obstructions. Recommend To ALLOW: Beach access natural pathway. In-place soundly built boat ramp, In-place (grandfathered) soundly built lift & turn cantilever launch, Small floatable dock measuring no more than the length of a single kayak and associated gangway constructed of natural light penetrating products and non-polluting materials. NOT Recommended: (Even though this policy implementation might decrease the resale value of my property for instance): New beach access stairs/rails, New boat ramps which have not been certified by an engineer, New other types of boat launchers, New large docks and gangways, Old unsafe and unsightly ramps and docks and rails, Boat houses of any kind.
13. Beach access pathways seems the best public access on several levels (environmental, aesthetics, etc.). The idea of lifting devices for boats sounds like something the area residents should prefer however public boat ramps are an important access for public use.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Policy Option: Designate a Coastal Development Permit Area to maintain native vegetation and ecological function. If you support this option what guidelines should be included, what information do you feel is important for a developer to provide? If you do not support this option, how should the Official Community Plan protect the coastal foreshore?

1. Yes
2. I agree with designating a coastal development permit area to maintain vegetation and ecological function. I think guidelines should include protection of public access, protection of the natural ecology, minimize footprint of shoreline development, and development should be aesthetically pleasing. Perhaps the developer should provide a plan of what he propose to do, he should also have talked to the neighbours to get their agreement to the proposed development. He should state his steps to protect the shoreline environment.
3. Support
4. Yes. None of the exemptions should be regulated and agree they should be exempt. I support the guidelines as outlined here.
5. I do not support this option. The Federal Government already has regulations in place.
6. Yes I support this option, setback guidelines, natural habitat protection, preservation of ecologically sensitive areas, zero tolerance for gray water into the ocean. The developer should be able to provide vegetation species impact on development, recycle of gray water - in other words dialogue on little to no impact on the environment.
7. Yes.
8. No substantial work to commence on shoreline (within 10 meters of HWM) areas without an impact report. All waterfront slopes should be maintained in a stable condition. Performance of substantial work, requiring a permit, should be regulated by taking deposits that are held until assessments after completion. Photo documentation should be employed to track any changes to shoreline areas.
9. I do not support this policy option. It is recognized that the shoreline is dynamic - vegetation may come and go naturally. The RDN Board Marine Retaining Wall policy already exists to provide guidelines.
10. Yes I support a Coastal DPA. The RDN should developed policy and DPA as per suggestions in the Green Shores Project. Information is available on the internet at; <http://www.greenshores.ca> The Green Shores project promotes sustainable use of coastal ecosystems through planning and design that recognizes the ecological features and functions of coastal systems provides options and tools for a wide range of planning, design and construction professionals who are interested in minimizing the environmental impacts of their projects in a cost effective manner. For home owners and communities, the stories, resources and examples presented here can inspire you to make choices that will be beneficial to everyone in the long term.
11. I support this policy in principle. I do not have the expertise or the experience to give advice.
12. NO: Concerns: A 15 metre inland and seaward DPA smacks of restrictive covenant issues which would be opposes by any shorefront owner. Some enforceable restrictions on the type of access and structures will be enough perceived pain. Owners will naturally be concerned about their property value potentially being undervalued relative to other jurisdictions which may allow unlimited uses. If there are not enough nearby opened-up public ROW's , that even shorefront owner's can use for their recreation or sport, it could be anticipated that they would opt for no shoreline restrictions and resist all such programs.
13. Yes. Guidelines should deal with specific structure signage and height, setbacks, erosion and sediment control and view corridors as well as materials used.
14. For the most part I do support this with the exception of fence building. I think this should require a permit as they could easily albeit accidentally encroach on public access.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Policy Option: Designate a Coastal Development Permit Area to maintain native vegetation and ecological function. If you support this option what guidelines should be included, what information do you feel is important for a developer to provide? If you do not support this option, how should the Official Community Plan protect the coastal foreshore?

