

# STAFF REPORT

TO: E.C. SWABEY, GENERAL MANAGER, DSD

FROM: A. TUCKER, ACTING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, DSD

RE: OCP 10-YEAR REVIEW PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

---

## STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Council, in consideration of *Local Government Act* requirements, including section 879:

1. endorse the continued consultation activities, including public consultation workshop sessions planned for early 2007; and
2. having specifically considered whether other persons, organizations and authorities should be consulted, direct staff to continue to proceed as it has done to date.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As endorsed by Council at their regular meeting of 2006-MAR-18, a review of the City of Nanaimo "OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW 1996 NO. 6000" (Plan Nanaimo) has been undertaken. As per Section 879 of the *Local Government Act*, the Council of the City of Nanaimo must ensure that one or more opportunities are provided for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities it considers will be affected by the review of the official community plan. Staff is currently proceeding with an extensive public consultation that, to date, has included:

- seven backgrounders have been published in the local newspaper;
- a community consultation conference was held 2006-NOV-18 at Malaspina University-College;
- a series of three open houses were held to provide additional opportunities for input into the OCP review process;
- numerous articles have been published in local newspapers and interviews undertaken with Shaw Cable to discuss the OCP amendment applications submitted as of 2006-NOV-01; and
- correspondence sent to numerous outside agencies and interest groups advising of the OCP review.

Staff are now seeking Council's approval to proceed with the consultation process, including a series of workshops to present and discuss those issues which generated the most discussion during the first stage of the public consultation process, and to endorse a consultation strategy for communicating with those persons, organizations and authorities Council considers may be affected by the OCP review.

## BACKGROUND:

At their regular meeting of 2006-MAR-18, Council received from Staff, and endorsed, the Official Community Plan (OCP) 10-Year Review process. As part of this process, a series of public consultation initiatives were proposed to involve the community, gain public input, and provide for public education. As per Section 879 of the *Local Government Act*, the Council of the City of Nanaimo must ensure that one or more opportunities are provided for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities it considers will be affected by the review of the official community plan. To date, Staff have undertaken the following consultation initiatives, as outlined below.

### *Community Consultation Conference*

A community consultation conference was held at Malaspina University-College on 2006-NOV-18. The conference was well attended by approximately 160 community participants. Also present were representatives from the Regional District of Nanaimo, District Municipality of Lantzville, Nanaimo City Council, the Plan Nanaimo Advisory Commission and the consultant team bringing total attendance to over 200 participants.

The conference began with four speakers during the morning session, speaking on demographics, social planning, urban design and smart growth. Presenters included Lance Berelowitz, Cheeying Ho, Andrew Ramlo, and Mabel Jean Rawlins-Brannan. The afternoon session involved a series of workshops designed to gain input from the participants on the key issues surrounding the goals within the OCP and other pertinent social issues.

A summary of the proceedings, as prepared by the City's consultant, is attached as Schedule A, and a detailed listing of all comments received from the conference flipcharts is attached as Schedule B.

### *Newspaper Publications - Backgrounders*

To engage community interest and provide a public education component leading into the community consultation conference, a series of backgrounders were published in the Nanaimo News Bulletin. These backgrounders included an introduction to the conference, a summary of each of the goals contained within the OCP, and subsequently provided a summary of comments received at the conference (see Schedule C).

In addition, numerous articles have appeared in the local newspapers providing extensive coverage on the various OCP amendment applications received for the 2006-NOV-01 round. Staff has also been involved with Shaw Cable interviews

### *Open Houses*

Following the 2006-NOV-18 community consultation conference, a series of three open houses were held throughout the community to provide additional opportunities for residents to provide input into the OCP 10-year review. Attendance at each of the three open houses was as follows:

2006-NOV-23	Dover Bay Secondary School	Approximately 20 people attended.
2006-NOV-29	Beban Park Social Centre	One person attended. Attendance was limited due to severe winter weather.
2006-DEC-03	John Barsby Community School	Approximately 20 people attended.

### *Upcoming Workshops*

In response to input received at the community conference and the open houses, a series of workshops will be held, beginning early 2007, to provide additional information on those issues which appeared to be at the forefront within the community. It is anticipated these workshops will focus on items including:

- the urban containment boundary (UCB);
- growth centres and densification;
- affordable housing; and
- public transit and trailways.

*Other*

To date, Staff has initiated contact with a number of external agencies and interest groups to advise of the OCP 10-year review.

- Regional District of Nanaimo
- District Municipality of Lantzville
- School District No. 68
- Vancouver Island Health Authority
- Ministry of Environment
- Ministry of Transportation
- Agricultural Land Commission
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Nanaimo Port Authority
- Snuneymuxw First Nation
- Malaspina University-College

Consultation can also be pursued with other persons, organizations and authorities, including, for example other agencies of the Provincial and federal governments. As section 879 of the *Local Government Act* requires Council to specifically consider the “persons, organizations and authorities” to be consulted, Council are respectfully requested to identify others than those listed above, if necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

---

A. Tucker  
Acting Director, Planning & Development  
Development Services Department

*dj*  
Council: 2006-DEC-18  
G:\CommPlan\Admin\2006\2006 12 18 OCP Public Consultation.doc

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 1 of 17)**



## Section 1: Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report summarizes the proceedings of the Plan Nanaimo 10-Year Review Community Consultation Conference held 2006-NOV-18 at Malaspina University-College.

The Conference was designed as the kickoff event for the first phase of public consultation for the Official Community Plan (OCP) review. This report, prepared by Praxis Pacific<sup>1</sup>, will be used to aid in the preparation of a first draft of the revised OCP, in combination with input received from other City consultation activities during the fall of 2006 and early 2007 (see Section 1.3).

### 1.2 Overview of Consultation for the 10-Year Review

With the overall goal of “a community-created and community-owned OCP that reflects shared values for a desired future,” public consultation initiatives have been designed to support the four main phases of the OCP review.

	<b>Phase</b>	<b>Anticipated Timing<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>1</b>	Confirming OCP Goals / Identifying Key OCP Issues.	October – December 2006
<b>2</b>	Consultations on 1 <sup>st</sup> Draft Revised OCP	March 2007
<b>3</b>	Consultations on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Revised OCP	May – June 2007
<b>4</b>	Final Public Review ( <i>Public Hearing</i> )	Fall 2007

### 1.3 Consultation Principles

Public participation related to the OCP Review is based on the following principles:

- ◆ Utilize multiple communication methods to generate awareness and momentum for the review process throughout the community;
- ◆ Ensure the consultation program supports the objectives of each phase of the OCP review in a logical, sequential manner;
- ◆ Elicit input from a broad range of stakeholders by utilizing key questions for each phase and providing multiple means for the community to participate;
- ◆ Provide transparency, clarity and cohesion by reporting back at key milestones, thereby demonstrating how input from one phase is integrated into the next;
- ◆ Demonstrate responsiveness by adapting activities to meet the evolving needs and interests of the client and community participants; and
- ◆ Utilize facilitation methods to ensure participants retain ownership of the OCP process and its outcome.

<sup>1</sup> Praxis Pacific is the public consultation subconsultant to UMA Engineering, the firm engaged by the City of Nanaimo to lead the OCP review.

<sup>2</sup> Revised timing



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 2 of 17)**

*Praxis*

#### **1.4 Other Phase 1 Consultation Activities**

Based on recommendations from the Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee (PNAC) to provide additional opportunities for residents to participate in the OCP review process, the City hosted three open houses, one each in South, Central and North Nanaimo:

- ◆ 2006-NOV-23 at Dover Bay Secondary School
- ◆ 2006-NOV-29 at Beban Park Lounge
- ◆ 2006-DEC-05 at John Barsby Community School

In each case, advertising for the conference and open houses encouraged residents to obtain information and submit comments online through the City's web site, or by writing or calling the Community Planning Department.

In addition to the above-noted open houses, an environmental forum was also hosted by the City on 2006-NOV-15, focussing on what steps the City has taken to protect and enhance the environment, and receiving input on how the community views those steps and any additional work that still needs to be done.

A workshop was also held for representatives of the City of Nanaimo and the Regional District of Nanaimo to discuss the regional growth strategy

While this report focuses specifically on citizen feedback from the 2006-NOV-18 conference, all comments received will be considered for the revised OCP. Updates on citizen participation will be provided throughout the process and a comprehensive final consultation report delivered at the conclusion of Phase 3.

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 3 of 17)**

*Praxis*

## **Section 2: Conference Description**

### **2.1 Promotion and Advertising**

The City encouraged participation in the 2006-NOV-18 Conference through extensive advertising and promotion.

- ◆ Full-page ads ran the weeks of October 16, 23, 30 and November 6 and 13 in the Nanaimo News Bulletin, providing information on the Conference and OCP review process; each ad also provided information to stimulate dialogue on the relevant OCP goals and issues, including
  1. Building Complete, Viable Communities
  2. Protecting the Environment
  3. Managing Urban Growth
  4. Improving Mobility and Servicing Efficiency
  5. Demographics and Housing Needs
- ◆ A subsequent backgrounder was also published in the 2006-NOV-30 edition of the News Bulletin, providing a synopsis of comments received from participants at the conference.