15. Protect the costal foreshore by npot having development. I saw today, where Cable Bay is going to extend to Cedar by the Sea. If the trees get cut down that far, the character of the area will be irreparably changed. We are witnessing the disappearance of our forests and wooded areas. Does anyone else value the trees, the lungs of our planet, the habitat for wildlife? Changing the wild areas, turning them into suburbs/subdivisions is soul-damaging. People don't even realize that living in concrete does not feed their souls. The further away we move from nature, the more discontent we see in cities, drugs, crime, unhappy families, stressed individuals, chasing after what they do not really know - peace and quiet.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Policy Option: Provide guidelines for beach access stairs and boat launches. If you support this policy, please tell us what limitations (height, setbacks, size, etc.) you feel should be placed on buildings, structures, and uses that occur on the shoreline. How should these guidelines be used (specify community preference, Board Policy, amendments to the Zoning Bylaw)?

1. Low is good - structures as far back as possible - amendment to zoning.
2. The OCP should provide guidelines for beach access stairs and boat launches. I support this policy, but don't have the expertise to begin to suggest limitations .
3. Support . Structures should not be out of character for the neighbourhood and surroundings .
4. No and no more added regulations.
5. I'm sorry I can not comment on height, setbacks, or size as I am not familiar. However, I do support beach stair access, and boat launches.
6. Probably but I need more information on this topic.
7. All work must be a technical rationale and targeted to meet a specific requirement. Minimize impervious structures including; retaining walls, boat ramps, stairways, and parking areas. Minimize foundations/structures within 5 meters of the high water mark, i.e. Works that can reasonably be moved or removed in future if required due to changes in the shoreline.
8. I don't think that this is a significant issue for Area "A".
9. Public Beach Access - should be provided on all road allowances and easements that lead to the foreshore. Boat launches 1) there is no need for additional public boat launch facilities on public lands required for Area A. 2) there should be no accommodation for private boat launch facilities on residential lands. 3) If any resort or marina development should occur the developer should be required to provide public boat launch facilities, along with public parking facilities for vehicles and boat trailers. These facilities should accommodate motorized and non-motorized marine vessels.
10. I support this policy in principle. I do not have the expertise or the experience to give advice.
11. YES. See some of previous size recommendations above.
12. Yes. The limitations would have to be site specific.
13. Yes I support this and I think the guidelines should be via amendments to the zoning bylaw.
14. This assumes development. Leave the shoreline natural. We don't need to traverse every inch of it. We can use the available beaches we already have.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Policy Option: Discourage hardening of the foreshore

1. Yes buildings should be as far back from the water as possible.
2. I support this option because I don't think a wall of giant concrete blocks is appealing. I'm wondering what the green approach is? Use of natural rock?
3. Support
4. I support this option.
5. I do not support this option. The Federal Government already has regulations in place.
6. Yes I support this option in keeping with the green approach, making the changes necessary now for a more healthy environment tomorrow.
7. Yes.
8. Regional District of Nanaimo-A should not permit an increase of erodible surfaces on the shoreline. I.e.: Any vegetation removed has to be replaced to ensure stabilization. An as-built submission including drawings and photos should be made following completion of any substantial work.
9. Why is it necessary to have this in the OCP if an RDN Board policy already exists? The policy, if necessary, should simply state "The OCP supports the RDN Board Marine Retaining Wall policy".
10. Yes, but I do not support the installation of any "hard" retaining walls. In general, the harder the construction measure, the greater the impact on shoreline processes - including sediment transport, geomorphology, and biological functions. Structural shoreline stabilization typically results in vegetation and in many cases natural sandstone removal resulting in damage to near-shore habitat and shoreline corridors. Shoreline stabilization should not interrupt natural processes solely to reduce erosion of undeveloped land.
11. New development: Using geotechnical analysis of the site and shoreline characteristics, subdivision applications must ensure that the lots created will not require shoreline stabilization in order for reasonable development to occur. New development on steep slopes or bluffs shall be set back sufficiently to ensure that shoreline stabilization is unlikely to be necessary during the life of the structure, as demonstrated by a geotechnical analysis. New development that would require shoreline stabilization that causes impacts to adjacent or down-current properties shall not be supported. Shoreline stabilization structures will not be allowed for the purpose of providing a sufficient setback to meet zoning requirements.
12. I support.
13. YES. Comment: I recall reading (DFO / Burrard Inlet Conservation ?) research a while back that found that adding any 'weight' to a shoreline was a mistake. I believe their results showed that such weight caused an immediate negative impact on adjacent parcels.
14. Yes. Area A needs to protect the foreshore.
15. Yes fully support for environmental reasons.
16. Assuming development. No to development, except for 5 acre lot minimum.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Policy Option: Maintain ocean view corridors

1. Yes - by keeping buildings further back from the water these corridors have a better chance of existing.
2. I support this option because people obviously enjoy their ocean views and would not enjoy a new development erasing their view. The needs of all stakeholders should be considered.
3. Support
4. I support this option.
5. I have mixed feelings here as views previously unimpeded were purchased at lesser value than ocean views in front of them. Have they wanted views they should have purchased accordingly. Having said that should adjacent properties share in the cost of the developers plan modification to protect their view.
6. Yes.
7. Regional District of Nanaimo-A must strive to protect and maintain all public right of ways and view corridors. This includes taking advantage of new access opportunities if presented.
8. I can support this type of policy in the OCP.
9. Viewscapes from the ocean should also be protected. Most waterfront property owners clear out all the trees along the foreshore to provide themselves with that "ocean view". The view from the ocean and foreshore is that of a subdivision. Establish a 15 metre setback from the shoreline natural boundary where no native vegetation is removed.
10. I support.
11. YES. If everyone abided by the current sanitary system setbacks which are from oceanfront natural bank and setbacks from active wells there would likely not be an issue of blocking ocean views. The Health Authority requirement forces non-UCB development to install higher -end septic systems (type 2 or higher aerated septic systems like I had to install) at long setback distances from the shore. The result is new structures should always be parallel to or behind other structures., not blocking ocean view corridors.
12. Yes. View corridors respect the rights of all citizens to enjoy ocean views.
13. Any protection against detrimental impact of development must be supported.
14. Assumes development. Does this also assume that ocean view corridors will entail cutting of trees so people can see the ocean. I drive to the beach to see the ocean, but I also enjoy staying at home where it is peaceful and quiet. I don't need to see the ocean.

Policy Options for Shoreline Uses in Area A

Please use this space to provide any additional ideas, comments or concerns you have with respect to shoreline uses in Electoral Area 'A'.

1. I think more signs designating public access to the shoreline would be great. Also Greg's suggestion about designated waterways would be a real boon to promoting eco-tourism. A map that indicates beach accesses, kayak entry and exit points, picnic sites, swimming beaches, wildlife viewing and boat launches would be great.
2. Would like to see policies around tree removal on our shoreline properties. Guidelines should support limited tree removal as much as possible while still allowing a home to exist. All subdivision should be made without flattening it and planting trees back later. It looks ugly and makes zero sense. High density small lots increase tree removal and create flat ugly subdivisions with no privacy whatsoever. No matter how many options or policies you create to try and stop sprawl there is a downside. Total removal of all vegetation is one of those downsides. I don't support this but understand issues around sprawl as well.
3. Shoreline areas are gems. Cannot stress the usefulness and importance of photo documentation enough to monitor and control the natural and unnatural processes that occur in these areas. RDN should retain all existing shoreline areas and in endeavour to acquire more shoreline for future public use.
4. This is a vast a subject with lots of research. We need to protect our shoreline locally enlist the advice of the Georgia strait alliance <http://www.georgiastrait.org/> they have lots of expertise as does Patrick Walshe www.greenshores.ca
5. Concern: I can supply digital photos of oceanfront locations along the proposed Blueway that reinforce some of the above arguments or recommendations. They depict for instance depict: .Rusted old steel pylons and shards and broken cement from poorly constructed boat ramps and launch structures. Abandoned rails into the waterway near beach access ROW. Tolerable grandfathered cantilevered boat launch system but intolerable rusted gangplanks. Green waste obstructing contiguous walk-on oceanfront access. Possibly intentional gate obstruction to a very soundly built grandfathered cement boat ramp on vacant ROW Blueway (ROW to be confirmed).
...the good , the bad, and the ugly
6. This workbook assumes development.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Develop an eco-industrial network in Area A