### **2.2 Attendance**

The Conference attracted participation from approximately 160 residents from throughout Nanaimo, and also included representation from Nanaimo councillors and staff, members of PNAC, RDN directors, and the mayor and councillors from Lantzville, for a total of approximately 200 participants. All age ranges were well represented, ranging from adult and youth (largely Malaspina University-College students) through to senior citizens.

### **2.3 Design**

The four primary objectives of the conference were to:

- a. Raise awareness of planning trends and important issues with respect to managing municipal growth and land use;
- b. Assess how well people believe the City has done in meeting Plan Nanaimo OCP goals thus far (successes and shortcomings);
- c. Identify key OCP issues;
- d. Confirm which Plan Nanaimo goals (existing and/or new) should be carried forward through the next 25 years.

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 4 of 17)**

### MORNING PLENARY

The first objective, to raise awareness, was the focus of the morning plenary session held in the Malaspina Theatre. Acting City of Nanaimo Mayor Merv Unger, and Dr. Ellen White and Geraldine Manson (on behalf of Snuneymuxw First Nation), opened the conference and Councillor Bill Holdom provided context for the OCP review and stressed the importance of citizen involvement. Four guest speakers presented on the following topics:

- ◆ *Andrew Ramlo of Urban Futures* brought to life the reality of anticipated demographic shifts for the City of Nanaimo and associated changes in demand for various forms of housing, noting that a particularly important objective for Nanaimo will be to provide a range of housing options for an increasingly active and healthy seniors population.
- ◆ *Cheeying Ho of Smart Growth BC* explained how more compact, mixed-use development patterns in Nanaimo will contribute to the viability of quality public transportation and a higher overall quality of life for local residents.
- ◆ *Mabel-Jean Rawlins-Brannan of the Victoria Community Council* challenged the City of Nanaimo to model best practices in order to meet vital social development goals, including the generation of quality employment and a range of affordable, quality housing options.
- ◆ *Lance Berelowitz of Urban Forum Associates* used a number of relevant projects in Nanaimo and elsewhere to demonstrate how many of the building blocks of effective urban design are often waiting to be uncovered in a city's existing infrastructure.

Following the presentations, the speakers convened as a panel and audience members posed questions and issues in a moderated discussion.

### AFTERNOON WORKSHOPS

The afternoon focused on meeting the other three objectives through two one-hour participatory workshops. **Workshop A** generated discussion related to Goals 1 and 3 of Plan Nanaimo (*Building Complete, Viable Communities and Managing Growth*). **Workshop B** focused on Goals 2 and 4 (*Protecting the Environment and Improving Mobility and Servicing*). Participants were also asked to comment on Goal 5 (*Ongoing Planning and Community Involvement*) and social issues within the context of discussions in both workshops. Each participant had the opportunity to attend both workshops.

Each breakout group was assigned a facilitator from the City of Nanaimo or UMA consulting team and provided with worksheets and large-scale maps: (OCP mapping for both workshops, a Growth Centres and the Urban Containment Boundary map for Workshop A; and a trailways, parks and green space map for Workshop B. The facilitator gave a brief introduction to the topic then asked participants to use their



**Schedule A**  
**Summary of Conference Proceedings**  
**(Page 5 of 17)**

The logo for Praxis, written in a green, cursive font with a horizontal line underneath.

worksheets as a tool to make notes for further discussion in response to a short set of open-ended questions:

- ◆ How well they perceive the City has done in meeting the various goals in the past 10 years - the successes and shortcomings;
- ◆ What they want to see emphasized, changed or added to the goals;
- ◆ What other issues Plan Nanaimo needs to address; and
- ◆ Whether the OCP should continue focusing on these goals.

Facilitated discussion was a major focus of each exercise, aiming for balanced participation and recording key points on flip charts. An additional four-page comment form was also distributed to participants for subsequent completion. This Comments Sheet has also been available at the Open Houses and on the City website.

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 6 of 17)**

The Praxis logo is written in a green, cursive font with a horizontal line underneath it.

### **3. Summary of Key Issues and Feedback**

#### **3.1 ANALYSIS METHOD**

UMA and Praxis Pacific has systematically reviewed and analyzed all input received from the workshops, including flip chart notes, participant worksheets, and comment forms. Flip chart notes were reviewed, coded, and sorted based on 'category'. Worksheets and comments forms were then reviewed to ensure all issues and ideas were captured as completely as possible.

This report uses some descriptors in an effort to capture the relative emphasis participants appeared to place on certain issues. However, it is important to emphasize that the workshop results are not quantifiable, and only a snapshot of public input received during Phase 1 consultations. The consultant/city team will also review and incorporate feedback received subsequent to the conference as work begins on the first draft revised OCP.

Key themes have been clustered under the most directly applicable goal, although they may have been raised in the context of discussion of another goal(s).

#### **3.2 FEEDBACK ON GOAL 1: Building Complete, Viable Communities**

As one participant commented, building complete, viable communities is "a goal in progress", but a majority of people said they are dissatisfied with progress made on achieving this goal in the past 10 years. They said numerous new single-family subdivisions are the key contributor to a sense that Nanaimo is "sprawling" and consuming valued green space instead of densifying into compact, mixed-use neighbourhoods. Some people said zoning appears to be inconsistent with the objectives and policies of Goal 1; in other cases, zoning amendments appear to respond to development interests rather than to the goals of the plan. There was also a perception that the City has failed to "follow its own caps of 15 storey building heights". Participants called on the City to strengthen its commitment to building complete, viable communities and focus strongly on Growth Centres as the hubs of future development.

Participants also indicated that some progress and successes have been achieved.



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 7 of 17)**

*Praxis*

### Successes

- ◆ There has been some densification
- ◆ Provision of commercial services
- ◆ Access to nature, walking trails and recreation facilities (enhancing neighbourhood liveability)
- ◆ Diversity of ages, cultures, uses, housing, jobs, gathering places
- ◆ No new malls have been built recently
- ◆ Longwood Station, Cameron Island, Wellington Village, the mixed use village at Departure Bay, mixed housing in Townsite area
- ◆ Public access and amenities along the waterfront
- ◆ New downtown development, with strong design elements and provision of parking
- ◆ Incentive policies for downtown development
- ◆ Servicing of growth areas
- ◆ Infill development at Bowen Road and Turner/Uplands
- ◆ Creation of Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan
- ◆ Excellent retail outlets
- ◆ Incentives for economic development and heritage preservation
- ◆ Creation of the City's Social Development Strategy

### Issues

#### Range of Services in Town Centres

Participants commented that while some Town Centres have ample retail and commercial services (especially in North Nanaimo), they generally fall short on other services, meaning that few are truly complete or sustainable. Residents must travel the length of Nanaimo – relying on their automobiles - to access the range of services they require such as parks, green space, recreation facilities, libraries, community and medical services, neighbourhood gathering places and dog parks. By contrast, other participants said that public facilities are fairly well distributed, but commercial and residential development is not. Several people said South Nanaimo needs more commercial and retail development. Woodgrove was cited as the Growth Centre where retail/commercial development has outpaced residential development.

#### Malls and Big Box Retail Development

Participants indicated that “big box” and “big mall” retail development has had a negative impact on the concept of mixed use neighbourhoods, leaving much of North Nanaimo without a sense of community or neighbourhood. People saw Town Centres as being currently focused on shopping malls; as such the Plan has not achieved targets for residential densities within these areas (Woodgrove was given as the prime example).

A number of participants said that malls and big box retail run contrary to the OCP goal of discouraging automobile use and encouraging pedestrian/cycling use. They called for a future focus on smaller, pedestrian-oriented retail shopping/services with less paved area for automobile parking. However, at least one person cited the variety of shopping outlets as one of the city's assets and another said the “Main Street Design” concept for Town Centres and Neighbourhood Villages did not provide for adequate parking.

**Schedule A**  
**Summary of Conference Proceedings**  
**(Page 8 of 17)**

The logo for Praxis, featuring the word "Praxis" in a green, cursive font with a horizontal line underneath.**Densification – High Rises**

While participants recognize densification as a prevention for urban sprawl, there were differing views as to what type of density is acceptable. Many people were averse to high rises (defined variously as a building taller than mature trees, more than five to eight storeys high). Some did not want to see high rises in any part of Nanaimo; others thought they should not be permitted along the waterfront or any area where views might be compromised (e.g. put them at the “back of Nanaimo” or “outside the City”); still others said high rises should be confined to the downtown area. Finally, a number of people said high rises might be appropriate in certain Town Centres, if they fit the character and scale of the neighbourhood. Some participants emphasized that high rises need nearby green space and neighbourhood gathering places to foster a sense of community.