1. Yes
2. This sounds like a great idea. I'm guessing that an inventory of waste products would have to be made and then publicized for possible inputs.
3. Support creating the policies to encourage this.
4. I support this. Methane gas from landfill being sold is a good thing.
5. No.
6. I agree, taking steps to reduce greenhouse gasses in Area A.
7. Strong Yes.
8. Agree – but pick one or two manageable projects to set a positive tone. Develop policies to encourage activity toward achieving the goals.
9. There are no industries of sufficient size in AREA "A" for this to work. In fact, South Wellington wishes to see it's industrial area downsized.
10. No. Future industrial development should be concentrated at the Sandstone Development and Duke Point Industrial Park (as well as other non-developed industrial lands) within the city of Nanaimo UCB, not in Area A. Eco-industrial projects should be capable of clearly articulating a net reduction in GHG emissions.
11. I don't have enough information to comment.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: 'smart growth and sustainability' "desirable place to work" "innovative use of alternative technologies, green building program" "minimal impact on the environment".
13. Good idea but I don't know how to achieve it.
14. Excellent idea - good for the environment and economic stimulation potential with job creation.
15. Better research this for the actual pay-off and risks involved.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the number of kilometres of cycling and walking paths by 5% per year.

1. If not more.
2. What exactly is 5%? Will the 5% compound each year? I agree we need to build walking and cycling trails in order to reduce GHG. If they are built people will use them. The community vision is to have a variety of transportation modes.
3. First off , we need an inventory of what is there now , a 10 year plan of where new paths are to be developed , and an estimated cost . Establishing unrealistic targets will ensure this part of an OCP is a failure and potentially cloud the whole document.
4. Support this.
5. No. There are many paths and trails in Area 'A'.
6. Absolutely, The sooner the better. Creates healthier more connected Area A.
7. Yes.
8. Target may be too aggressive and may set the community up for failure. Pick one project that a large number of people will get behind and have it in hand for the day funding is available. Keep something in front of provincial/federal government at all times.
9. I could support this as a target if it was to improve safety for cyclists & walkers by improving road shoulders - no need to create "paths". Lots of people walk & cycle on roads now and more would if they felt safe.
10. Yes. Policy must include a mechanism that allows monitoring of progress on a yearly basis.
11. Yes
12. YES. But the target is too low (perceived in this location that 5% of nothing is nothing). Vision Relevance: "highly desirable place to live,work and play" "minimize impacts of human activities" "managing social systems in a way that enhances quality of life" "recreational and sports opportunities" "excellent multi-modal transportation system" "per capita greenhouse emissions have been reduced"
13. Good idea, especially if any road upgrades by the Ministry of Transportation builds Active Transport cycling, walking, horseback trails along existing roads.
14. Definitely has merit.
15. Where? Does this mean spoiling natural areas?

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the land area organically farmed in Area A by 5% per year.

1. Farmed areas are decreasing yearly - cost of organic farming is high.
2. I agree with this target, but I don't what policies would encourage this type of growth. Regional tax breaks??
3. Nice idealistic goal , but farmers are struggling as it is , and they are only going to produce what they can sell profitably .Ask the farmers what is a realistic goal.
4. Target government requirements that are not working first and is the reason we have less farmers. Farmers have to make a living and be profitable. Ideas are only good if they are viable otherwise they are just words on paper.
5. No farmers have the right to choose.
6. Absolutely, Again healthier food healthier community in Area A.
7. Probably yes.
8. Agree that this could be a “showcase” item and it suits the community but the target may be too aggressive and may set the community up for failure. Set a baseline and target “continuous improvement” as the goal. This initiative needs a passionate champion(s) to actually happen.
9. Not excited about this target. Would rather see something that shows amount of farm land being brought back into production each year. If we are concerned about local food supply the key is not whether it is organically grown or not but that it is grown period.
10. Yes. I would encourage a higher percentage of land converted to organic farming.
11. Yes or more.
12. YES: Vision Relevance: "become a leader in local food production" "opportunities for local employment" "have minimal impacts on the environment".
13. Great. Encourage homeowners to rip out their laws and put in veggies.
14. For health benefits alone this is a yes.
15. Yes.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the proportion of locally grown food which is consumed locally by 10% per year.

1. Overly optimistic.
2. I agree wholeheartedly with this target. I think it will take some aggressive incentives to reach this target each year. Establishment of a farmers market would help. Certified meat cutters in the area would help. More small scale producers would help. Community gardens would help. Both the last two targets would help fulfill the community vision of area A being a leader in agricultural production.
3. Simply establishing policies to make agriculture a priority function on ALR land will not , in itself ,make farmers grow food .Like the previous targets , they need to be realistic and achievable .
4. Support providing incentives.
5. This should be a goal not a regulated target.
6. Yes. Healthier, reduced GHG emissions having to drive less, socially excellent outlet for community in Area A.
7. Strong yes.
8. Target may be too aggressive and sets community up for failure. Set a baseline and target “continuous improvement” as the goal.
9. Too broad a target. How about measuring the sales improvement at Farmers' markets in the area?
10. Yes. Again I would suggest this target should be acted upon aggressively. Food production takes time to develop, and cannot react overnight to food shortages, or food distribution disruptions.
11. Yes.
12. YES. Vision Relevance: "Leader in local food production" "diversity of residents from all economic and ethnic backgrounds are welcomed and have an enhanced sense of community pride". Recommendation: Also consider public / leased small garden plots for youth or seniors who do not have access to arable land. The small community plots designated in an area in the South Surrey / White Rock Crescent Beach area on arable land adjacent to the Blackie Spit oceanfront park is successful.
13. Also the Cedar farmer's market runs from mothers day to the end of October at the Crow and gate. Every year it gets more sellers and buyers.
14. Absolutely.
15. Does this ensure that in 10 years, we will produce 100% of our food needs. Couldn't we move more quickly? Starting next year? 100% by 2019 or when?

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the number of existing dwelling units and other buildings upgraded to higher energy efficiency standards.

1. In urban settings.
2. This would be another great target. The suggestions in the workbook are good. What would be a good number of homes to retrofit each year? 10, 20??
3. This appears to be a target coming thru the back door . The Region should FIRST establish the incentives and identify the criteria. I don't support an entire Area A DPA for new construction ,but support incentives to encourage such construction and make it well worthwhile to utilize such techniques.
4. No. Against increased regulations.
5. Yes, support what we 'say' in our Community Vision with upgraded higher energy efficient options made available.
6. Strong yes.
7. Agree –don't take your eye of the ball but retrofitting existing homes is a difficult sell for existing homeowners on stretched budgets unless government programs are in place to fund it. For the interim energy efficiency efforts may be better focused on new construction. A few successes here will provide real life examples increasing public awareness.
8. I can support this target but need a meaningful target number.
9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. YES. Vision Relevance: "innovative use of alternative technologies" "opportunities for local employment". Comment & Recommendation: My son moved here from Vancouver to an affordable rental house in rural area A and is now a Certified Energy Advisor active in this emerging subject . He is an independent entrepreneurial contractor working in association with City Green out of Victoria and more his territory is Nanaimo to Duncan . This case-in-point is consistent with my policy recommendation in the last Citizens committee meeting wherein the RDN should adopt an economic sustainability policy of "one Job per new resident" . It is especially pertinent when the job is directly in this OCP subject arena.
12. Yes, by exempting new construction from DPAs if they meet energy efficiency standards.
13. As long as incentives were offered this has the potential to be successful.
14. Yes. Need to know more about this.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase transit ridership by 5% per year, double commuters every 5 years.

1. Yes - Transit must be timely, convenient, and affordable.
2. With gas prices rising I think the 5% increase per year is realistic. There is a need to move people about area A without using the automobile and transit is an option that can meet that need.
3. What are the policies that are going to encourage commuters to utilize transit ? This target is partly based on the expectation that new development will be designed to support and encourage transit . Where is this new development going to happen ?
4. I do not agree with transit being a consideration if it is used as a way to turn down an application. I agree with it being looked at but that's is it. Transit has a long way to come in Area A before it should stop development.
5. People should have the choice of their own transportation methods.
6. Yes I agree, but also increased routes which helps with the Community vision by reducing vehicular traffic and provides greater links to one another in the community.
7. Sure.
8. Target may be too aggressive and may set the community up for failure. Increased transit ridership is almost totally dependent on growth or a significant change in costs to the consumer. Regional District of Nanaimo-A can only influence one of these factors.
9. I don't have a problem with this as a target. Forecasted population increases should achieve this.
10. My understanding is that traditional thinking for public Transit requires density to justify the service. This option suggests that density in Area A would be targeted to increase by at least 5% per year. In keeping with maintaining the "rural" character of Area A how can this target be balanced to any area outside of the UCB?
11. Yes.
12. I agree with the target and transit should be a consideration n rezoning applications. But it is density that dictates transit services. And because Area A is so rural and spread out, we need park and rides.
13. Yes.
14. Not if it means increase to population and density of housing. Don't create a population explosion just to provide more transit. That just serves developers and subdevelopments.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the amount of mixed use development occurring in the village centres.