**Densification – Medium Rises**

Support for medium-rise (e.g. 3-4 storey) multi-family dwellings was much stronger, with many participants calling for a greater diversity of housing types in Town Centres and Neighbourhood Villages. This was important for neighbourhood inclusiveness for a variety of cultures, ages, income levels and family units.

**Densification – Mixed Use**

A fair amount of support was expressed for mixed-use, medium-rise buildings containing residential and commercial space, typically commercial space at ground level and residential above. Such spaces might also incorporate medical, dental and other services, with an emphasis on local enterprises and nearby space for community gardens. Heritage Mews was named as a success.

**Densification - Rehabilitation and Infilling**

Many people advocated for focusing on rehabilitating and infilling already developed portions of the city before expanding to build on vacant land. Suggestions included:

- ◆ Rezoning vacant land presently zoned for single family housing to multiple family housing and mixed use
- ◆ Identifying and designating redevelopment zones
- ◆ Providing incentives to developers to rehabilitate and infill (at least one person acknowledged that the cost to rehabilitate old buildings could be prohibitive)
- ◆ Support innovative approaches to development such as “transfer rights” and “performance zoning”

**Priority Town Centres**

Some participants felt the City should designate some Town Centres as priorities for development and redevelopment, ‘completing’ them before moving on to the next level of priorities. They said it would be better to have some complete, sustainable Town Centres than to have services and amenities dispersed inadequately among them all. Suggested areas included Downtown, Harewood, Old City and Woodgrove (with a focus on residential development at the latter).



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 9 of 17)**

**Unique Neighbourhoods**

Participant feedback indicated overall support for zoning that acknowledges, reflects and encourages diverse Town Centres with unique characters – some “suburban” with a focus on single family dwellings and large shopping facilities (e.g. in North Nanaimo), others more “people-scaled” with a pedestrian and small retail focus (e.g. in South Nanaimo and Downtown). Housing forms and design should be scaled to fit the character of the neighbourhood.

**Detailed Community Plans**

A number of people said Plan Nanaimo’s wording and policies regarding density are unclear, making it difficult for residents to understand the OCP’s implications for their specific neighbourhood and creating the potential for conflict and “surprises”. Public input to detailed neighbourhood plans, focused on local needs, was seen as a way to facilitate dialogue, clarity and greater certainty for residents about their future.

**Education**

A number of people suggested that the City needs to communicate with and educate residents about why increased density is necessary and desirable for a sustainable, liveable city. They said this might help people accept both higher density and mixed uses in their neighbourhoods. Another suggestion was to provide neighbourhoods with incentives to accept densification.

**Economic Development**

Participants articulated the need for Plan Nanaimo to encourage economic diversification, targeting industries with high-value, higher-paying jobs as a way to attract and retain all segments of the workforce, particularly young people.

**Other Potential Town Centres/Neighbourhood Villages**

Other areas of Nanaimo suggested as possible Growth Centres:

- ◆ Malaspina College as it plays a major role in the City (although at least one person suggested the campus be moved downtown to help spur downtown revitalization)
- ◆ Hospital area – with a focus on medical services
- ◆ Wellington Road
- ◆ Divers Lake
- ◆ Lagoon Way

**Integration of Social Issues into Plan Nanaimo**

A number of people called for the City to build social planning principles into the Plan Nanaimo OCP, make a specific goal of addressing social issues, and/or incorporate the City’s Social Development Strategy into the OCP.

**Affordable Housing**

The most frequently raised social issue was concern about a lack of affordable housing and rental housing in the City. Several people said it has reached a crisis level, particularly for low income wage earners, but increasingly for middle income earners as well. People saw a need for more rental units, communal housing, boarding houses and/or affordable supervised housing.

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 10 of 17)**

*Praxis*

Participants had a number of ideas to stimulate development of affordable housing:

- Allow more secondary suite development
- Provide incentives, such as tax breaks to developers, to provide some affordable housing as part of new developments (also seen as a way to increase density and mixed housing); or by allowing developers to build at a higher density if they make a contribution of money or land for social housing
- Create areas of mandatory “inclusive zoning” where developers must either provide a certain percentage of non-market housing (20% was suggested), allocate a proportion of their land to a community land trust, or contribute to a housing trust fund
- Create greater flexibility in rules concerning supervised housing
- Use Development Cost Charges and city funds to establish affordable housing
- Facilitate mixed income housing in all areas of the city to promote diverse neighbourhoods, inclusive of a variety of ages, cultures and mobility
- Encourage Malaspina University-College to build student dormitories

**Social Services**

Social services seen as needing improvement included:

- ◆ Shelters and support for the homeless
- ◆ Services for seniors and people with addictions, mental and/or physical health issues
- ◆ Subsidized transit and transportation for people in need (including those listed above and low income earners)
- ◆ Support for new parents and early childhood development
- ◆ Social services in areas outside the downtown area and perhaps in contrast to this, integrated social services centres

**Other Issues**

A few people raised concerns about safety, suggesting that the OCP and City policy needs to acknowledge and facilitate action on community security, and at least one called on the City to consult on and establish a policy concerning casinos in Nanaimo

**3.3 FEEDBACK ON GOAL 3: Managing Growth**

Growth issues were discussed extensively in the context of building complete, viable communities. Additional issues raised relative to Goal 3 were the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB), industrial land use, and preserving agricultural lands.

**Urban Containment Boundary**

The UCB was seen as a fundamental tool for managing growth and guiding development in Nanaimo. Most participants did not want to see changes or exceptions; a few said that exceptions might be considered under the following circumstances:

- ◆ if the negative impacts of extending the UCB are offset by equal or better mitigation elsewhere in the city
- ◆ if the exceptions are viable and extra servicing costs are picked up by the developer
- ◆ if all applications for exception are reviewed within the context of one another.



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 11 of 17)**



**Industrial Use**

Several participants commented on industrial land use as follows:

- ◆ industry should not be permitted to locate next to residential development
- ◆ industrial uses should be concentrated in appropriate zones – the City should encourage and/or provide incentives for fuel companies to move their bulk fuel storage from downtown to Duke Point

**Preserving Agricultural Lands**

A number of people said the UCB is key to protecting agricultural lands from development. This was linked to the issue of food security, with several people calling for Plan Nanaimo to incorporate a food policy that supports a self-sustaining agricultural economy through, for example, community gardens, provision of space for a farmers' market, and possibly a central depot for storing and sorting local food products. The depot might also be used to provide employment and teach life skills to disadvantaged residents.

**3.4 FEEDBACK ON GOAL 2: Protecting the Environment**

Nanaimo residents clearly treasure the natural beauty and assets within and around their city. Conference participants spoke passionately and extensively about the vital importance of protecting those assets now and for future generations. Up to half indicated they thought the City has done a reasonable job, or better, of meeting this goal by acquiring and protecting parks and green spaces, providing trailways, expanding recycling and protecting waterways. Examples of successes were provided.

**Successes**

- Foremost, the City's actions in acquiring parkland – it was noted that the per capita park area in Nanaimo exceeds the BC average
- Offsetting impacts from traditional development to at least some extent
- Stream protection and restoration
- The Waterfront/Harbour Walkway
- Maintaining good accesses to beaches
- Bylaws to protect watercourses, including riparian setbacks
- Expansion of recycling, curbside pickup and composting programs (elaborated upon under Goal 4)
- Environmentally Sensitive Area guidelines and protection
- Public education on aquatic-related issues
- Steep slope regulations
- Trailways
- Tree bylaw
- Preservation of urban forests such as the Morrell Nature Sanctuary, Beban and Bowen Parks
- Preservation of Buttertubs Marsh, Neck Point Park and Pipers Lagoon
- Sewage treatment and stormwater management
- New technology incorporated into construction of the conference centre
- Wetlands protection at Sunshine Ridge and Rockwood, innovations at Longwood



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 12 of 17)**

- The ALR
- Downtown densification
- No road in Linley Valley

### **Issues**

Some people found progress on achieving Goal 3 unsatisfactory, citing loss of green space to urban sprawl, an increase in automobile- rather than pedestrian-based development, paved pathways in natural areas, and other concerns. Two or three people said that credit for environmental protection (such as Neck Point) is due not to the City's efforts, but to those of community groups.

### **Parks**

Nanaimo residents love their parks! Participants said the City needs to protect and expand parkland for community use, especially as development pressures increase. They made various suggestions for additions/improvements:

- ◆ Increase parks from 5% of Nanaimo's total land area
- ◆ Provide more neighbourhood parks, a better distribution of parks throughout the city, and additional waterfront park space with connections to trailways
- ◆ Locate docks on water, not taking up valuable land shore
- ◆ Assure public access to the waterfront in general
- ◆ Provide park amenities for people who are mobility impaired
- ◆ Require that every new subdivision development include park space and tree plantings
- ◆ Provide recycling bins in city parks
- ◆ Improve park cleanup, maintenance and security
- ◆ Expand Cottle Lake Park to take in the entire Linley Valley
- ◆ Purchase land at Mount Benson to protect it from logging
- ◆ Negotiate with SFN to make Inucan land a park
- ◆ Improve access to Newcastle Island – possibly with a bridge

### **Wildlife Habitat and Ecologically Sensitive Areas**

Some people drew a clear distinction between people-oriented parks and comparatively undisturbed undeveloped open space for wildlife habitat. These spaces, they said, should be free of pedestrian/cycling trails, be connected with appropriate wildlife corridors, and assure wildlife access to the waterfront. Buffers should be established around ecologically sensitive areas and no development should be allowed in these areas at all.