1. Yes.
2. Mixed use development would be welcome in Cassidy especially if it provided more services to people so they wouldn't have to travel as much. The community vision is for more self contained communities: closer to work, closer to services, closer to transit.
3. Support this target providing it remains an option for development and not mandatory .
4. These decisions should be left to the business community and proprietors to determine what is viable and what niches are needed in the marketplace.
5. Absolutely: encourages nodal amenities reducing vehicle travel, socially better for community, provides for more folks all round needs in a smaller condensed area.
6. No comment at this time.
7. Support new multi-family, multi-use green buildings. Get the land ready, advertise it and engage a desirable developer.
8. I think that this is the most realistic way of dealing with anticipated population increases.
9. Yes but only for village centres that have access to water supply and sewer services. Mixed use development can only achieve the goal of allowing people to live close to where they work and close to services if each development proposal goes through a public review process. Otherwise how would it be determined what services the local community would utilize?
10. I have concerns about the concept of nodes and the opportunity for further sprawl. I would prefer to see alternative transportation options for travel to services in Nanaimo. Rural people accept the lack of services as part of life and when they 'go to town' accomplish many things per trip. Unless there are other incentives such as extremely high fuel prices many will still seek out services in other areas for a number of reasons.
11. Yes.
12. Good idea, but we need safer paths for active transportation and improved neighbourhood connections.
13. Yes.
14. Which village centres –this assumes more development.

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Increase the amount of locally produced renewable energy (co-generation, solar, wind).

1. Yes, but not at the cost to the environment. Run of river sounds really nice but can have drawbacks. There's a draw back - power plant has a water licence and can use up water that is in short supply.
2. I definitely agree with this target. We are playing catch-up in this area as compared to many countries in Europe. Windmills, solar panels, electricity produced by turbines powered by gas from animal waste are common place and should be encouraged here. I still think super energy efficient mobile homes with solar panels and a small windmill and other energy saving devices should be being built and maybe they are. What would our policy be if a farmer wanted to erect a large electricity producing windmill on his property. I think the OCP should support it.
3. Support this with reservations . Wind farms and co-generation have been a sensitive issue in this area and a blanket endorsement cannot be given .
4. This does not need to be a target option it is already an option.
5. Yes, encourage business to become active in environmentally friendly locally produced renewable energy.
6. Yes.
7. Support all entrepreneurial attempts to do this but otherwise leave this alone. Have friendly policies in place but do not offer any monetary support by RDN outside of administration costs of supporting proposals, needs to be economically viable to be sustainable.
8. I support this option.
9. Rather than producing more energy, the RDN should aggressively introduce energy reduction programs. The production of locally produced renewable energy that is fed into the grid is not a solution to local energy needs. Locally produced renewable energy projects should only be supported if they are producing energy that will be locally consumed. i.e. a farm produces energy for it's own consumption.
10. We have along way to go with conservation before we consider further energy sources even renewable). I am opposed to developing new energy simply to continue our wasteful ways.
11. Yes.
12. What about tidal energy e.g. Dodd's Narrows.
13. Yes.
14. Need to look into this more closely. Can we do this without proposed subdivision development, or is that the incentive?

GHG Emissions Reduction Targets in Area A

Target Option: Decrease the amount of solid waste going to the landfill.