### **Environmental Planning and Monitoring**

A number of people called for a more comprehensive, ecosystem-wide approach to environmental planning involving the City, the Regional District of Nanaimo and other agencies. They advocated for a comprehensive inventory of environmental areas, development of key indicators and performance targets for streams and the Nanaimo River Estuary, frequent monitoring, and an annual report out to the public. Additionally, several people said that the City should emphasize environment custodianship in all policy development, assuring integration of environmental planning with engineering and general planning. Some felt that engineering standards (e.g. impervious surfaces for city

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 13 of 17)**

*Praxis*

roads and swales) can conflict with environmental objectives (reducing stormwater runoff). One person expressed a contrary opinion – saying there was too much focus in the OCP on the environment relative to economic and social/cultural development.

**Green Building Initiatives**

Participants said Plan Nanaimo should encourage and provide incentives for green building initiatives such as low water consumption devices, alternative energy sources, geothermal heat pumps, composting toilets, grey water, and sustainable development plans. Some people suggested that LEED standards be adopted in the Plan.

**Trees**

People expressed concerns about trees being removed for new development, and also from buffer zones. They called for increased commitment to tree retention and planting of street trees, including food trees (fruit and nut) that could support food self-sufficiency. At least one participant recommended development of a comprehensive, long-range urban forest plan.

**Watercourses**

Like parks, wildlife habitat and trees, participants said care must be taken to protect Nanaimo's watercourses. They said policies and bylaws need to assure pesticide- and herbicide-free buffer zones around watercourses. One person criticized the City for filling in the stream ("not a ditch") at Randle Road and wondered if the fill could be removed

**Invasive Species**

Several people expressed concern about invasive species growing in ravines and buffer areas, and encouraged planting of indigenous plants in landscaping, riparian areas and street gardens.

**Public Education**

Public education was seen to be of continuing importance in efforts to protect the environment. Participants said the City needs to communicate to the public what it is doing to protect the environment, the costs of doing so and implications of not doing so. The public needs to be educated about environmental issues and sustainable behaviours. Specific suggestions included painting fish symbols at storm drain locations and facilitating semi-annual community cleanups

**Global Warming**

Several people said that given what is known about climate change, such as potential impacts to flood plains, Plan Nanaimo should address a long-term (e.g. 100 year) horizon in its policies.

**Other Issues**

Other issues participants raised included protection of the Nanaimo River Estuary (log storage was specifically noted), concern about noise and light pollution, and protection of public viewsapes.



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 14 of 17)**

### **3.5 FEEDBACK ON GOAL 4: Improving Servicing and Mobility**

Participants had much to say about objectives and policies related to Goal 4. Trailways, commuter bike routes and recycling received numerous kudos, and several other successes were noted as well.

#### **Successes**

- ◆ Trailways
- ◆ Commuter bike routes
- ◆ Bike carriers on buses
- ◆ Curbside recycling
- ◆ Nanaimo Parkway diverting traffic away from the city core
- ◆ Esquimalt and Nanaimo Rail walk
- ◆ Provision of basic municipal services in the north
- ◆ Good north-south transportation
- ◆ Recreation Centres
- ◆ Second swimming pool on Third Street
- ◆ Selby Street improvements
- ◆ Air service to the mainland

#### **Issues**

##### **Public Transit**

City transit elicited much discussion. Generally, people see public transit as a necessary alternative to the automobile but find too many barriers to using it themselves:

- ◆ Trips take too long and in some cases, require multiple transfers
- ◆ Residential densities in neighbourhoods are too low to support viable transit services
- ◆ Connections to downtown are poor, despite recent improvements

People had a number of suggestions for improving the viability, attractiveness, and service levels of the transit system:

- ◆ Focus density along major arterials to support transit viability
- ◆ Use smaller buses on routes with lowest ridership; combine with increased frequency
- ◆ Provide better coordination of transit service and ferry arrivals/departures
- ◆ Provide more covered and attractive shelters (covered especially needed for mobility-restricted citizens in chairs)
- ◆ Provide service to Duke Point and improved links to Nanaimo hospital
- ◆ Provide enhanced service training to drivers so they are more helpful to customers
- ◆ Direct more tax dollars or institute a transit levy on gasoline purchases to subsidize transit
- ◆ Provide reduced transit rates for students

##### **Alternatives to the Automobile**

Participants identified the need for Plan Nanaimo to continue encouraging and facilitating alternative forms of transportation, including public transit, cycling and walking. The viability of these alternatives was closely linked to increased density, well-serviced and pedestrian-oriented neighbourhood centres, and a well integrated system of trails and

**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 15 of 17)**

*Praxis*

sidewalks. Several skateboarders encouraged the City to lift restrictions for skateboarding along the downtown waterfront walkway, citing skateboarding as a legitimate form of commuting.

#### **Trailways**

Numerous participants were frequent and appreciative users of trailways and there was substantial support for extending the trail network throughout the community. People suggested:

- ◆ Better connections between trails to provide continuous cycling and walking routes
- ◆ Improved cycling safety on commuter routes (i.e. design road widths to accommodate safe bike use - Bowen Road, Old Island Highway and Hammond Bay Road were named as examples of roadways too narrow for safe cycling)
- ◆ Leave most trailways unpaved (there was not unanimity on this point)
- ◆ Delineate lanes for bikes and skateboards on heavily used trails
- ◆ Increase bike parking throughout the city and at new development

#### **Infrastructure**

Several participants suggested that the City should not pay to extend municipal services beyond the Urban Containment Boundary until all presently-developed areas are fully serviced with water, sewer, sidewalks and garbage collection. Some said that developers should pay the cost to service new developments.

#### *Sidewalks*

A connected system of safe sidewalks was seen as an important element in encouraging people to walk rather than drive to and from destinations, and to walk for exercise. But participants noted some barriers such as: sidewalk deterioration (compromising safety); incomplete sidewalk systems (especially in older areas and in Growth Centres); sidewalks too close to busy roadways (a "strip of green" would help separate the two); and generally poorer sidewalks in South Nanaimo. Another suggestion for encouraging walking was provision of covered walkways and/or awnings in shopping areas and automobile-free pedestrian malls.

#### *Roadways*

Safety of Nanaimo roadways was raised as an issue. Some people said design standards for road alignment and slope should be reviewed with an eye to improving safety; others noted issues with the Nanaimo Parkway - insufficient exits and accesses and significant pooling of water.

#### *Parking*

Several individuals said the City's requirements for provision of parking spaces at developments are too high, resulting in an excess of paved space. Parking spaces use up valuable land, increase stormwater runoff surfaces and facilitate automobile use. It was suggested that the parking space requirement be lowered, and/or underground and under building parking encouraged. Additionally, some people said the City should discourage parking in the downtown area.



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 16 of 17)**

*Praxis*

**Overall Transportation Planning**

Several people said the City should develop an overall transportation plan set within the contexts of the region and the Growth Centres as transportation hubs. The plan should be integrated into the OCP, cover a 25 year horizon, and provide for:

- ◆ Transportation for an aging population
- ◆ Improved connections along Nanaimo's east-west axis
- ◆ High Occupancy Vehicle lanes on major corridors
- ◆ Development of a north-south light rail line

**Stormwater**

Stormwater quality and increasing volumes of stormwater runoff into receiving waters was of concern to a number of participants. The need was identified for an integrated stormwater management plan rather than "piecemeal" plans for managing stormwater in individual developments. Various thoughts on this issue included:

- ◆ The city has seen too great an increase in non-permeable paved surfaces (roadways and parking areas) - implement permeable surfaces so stormwater can percolate back into the ground
- ◆ Emphasize swales to collect stormwater
- ◆ Use polished stormwater to enhance creek flows
- ◆ Discourage or disallow development on high ground, where erosion is an issue

**Solid Waste**

Participants were happy with the City's recycling and composting programs, but said these programs should be expanded to include:

- ◆ Curbside pick up for glass, compost and biodegradables
- ◆ Recycling of foam packaging
- ◆ More recycling bins throughout the city (Woodgrove was specifically mentioned)
- ◆ Monthly yard waste pick-up (use the waste for trail cover)
- ◆ Blue boxes (more efficient than blue bags)
- ◆ Planning now for an alternative to the existing landfill
- ◆ A target of zero waste

**Water**

Participants said proactive steps need to be taken to ensure Nanaimo residents have an adequate supply of safe, clean water for the future, including:

- ◆ Ensuring no spraying of pesticides or herbicides in Nanaimo's watershed (the City should consider acquiring land to protect the watershed if necessary)
- ◆ Ensuring that groundwater locations are identified and protected prior to development
- ◆ Promoting water conservation by encouraging developers and citizens to landscape with drought resistant trees, shrubs and plants

**Other Issues**

Other servicing and mobility issues participants raised included:

- ◆ Concern about air pollution – need to preserve clean air
- ◆ Departure Bay ferry terminal – move the terminal to Duke Point or at least take a stand against any expansion or major traffic increase (e.g. no superferries)



**Schedule A  
Summary of Conference Proceedings  
(Page 17 of 17)**

*Praxis*

- ◆ Jingle Pot Marsh – the flood control berm is inadequate; the recent flooding there points to the need for site-specific, adaptive design; also, relocate the TransCanada trail so it runs around the perimeter of, not through the marsh
- ◆ Rehabilitate deteriorating combined sewers and storm sewers
- ◆ Move to tertiary sewage treatment
- ◆ Upgrade the CPR terminal
- ◆ Provide more facilities where children can recreate

### **3.6 FEEDBACK ON GOAL 5: Ongoing Planning and Community Involvement**

Overall, conference participants expressed the view that the City needs to do more toward fulfilling this goal. Specifically, they said:

- ◆ Public consultation needs to be more inclusive; more information sessions, task forces and media involvement in soliciting public input were suggested
- ◆ The City needs to do a better job of communicating what Plan Nanaimo says and what it is doing to meet Plan Nanaimo goals
- ◆ Progress toward achievement of Plan Nanaimo goals should be monitored continually and brought forward for public review every two years
- ◆ The 6-month OCP amendment review process should be retained and more community input promoted
- ◆ The City should encourage greater and community involvement and develop additional, detailed Neighbourhood Plans in consultation with local residents; neighbourhood associations should play a greater part in rezoning processes
- ◆ The City should support and consult more with community and environmental groups
- ◆ A process should be implemented to engage and partner with First Nations
- ◆ The Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee should champion social and environmental issues; Council should stand firm on Plan Nanaimo goals

**Schedule B  
Summary of Conference Remarks  
(Page 1 of 19)**



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE  
2006-NOV-18  
Summary of Comments**

**Workshop A – Part A (Building Complete, Viable Communities)**

- Public consultation process could be more inclusive.
- Negative impact of “big box” on mixed use neighbourhood concept.
- Encourage development in the south end.
- Successes include green space and recreational facilities.
- Update City website to include sections for each neighbourhood association.
- Focus more on affordable housing.
- Should focus on local needs, not homogeneous communications.
- Transportation infrastructure:
  - Consolidate ferry services at Duke Point.
  - Need appropriate sized buses (cost vs benefit); look at peak load issues.
- Move toward medium-density (3-4 storeys).
- Densify existing residential infrastructure.
- Stimulate purpose-built rental developments (rental cost an issue).
- Incentives to provide affordable housing (eg. no property tax).
- Supervised affordable housing; communal housing.
- More flexible rules relating to (supervised) affordable housing.
- Neighbourhood plans are key; active community participation.**
- How to speed up the neighbourhood plan process.
- Lack of thorough understanding of Plan Nanaimo details.
- Average citizen has trouble translating zoning into what the street looks like.
- Cynicism regarding the input process.
- Input into neighbourhood plans from those outside that area is lacking.
- Nodes are better than big box, but lack of residential at mall centres.
- Pedestrian movement indicator of success.
- Affordable Housing
  - Boarding houses.
  - UCB not built out.
  - Secondary suites – showing up in new development.
- Connecting health to housing in nodes and public transit – go together.
- Property tax funding for affordable units.
- Integration of RDN transit and the City.
- Has improved since the 1970s.
- Problems with town centres – not enough residential (ie. big box zones).
- Good access to nature / facilities.
- Too much need to drive everywhere.
- Lower density means more interaction with local areas.
- Variety of densities in a variety of areas.
- Town centres should be hubs of future development.
- Economic development is key to addressing social issues (laizzes faire economies).
- Attract high value jobs to Nanaimo.
- Focus specific areas on particular business (1/2 table agreed, 1/2 did not)
- Plan execution – needs action, awareness.
- Development pressures – status quo (easy and cheap).
- Focus on developer interest (PNAC) – needs more issues championed (social, environmental).
- Too much left to developer profit motive (so long green space!).
- Integrated planning is key – interrelated.
- High rise (ie. Pacifica) – investors more frequent (not locals invested in community); poverty.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 2 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

***Workshop A – Part A (Building Complete, Viable Communities) - continued***

- Walking trail network a success.
- Insight (Hawthorne) – density could have been higher?
- Longwood Station a success.
- Strong economic focus vital, but social issues not sufficiently captured.
- Continue with complete, viable communities.
- Bicycle paths near tracks – how to access?
- East-west connectivity a problem – “ghettoization” of communities.
- Safety to be better addressed.
- Housing/living for seniors’ community.
- Diversity of incomes, ages, cultures, uses, housing, jobs, gathering places.
- Public reporting from PNAC – more frequent!
- Increasing density and needs to be championed (cannot have transit with low density).
- Economic development needs to be linked to other issues (wages, quality employers, social).
- Social Issues that Plan Nanaimo should focus on:
  - Diversity
  - Integration
  - Education Options
  - NIMBYism often not informed on key issues!
  - More secondary suites.
  - Food security a growing issue – need education on this.
- Focus on building more diverse, complete, viable communities:
  - Provide services for all, with all basic neighbourhood essentials, dog parks as a “third place”; consideration of life cycle and quality of life (daily).
- Land use mix is lacking in many areas.
- Money leads to development.
- Plan Nanaimo is good, but where’s the action?
- Zoning needs to support OCP objectives / policies; there is a disconnect.
- “Available” land is steep slope land with higher development costs.
- Incorporate sustainable principles in OCP – not there.
- Cameron Island as a success – building blocks of neighbourhood are there – walkable.
- Longwood Station a success.
- Town centres are only town centres on paper.
- Insight residential development.
- What about employment?
- Need to integrate rather than segregate.
- Zoning needs to encourage mixed use.
- Need to define and encourage diverse town centre.
- Growth centres need developable land.
- Establishment of community groups a success.
- Good that City looks at whether or not development fits.
- Need to better communicate OCP development plans to citizens.
- Need to see the benefits of mixed use and density.
- Presentation methods need to be diverse to communicate OCP goals and building form.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 3 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

***Workshop A – Part A (Building Complete, Viable Communities) - continued***

- Need to understand the character of Nanaimo.
  - Sense of Community.
  - North Nanaimo is more urban (everything is there).
  - South/Downtown is people scale.
  - City does not encourage alternative mobility (skateboarding, etc).
- There is a communication gap.
- 90% single family dwellings, 10% multi-family dwellings.
- Goals and strategies for affordable housing:
  - Higher density.
  - Attitude against multi-family and single family dwelling focus / ownership.
  - City funds / DCCs to establish affordable housing units.
  - Support affordable housing.
  - Emphasize a variety of housing forms – a scale that fits the neighbourhood.
- More community involvement in planning process.
- Services availability to community – not just a building focus.
- Communication strategy – more diversity.
- Better outreach.
- City has done poorly in meeting Goal #1; need more community input – too much money driven.
- Waterfront is okay.
- Gap between plan policies and in the ground.
- San Francisco bowl development driven by demand market for high rise in downtown; RDN / City responsible for bowl – exclusivity downtown with high rise form.
- Density is okay, but not high rise.
- Build up of hospital area would allow for living and walking to work.
- Solution to affordable housing – reduce floor area of building.
- Fix up of areas – invest in rehabilitation.
- Residential and business combined (Heritage Mews)
- Think about moving part of campout downtown as means of revitalization.
- Homelessness downtown is an issue.
- Too few walking trails.
- Development vs community north end.
- No parks and walking trails
- Hillside development.
- Too much same.
- 30 minutes to go anywhere.
- North end has no neighbourhood villages.
- Social issues – work with groups; more coordination needed; hard to connect social issues / groups.
- Social issues get moved somewhere else as areas redevelop.
- Old buildings are not sound; costs to do anything are prohibitive.
- Town centres without “complete community” definition seems to be based on shopping malls, not on what makes a complete community (parks, recreation, libraries).
- No public facilities except downtown.
- All social agencies focused downtown; need to be encouraged in other areas.
- Affordable housing not adequate in OCP (look to Kelowna); definition for single family, multi-family, income based, subsidized, supportive housing.
- Spread out affordable housing.
- Need for mixed income housing within all areas (same for elderly, disabled).