1. Yes - use/reuse/recycle
2. I think the RDN is doing a good job with it's Zero Waste strategy. Collection of food waste might help. Encouraging producers of food and consumer products to use environmentally friendly packaging would help. Too much plastic.
3. Just a motherhood statement endorsing the Region's policies . Most rural people have historically been leaders in waste reduction.
4. I support the Regional District of Nanaimo's solid waste program. Having said that, again with putting more costs on the developer or residential homeowner by insisting on facilities for organic diversion. Don't support this.
5. The landfill has sufficient capacity to handle our day to day waste, it is desirable to decrease however without further regulations and increased costs.
6. Yes, encourage more efficient recycle of waste.
7. Strong yes.
8. Strongly agree – support existing efforts and vigilance around assessing new technologies.
9. I support this option.
10. Yes. I would support a organic material composting facility. Properly composted material is a key ingredient to building healthy soil for food production. Compost could become a revenue stream for the RDN. I would also support a reduction in curb side garbage pick-up to bi-weekly instead of weekly. In our household of 2 adults we put out one bin on garbage every 6-weeks. REDUCE REDUCE REDUCE!!
11. Of course.
12. YES. Case -In -Point: I have relocated and renovated 2 beautiful homes in my retirement business over the past 3 years. Each 18 year old custom design house was saved from demolition and each weighed over 50,000 pounds. All of that would have gone to landfill. This case- in- point demonstrates how recycling something as large as a 3500 square foot home can be both environmentally sound, and has created one new economically sustainable retirement job/business in area A for a new resident (me). A non- insignificant spinoff benefit to the area is approximately \$ 300,000 has been spent in this area on the Pylades Dr oceanfront project in labour and materials and taxes. And another \$430,000 was spent on land that stayed in the Nanaimo area.
13. Continue to support the Regional District of Nanaimo's current initiatives because they're making a positive environmental impact.
14. Yes - a residential organic diversion is a great idea.
15. Yes. Compost. Eliminate packaging and plastics at source of purchase. Do not increase the population and you will have a decreasing need for dealing with solid waste as people figure how not to acquire it in the first place.

Policy Options for GHG Emission Reductions in Area A

Please use this space to provide any additional ideas, comments or concerns you have with respect to GHG emissions reductions in Electoral Area 'A'.

1. I know Oak Bay has made a policy allowing electric vehicles on it's streets. It would be pro-active for area A to do the same thing.
2. Many of the ideas presented are great. I feel this Official Community Plan is getting very complex. Area A is a small rural area, is this even being remembered? No offense intended but Area A can't save the world and neither can its Official Community Plan. These options need to be looked at, at the federal and provincial level and presented as national initiatives first. I feel that transit in the rural areas being used as a way to get people out of their cars will not work. In Nanaimo I agree you can get people out of their cars via promoting transit. Bus ride and car ride would be similar in time it takes and is closer to where these residents work. Reducing cars in cities can work. Cars are here to stay and you will never get people who live 20-30 minutes away from their jobs on a bus. Its time to wake up to this point and not dream up ways of penalizing people via development in order to promote transit in Area A. Our area is never going to have the employment base to sustain the population in my lifetime and that is just a fact. Transit should be promoted and increased in our area for those who don't drive and our youth.
3. Pick one or two things from the Community Vision as "showcase projects" and be the best - e.g., a. Rainwater management, b. Permeable structures, Volunteer water sampling program, Community environmental education.
4. The issue of backyard burning needs to be addressed in Area A. Currently there are no restrictions on how much or how frequent material can be burned. Restrict immediately all slash burning in Area A. There are other methods available in the area to recycle wood waste. There are numerous small portable saw mills in the area, which burn cuttings from the milling operations on regular basis.
5. There is a ton of information out there.
6. I am pleased that this is a topic, but I don't see increased development as a solution. We need to learn to live differently, not carry on as usual. I appreciate the consideration offered for GHG. I'd like to see more research done into environmental protection. We need a local Ministry of local planning to guide us to living more in tune with nature. More development (I refer to the large development/subdivisions, more than 5 houses in a development) does not get us there.