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 4 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

***Workshop A – Part A (Building Complete, Viable Communities) - continued***

- 15-storey limit in OCP not respected.
- Land Capacity – is there capacity to accommodate 120,000 people.
- “Sister” areas of agriculture – encourage / promote businesses to buy within areas.
- Follow the “caps” already in place.
- What about density tradeoff for open space or other amenity (funds for social housing).
- Green space allocated due to needs to be significant and usable.
- Setback and green space needed for high rises; guidelines eroded resulting in lack of sense of community / security; need to be comfortable.
- Improvement in maintaining food supply.
- Parkway? It’s a highway!
- Livability of north end; big box continues to grow separate from residential; transportation to/from residential results in higher volumes and higher speeds (eg/ Turner); need to put residential within the big box area.
- Development has been random; needs to take into account transportation.
- UCB – keep as is with no changes.
- City is too removed from hinterland.
- Current livelihood based on future development rather than focusing on local resources.
- Incorporate multi-uses in existing residential.
- Use schools as community uses; more cooperation with school district provides opportunities for local craftsmen.
- Schools / community parks / neighbourhoods – livability increases (Saskatoon).
- Need parkland, shopping, recreation, education, etc.
- Encourage community gardens.
- Look at better use of existing facilities.
- Support commercial / residential mixes.
- Neighbourhood groups are important part of process.
- People are dispersed in the pattern that we live in and work in different areas.
- Need cultural / lifestyle shift; consumption of resources and ecological footprint.
- Focus on existing town centres.
- Complete town centres as communities – they are only shopping centres.
- Lagoon Way area – development might be possible.
- Positive – Wellington Neighbourhood Village
- Positive – project in village on Departure Bay (mixed use).
- Positive – Longwood project (mixed residential/commercial).
- Positive – Townsite is mix of residential uses.
- Negative – Loss of neighbourhood village on Hammond Bay.
- Negative – No residential at Woodgrove.
- Mainstreet design problematic – lack of parking on street.
- Cost of mixed use building is a negative; need higher density (3+ storeys) to make it work.
- Conflict between OCP policies and engineering standards.
- Reduce parking standards in town centres and neighbourhood villages.
- Potential to move town centre boundaries to include residential land with redevelopment potential.
- Recognize hospital area as major town centre with focus on medical use.
- Recognize college as a town centre as it plays a major role.
- Need for detailed town centre plans, as well as other areas (future study areas) – eg/ Wellington Road and Divers Lake area.
- Density should be sensitive to neighbourhood character (ie. heritage buildings).



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 5 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

**Workshop A – Part B (Managing Urban Growth)**

- No new malls – good.
- Downtown has been hurt; new development in the downtown is right direction.
- Unbalanced commercial and residential development, but balanced distribution of facilities.
- Need more even distribution of medical facilities.
- Servicing of growth areas has been good.
- Try to dispel the 'not in my neighbourhood' notion; need more public communication / education.
- UCB – work within its boundary; is a guide to development; tensions with respect to changing the UCB is an issue.
- Urban containment boundary and regional growth strategy have done well in containing growth within UCB; need to stick to it.
- Infill development is a success.
- Infill land may not be available – unwilling sellers, etc.
- On what basis do we need to change the UCB – need to view all applications in context of each other.
- Expansion of UCB could kill the nodal concept.
- Steep slope development.
- OCP density in villages – working is too vague with too many policies; solution is with neighbourhood plans, which should be inclusive of urban design.
- Exceptions to UCB possible if those exceptions are viable.
- Blend of density (downtown) and single family dwelling style in outer areas.
- Maybe density should happen in new, bigger developments outside of City.
- Autocentres are bad.
- No real big change in the last 10 years., especially regarding pedestrians.
- Encourage density without highrises.
- Where are the medium rise buildings?
- Put high rises at the back of the City?
- There is a disparity of opportunities for different areas.
- Need detail in town centres.
- How to balance developer's needs with the needs of the citizens.
- UCB could be breached if costs picked up by developers.
- Keep the UCB.
- Need in the OCP to target specific industries and encourage them to develop in Nanaimo.
- Green spaces can be more than parks – can be public spaces.
- Mom and pop operations in residential areas.
- Better road connectivity.
- RDN and Nanaimo City collaboration.
- More pubs with less parking.
- Population growth not exactly a challenge to date.
- Better at integrating public input.
- Have been overly focused on the north end (positive or negative?).
- Harewood needs attention – need to go to north for hardware.
- Too far down in the low-income, retail-driven road.
- Need to open up "industrial" form of uses and integrate.
- Value of "cottage" industries to economy means an increase in vitality and economic spinoffs.
- Champion the integration of uses rather than segregation.
- Banking in the north does not lead to walkability.
- "Third Places" – look at gathering places at the micro level.

**Schedule B  
Summary of Conference Remarks  
(Page 6 of 19)**



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE  
2006-NOV-18  
Summary of Comments**

***Workshop A – Part B (Managing Urban Growth) - continued***

- Need more neighbourhood essentials – building blocks of community.
- Desperate to get anything anywhere! – not just promotion, but thoughtful planning.
- Plan Nanaimo also needs to address
  - Principle of “do no harm.”
  - Dealing with the longer term.
  - Adaptive reuse.
  - Health facts and education.
  - Park/green zoning – too much left to development community.
- Are filling up land, but not directing growth quality / type.
- Downtown is an example of positive change – incentive policies.
- City to show best practices at work with key redevelopment properties.
- Take ideas from elsewhere on increasing redevelopment.
- Need political will and action.
- Back room deals means no trust in validity of the public process.
- Zoning is reactive to developer interests (look at inner harbour of Baltimore).
- OCP needs to better “frame” redevelopment zones, which can lead to action.
- Preserving waterfront – public access is vital!
- College – living options (affordability).
- College is a growth centre in reality, but not on paper.
- Education and awareness about safety, access, etc.
- Affordability is a larger issue.
- Security needs to be emphasized / supported by OCP and City.
- Low average income is a challenge.
- Council needs to listen to what is taking place.
- No credibility / weight to public process.
- Need continuous monitoring, not every 10 years.
- 3008 Hammond Bay Road – lots of opposition, but went ahead.
- Continuity and work with what’s already been done (less dusty reports, more communication of these ideas).
- Focus growth in downtown / Harewood / Old City.
- Development would deal with social issues.
- Retain the UCB.
- Affordable housing.
- Move away from urban sprawl.
- UCB not to be violated.
- Set a maximum population within UCB and review numbers periodically.
- Retail town centre concept and neighbourhood villages in OCP to manage growth and encourage transit down the spine.
- Need to revisit the casino issue and establish a city policy.
- Developments need to (new and redo) support affordable housing.
- MaU should supply dorms for students.
- Guessing that growth has been managed by developers; how to correct?
- Need to follow Plan.
- No effort to develop parks and green space / trails and other amenities; there are exceptions (railway, trail, waterfront, Linley Valley partially saved).
- Some of town centres have been connected.
- Too much focus on downtown convention centre.

**Schedule B  
Summary of Conference Remarks  
(Page 7 of 19)**



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE  
2006-NOV-18  
Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop A – Part B (Managing Urban Growth) - continued***

- Flexibility in plan is important.
- Density transfer – might be value in trading off / compensation for areas
- Have 80,000 population with zoning in place for 120,000.
- UCB has held, but should recognize pressure has only been in last half of decade.
- Growth has been managed, but so has message.
- Promises mad regarding servicing to other areas (back to 1975).
- UCB moved to City boundary; establish criteria for servicing, establish comprehensive development plans for areas coming in; maintain ALR.



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 8 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

**Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment)**

- Sprawl concerns.
- Important to maintain UCB.
- Open Space – concerns about trailways; should have fewer trails in parks.
- Good recycling program, but need more bins and greater accessibility to drop off.
  - Foam packaging needs to be accepted at all bins.
  - Wasteline newsletter works well.
- Connectivity of parks.
- Need more street trees and better street tree guidelines.
- Need greater use of indigenous plants – look at riparian area planting and street garden guidelines.
- Garbage collection in parks is not adequate.
- No recycling bins in parks.
- Public beach area needs to be cleaned.
- Areas need to be set aside for wildlife values – provide space for wildlife, not just for recreation.
- There should be a “conservation design” focus on development.
- Set aside open space without trails.
- Provide more of an ‘ecosystem’ focus on development.
- Provide buffers arounds ESAs.
- Protect Linley Valley park.
- Don't change the UCB.
- Trail security and maintenance concerns (ie. Bowen Park near Millstone).
- More attention to Mt. Benson and significant lands outside of Nanaimo.
- Waterfront walkway great.
- Secure park status in City (eg. Park zoning).
- Nanaimo estuary needs to be a priority for attention.
- Loss of trees / overdevelopment.
- Suffering from past impacts on environment; restoration needs to be enhanced.
- Hillside erosion concern.
- Improved access to Newcastle (bridge?).
- Extending trails / protecting ESAs / Steep Slope Zone.
- Air pollution.
- Negotiate with SFN to make Inucan land a park / greenspace; buy it from them.
- Traditional development has been damaging the environment.
- Parks have been doing a good job of somewhat offsetting this.
- Steep slope regulations are an improvement.
- City road standards are hampering some of these environmental protection measures.
- Economics and existing development rights hamper protection of the environment.
- Segregation of uses and lack of densification and mixed use are not helping us protect the environment.
- Existing policy is okay, but it has not adhered to guidelines in place; need to be more strictly adhered to (eg/ UCB).
- Policy flexibility is necessary, but same objectives (eg. UCB) should be required to show very clear necessity prior to amendment.
- Communication (what are we doing to protect the environment)!!
- More neighbourhood parks required.
- Emphasis on stormwater quality.
- Biocide infiltration into the environment (policy towards preventing).
- Biodegradable curbside pickup (policy toward implementing this).