Policy Options for Community Sewer in Area A

Policy Option: Support alternative sewer systems

1. I have questions about alternate sewer systems and how they work. If they are more efficient than septic systems and allow for higher density within the UCB, then I support them. I'm also assuming that they protect the aquifer. The manufactured home parks in Cassidy are all on septic systems. Have any studies been made to examine the efficiency of these systems and how they affect the aquifer?
2. Support. This would ensure a healthy alternative, and only those with inadequate or failed systems would be required to pay.
3. 49th had this system and it has never worked.
4. Yes but without a regulation policy and septic fields should be permitted.
5. Yes, I believe all alternate sewer systems need to be encouraged and explored as a means to efficient disposal of waste.
6. Yes.
7. Yes – but focus on high density areas only. Consider private enterprise for services. Rural areas should keep existing facilities due to costs but installations should be audited/inspected and recertified every 2 years.
8. I can not support this option for properties inside the UCB unless they are unable to physically connect to a community sewer service.
9. Yes. Support should also be provided for composting toilet systems, and grey water recovery systems, both in new development and upgrading of existing systems.
10. NO Within UCB. YES Outside UCB. Concerns: Alternative septic systems would presumably still affect the quality of water in aquifers and can only get worse with population growth and density. Do it right and put UCB properties on common sanitary systems otherwise how can you call it urban?
11. Yes to onsite sewer treatment options and the Official Community Plan should recommend the Regional District of Nanaimo investigate the feasibility of operating these systems.
12. Perhaps.
13. More development? Do not force people who have their own good septic system to join a sewer system. By the same token, don't encourage development/subdivision, just to have enough people to pay for sewer. It all ends up costing more and damaging the environment.

Policy Options for Community Sewer in Area A

Policy Option: Increase the minimum parcel sizes for properties outside of the UCB such that the smallest minimum parcel size is 1.0 hectare

1. I agree with this policy because it will allow for community sewer grants. It will also encourage development within UCBs.
2. Current UCB boundary options need to be decided before this option should be considered .Also need to look at the extent of properties are affected , and how that impacts on the community
3. Don't know at this point if I support this.
4. No. Minimum standards are sufficient.
5. Not necessarily if policies are adopted regarding acceptable forms of alternate housing.
6. Don't know.
7. Yes.
8. I can not support this option.
9. Yes.
10. NO. Concern: This effectively downzones property by increasing the minimum parcel size by 5 times today's policy (ie 2,000m² to 10,000m²). I have experienced many landowners in another jurisdiction who by virtue of health or lack of retirement funds had to sever off a parcel of their acreage just to survive. Removing that flexibility is very restrictive. Downzoning does nothing to assist current and future generations of children in obtaining affordable housing in rural areas, perhaps having a smaller plot near ageing parents. Any community dependent on grants for sanitary infrastructure will not be economically sustainable.
11. Yes - as long as the boundaries of the UCB are extended to encompass existing smaller parcels.
12. At lease. I suggest 5 acre lots.

Policy Options for Community Sewer in Area A

Policy Option: Continue to support community sewer within the UCB.

1. Continued sewer development in the Cedar UCB may be beneficial to the community, but is it necessary for all since they have the NCID water system? New development in Cassidy may have to rely on alternate sewage treatment to allow for increased density.
2. Do not support overly expensive expansion of community sewer into the residential subdivisions unless there is a defined need to rectify a significant number of failed systems .
3. Yes.
4. No extension of service should be considered.
5. Yes I support this option.
6. Yes.
7. Yes – initiate advance planning for the location of alternative sewer services in high density areas only. Users include all residents and everyone should pay something, especially for the services provided in the village centers.
8. I can support this option.
9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. Yes. Also, Cassidy should be considered for inclusion into the Restricted Community Sewer Service Area. All those septic tanks above the aquifer probably is not sustainable.
12. Has merit.

Policy Options for Community Sewer in Area A

Please use this space to provide any additional ideas, comments or concerns you have with respect to community sewer in Electoral Area 'A'.

1. Sewage treatment is an expensive proposition. The question is: Does the current system of septic tanks and tile fields pose a threat to the health of the aquifer and thus to public health? Have any studies been done? Most of these systems have been around for decades. Can alternate systems be cost efficient and allow for higher densities within the UCB?
2. Education, it's ground water protection, phase out the use of harsh chemical cleaners and bleach, end the use chemical's that end in '-cide', pesticide, herbicide, insecticide etc.
3. Again development appears to insinuate itself with this process. A object to the info collected for the Official Community Plan going to one draft only. The process is incomplete and there is so much more critical information to be considered in developing an Official Community Plan that suits rapidly changing times that we are told be reputable scientists are heading to the need to protect our environment to slow down and mitigate the damage we are creating and is growing upon us, note climate change, increasing cost of food, loss of agricultural land and farmers, loss of fisheries, etc. The current recession is a wakeup call that things may not continue as we are accustomed.