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 9 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment) - continued***

- Park zoning (shortcoming).
- Protect the environment (eg/ 3<sup>rd</sup> St marsh – but provide public access).
- Identification and protection of significant environmental and cultural areas should be a key goal.
- Citizen involvement helped save Neck Point
- Streamways and wildlife corridors need to be protected.
- Riparian setbacks in place.
- Pesticides a concern.
- Sediment erosion a concern.
- Establish pesticide / chemical free zone around watercourses.
- Safety / habitat concerns for wildlife (eg/ deer).
- Limited transportation choices affecting air / water quality.
- Longwood – wetland innovations were good.
- Limit waste.
- Need more monitoring of Nanaimo estuary.
- Applecross tree removal – we need stronger bylaws.
- Industrial use / air quality concern (ie. hog fuel burning).
- Green building / green roof policy needed.
- Green building bylaw (to address the use of safe building materials).
- Encourage geothermal heat pumps.
- Composting toilets / greywater.
- Continue with expansion of trailways.
- Stronger policies for "pedestrian friendly".
- The new crosswalks are much better; keep installing these.
- Plant vegetation that could be useful (eg/ urban agriculture – fruit / nut trees for food).
- Park acquisition has been good.
- Stream restoration has been good.
- Public education has been good for aquatic related issues.
- Need to look at long term environmental health.
- Encourage less auto dependency.
- Actively pursue conservation areas.
- Provide for better distributed parkland throughout the City.
- Encourage greater than 5% (eg/ 10%) parkland acquisition.
- Need more paved, cycle friendly pathways.
- Provide for more bike lanes on streets.
- Provide for more connectivity between neighbourhoods.
- Utilize more frequent, smaller busses.
- Maintenance / protection of E&N railway needs to happen.
- Curbside pickup for glass.
- Monthly yard waste pickup to be utilized for trail cover, etc.
- Need blue boxes, not blue bags.
- Improve community cleanliness (eg/ semi-annual clean up of garbage – curbside pickup); provide for greater public education.
- Biweekly garbage pickup for greater efficiency.
- Composting program would be good (food waste).
- Encourage community gardens and food trees in landscaping.
- Kudos for wastewater treatment, stormwater management (pre-treatment, infiltration, etc).
- Allocation of park space is ahead of other municipalities, exceeds provincial average.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 10 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

***Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment) - continued***

- Not afraid to use new technologies – soil mixing at NNC, expanded pip stormwater detention pond; designed from both an aesthetic and fundamental perspective (mediates stormwater/impervious surface impacts).
- DCCs.
- Building / bare land strata tied to localized stormwater infiltration / treatment solutions; constrains development type relative to having municipality taking responsibility for retention ponds.
- May be conflicts between building code and ownership type, with desire to treat stormwater.
- Further opportunity to use polished stormwater for enhancing creek flows (rather than by directing by pipe into ocean)?
- “Sustainable development plans” not referenced in city planning – “sustainable community.”
- Perception of imbalance in focus on environment (too much) versus economy versus sociocultural.
- Environmental protection – better transparency regarding costs; consumer (housebuyer) not ready to pay the bill.
- “Build Green”.
- Plan Nanaimo not sufficient.
- Global warming.
- Rising sea levels but still building high rises.
- Rezoning occurs too quickly – need to look at whole picture.
- Buffer zones – trees end up coming down.
- Salmon streams – not enough attention to those.
- Why non-government organizations doing environmental protection (ie. Linley Valley, Mt. Benson).
- Too much influence / power from development.
- City should buy Mt. Benson.
- Watershed – we don’t own it (spraying).
- Need to institute monitoring system – monitor every year, every day.
- Further institution of green space into development all along waterfront.
- No park space for mobility impaired.
- Every development subdivision required to have reasonably sized park space.
- Useable green space; Citizen, family, senior, family – what is a reasonable size?
- Green burial (coffins from willow); do something new.
- Alternative energy resources (300 wind generators, tidal power) leads to jobs, industry, green, tourism.
- Geothermal – why not NCC?
- Greywater reuse
- Density and sprawl – does OCP have mechanisms to handle it?
- Increasing density means increasing greenspace.
- Problems with prezoned RS1 land.
- Zones of transition.
- Need more of waterfront parks (eg/ Neck Point, Pipers).
- Accessible, well maintained.
- Good access to beaches.
- Beautiful climate.
- Where is groundwater – need to know pre-development.
- Every development planting trees.
- Nicol Street – get trees.
- Docks – put them out on the water, not on shore.
- INCLUSIVE parks.
- Garbage problem on boulevards.



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 11 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment) - continued***

- Make parks sacrosanct.
- Cable car on Mt. Benson.
- Bridge to mainland – yes? No?
- Surtax for non-residents to be put to environment and social housing.
- Stop at six storeys OR no higher than trees.
- No waterfront towers.
- Enforce bylaws (eg/ Applecross).
- Bring back the beaches – restore the beaches.
- Walkway – ferry to downtown.
- No palm trees at any beaches.
- We need inventory of environmental areas – need to know what is there – needs to be comprehensive.
- Need continuous consultation.
- Amalgamate industrial areas to protect environment.
- Clear a space for a farmer's market (no \$ parking).
- Uplands (by Longwood Pub) – beautiful street, landscaping, clean.
- Sacred Greenspace.**
- Good start.
- Microscale solutions during development, eg:
  - High – City early implementation of watercourse bylaws; steep slope bylaw (Cottle Creek).
  - Mod – Recent changes to park policy, management and restoration of natural systems, ecovalue of parks.
  - Low – Strong resistance within corporate structure to urban design standards, specs regarding stormwater management.
- Tree Bylaw – good but needs to be expanded (mod) – more flexible and broader scope; enforcement an issue.**
- Strong determination to pave (ie. trails).
- Roads and traffic concerns.
- Climate change concerns (eg/ Malaspina College – alternative energy and fuel sources).
- Community education is a challenge.
- How do you encourage sustainable behaviour?
- Creation of the trail system
  - Well used.
  - Opportunity for improvement.
  - Trails match area they are in.
  - Consultation process – disconnect between process and implementation, between staff and community/environmental stewards thoughts.
  - Community groups feel disenfranchised.
  - Access to park facilities – important in building appreciation of these facilities.
- Engineering department is very resistant to environmental concerns.
- Lack of coordination between park initiatives.
- Future challenges – performance targets (water quality, for example streams, Nanaimo Estuary, environment); quantifiable (MOE); potential for coordination with regional government.
- Innovation – municipal government risk adverse, which hampers innovation; need for a shift to explore these no ideas (alternative design standards).
- Lack of encouragement for innovation (engineering); to implement alternative standards requires full buy-in (for new subdivisions).

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 12 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment) - continued***

- Decrease impervious areas, swales – requires flexibility and adaptability.
- MOU has a flaw related to CEAA application.
- Environmental Planner and Coordinator are good, but requires change in thought for rest of planning; knowledge succession an issue; lack of integration with planning (social, environmental and planning in general); need a community ombudsman.
- Plan process is not as inclusive as it can be.
- UCB – making and preserving green areas (Pipers Lagoon and Neck Point are examples of protecting green spaces).
- Trail walkway to waterfront.
- Trail – connectivity to waterfront.
- Need for expansion of trail system – accessibility; increase connectivity; north south bike path still exposed (need for a green barrier); not a commuting network (need better connectivity); good links to downtown / college.
- Trail / bike system doesn't adequately connect town centres.
- Need for linkages to major north south trail.
- Safety concerns (vulnerable user interaction with cars); topography challenges in providing facilities.
- Need to plan our community as an ecosystem, nested within various linked systems (shift in thinking required).
- Infill development.
- OCP can have internal references between topics to provide a more global perspective (ie. transit topic – linkages to other goals).
- Development guidelines from an environmental angle are not strong enough.
- Negative – poor tree retention.
- Negative – sprawl.
- Positive – garbage and curbside pickup good, but needs more rigorous disposal requirements.
- Positive - RS-7 steep slope zone.
- Shortcomings – ravines and buffer areas; invasive species; need better policy near Quilted Duck.
- Positive – Waterfront Harbour Walk.
- Negative – Waterfront highrise.
- UCB – little or no change is good; need to link to linkages beyond.
- Highrises can be supported provided they are properly placed.
- Retention ponds – need to encourage more use.
- Benefits of natural areas for recreation – integrated environmental planning (sustainability).
- Positive – successful composting program.
- Active lifestyles need natural areas.
- Positive – ALR is successful.
- Positive – big parks.
- Densification downtown.
- Park / natural area interconnectivity an issue.
- Focus on existing assets – ecological evaluation needed.
- Keep building on trail / park system.
- Need to allow for new ideas in development activities.
- Non-car transport needs more encouragement.
- Where has City been on preservation of Mt. Bension.
- Public viewsapes – mandate in plan for new developments.
- No sense of urgency with respect to environment.
- Need to mimic natural processes in city building (eg/ stormwater); stay close to natural cycles.
- Need to emphasize more then the bottom line.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
(Page 13 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop B – Part A (Protecting the Environment) - continued***

- Incentives for “green” development (eg/ take DCCs away, emphasize LEED standards instead).
- Rethink need to pave everything.
- Need for greater integration / communication of City goals/processes to development community.
- Empower neighbourhood associations to take on environmental issues (helps with labour costs).
- Create greater culture of citizenship.
- Do better job of why density is required – be clear on City support.
- Have done well in maintaining existing green space.
- Concern about loss of environment / trees related to developments (punishment does not deter illegal removal).
- Pollution in water system – what is being done to protect watershed; need to consider land acquisition if necessary to protect.
- Ecology of north Nanaimo is shortcoming (ie. Woodgrove).
- Is sewer system sustainable? Practice should be environmentally friendly.
- On site water detention needs to be encouraged.
- Need dedicated park zone.
- Bulk fuel storage on Stewart Avenue should be moved to Duke Point.
- Should have report card on environment every 1-2 years.
- Environment should be front and centre on all policy development in OCP update – a primary goal.
- Encourage LEED system for building construction.
- Provide “green” incentives.
- Alternative energy supply at home level.
- Public education which promotes environmental awareness.
- Use indicators / targets – express in policy wording.
- Regulations for Recycling – stronger regulations particularly for business (look at tax credit incentives).
- Each town centre should have recycling centre.
- Composting system could be better.



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 14 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

**Workshop B – Part B (Improving Servicing and Mobility)**

- Transit is impractical.
  - Trips take too long; can be an hour or more.
  - Bikes on busses are a good thing.
  - Not enough students taking bus.
  - Density is key to improving system.
  - Have different sizes of bus to cover different routes.
  - Raise levy/taxes to improve transit.
- Bowen and Old Island Highway does not feel safe to cycle on.
- More emphasis on swales / integrated stormwater plans to get stormwater back into the ground.
- Need a watershed focus instead of on single developments.
- Put recycling bins at Woodgrove.
- Provide opportunities to encourage alternative transit; hold 'celebraton' events (eg. bike to work week) to raise awareness and encourage more users.
- Air quality is an overall concern.
- Control zoning amendments for industrial use within the UCB (eg. Meredith/Boxwood area).
- Implementation on all aspects of the goal need to be clearer for the public to understand; how well are we doing?
- Progress needs to be presented to the public more frequently.
- Poor trail / transit (hilly, placement, dark).
- Bus takes too long – too many transfers.
- Ridership needs to increase if density goes up (transit improves).
- Prefer skateboarding for downtown because easier to become a pedestrian and don't have to look for bike lock-up.
- Free bus passes for students.
- Subsidize public transit.
- Bus should link to ferries more efficiently.
- Engineering standards too high for subdivisions (overcapacity of servicing).
- Parking requirement too high.
- Make public more aware of environmental issues.
- City should have full control of Nanaimo River upper watershed.
- Restrictions on cycling / skateboarding on downtown waterfront should be reconsidered.
- Hammond Bay Road too narrow; uncomfortable to ride bikes.
- Need lanes on trail to allow bikes and skateboards to travel with pedestrians.
- Too extreme in enforcement for skateboarders.
- Recreation Centre (Oliver Rd) success.
- Have seen more bike trails.
- There is a disconnect between routes.
- Commuter (bike) routes have been improved, but still need work.
- Bus service has improved, but downtown connections are poor.
- Rail corridor – will it be used as a commuter corridor?
- Connections to the corridor are poor.
- No support for expansion of Departure Bay ferry terminal.
- Support for Parkway overpasses needed.
- City and MOT – MOU for Parkway needs support.
- Need to look at water quality and long term supply.
- Current bylaws restrict certain modes of commuting (eg/ skateboarding) contrary to OCP goals.

**Schedule B  
Summary of Conference Remarks  
(Page 15 of 19)**



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE  
2006-NOV-18  
Summary of Comments**

***Workshop B – Part B (Improving Servicing and Mobility) - continued***

- Review building schemed at subdivision to ensure they are not contrary to OCP environmental goals (eg/ clothes lines).
- Pedestrian / bikeway interconnectivity needs to be addressed.
- Parking lot disincentives (per lot tax, maximum rather than minimum requirement for parking).
- Encourage underground and underbuilding parking.
- Engineering representation on PNAC.
- Engineering involvement needed early in OCP review.
- Look at alternative road standards.
- Mixed use reduces demand on infrastructure (eg/ roads).
- Improve road safety (eg/ alignment, slope, etc).
- Run smaller buses more frequently (more efficient).
- 'Ecological' filtration for stormwater treatment.
- Use permeable services for roadways.
- Utilize clustered development.
- Have compost pickup in conjunction with recycling.
- Use recycling 'bins', not plastic bags (longer lasting and more environmentally friendly).
- Establish a food policy – incorporate agriculture into developments, provides greater accessibility, and encourage a better farmer's market.
- Encourage water conservation through drought resistant plants and providing more restrictions on landscape types in commercial developments.
- Encourage sustainable, socially responsible businesses.
- Infrastructure rehabilitation missed (eg/ CSOs, existing storm sewers).
- Protection assumes baseline is okay; not necessarily a good assumption.
- Need to think about enhancement / restoration.
- Aquatic program – lack of harmonization regarding fisheries issues.
- Time limits on decisions about fisheries / environmental issues.
- Umbrella and boundaries on environmental review.
- Lack of links between individual components such as stormwater management and others.
- Areas opposed to densification OCP principles should pay penalty, or....should there be incentives instead?
- Real issue is less reliance on automobile.
- Air quality, transit, and vehicle emissions – need to be better addressed.
- Look at 10 units per hectare.
- Multi-family should be encouraged along transit corridors.
- Zoning – dollar incentives.
- Infrastructure costs in areas identified in OCP for new development may be disincentive.
- Land taxes.
- If want to attract business, need transit system that works.
- Transit and Plan Nanaimo disconnected.
- There has been some increase in ridership, but routes / frequency not matched to resident and business needs.
- Transit not approachable.
- Parking problems.
- New power sources for transit.
- Bus station – poor move downtown; should be integrated with ferry, train, plane.
- Duke Point – no bus!!!
- Every city in world has integrated transit / modes.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 16 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

**Workshop B – Part B (Improving Servicing and Mobility) - continued**

- Washrooms.
- Public transit – want work with density.
- Ashamed of Nanaimo – people in wheelchairs waiting in rain for a bus; same for homeless.
- Parking problem with highrises.
- Success – air service to mainland.
- Superferries – what will that do to Brechin at Northfield?
- Coordinate transit with ferries.
- Do we want to be a bedroom community for Vancouver?
- Traffic increase in last few years is tremendous.
- Auto **only** viable mode due to sprawl.
- Theatres north, library downtown.
- No meters downtown.
- Parking downtown – don't drive downtown.
- People need to challenge rules.
- Meter people pick up garbage.
- Encourage walking – walking streets, pedestrian malls, covered, awnings.
- Streets are a mish mash.
- Train – encourage use.
- Make a streetcar line north to south.
- Increase cost of gas
- Bus pass incentive (tax decrease).
- Underutilization of airport.
- Covered bus shelters.
- City to talk over walk-on ferry.
- NNC servicing (\$\$).
- Why extend servicing when not all areas are serviced.
- Need to get back to basics – water, sewer, sidewalks, garbage.
- Developer paid.
- Police, fire and emergency needs to be sufficient; increase foot patrols.
- Increase city staff to cope with programs OR better utilization of existing staff.
- Hospital needs improvements.
- Integrated Transportation.**
- Basic Services For Everybody.**
- Plan should take into consideration adjacent communities (Lantzville).
- Flooding – JPM berms did not hold back water; City needs to reassess their strategies in light of recent / ongoing flooding events; need locally appropriate planning / engineering site adaptive planning / design solutions (no single engineering solution).
- Discontinuous implementation of strategies (not consistent), especially for water retention and sidewalks (north versus south parts of City).
- E&N trail was keep – keep it up.
- Good curbside recycle program.
- City Map – disconnect in streets; name changing on one street length makes for difficulty in navigation; better street numbering and naming.
- Continuous, linked sidewalk system linking to trailways.
- Proactive implementation of pedestrian facilities.
- Bike parking should be at developments (through the development process) and throughout the city.
- Transit is good – bike friendly.



**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 17 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

***Workshop B – Part B (Improving Servicing and Mobility) - continued***

- For next 25 years, should be opportunities for rail, light rail, with spine through town with transit connectivity.
- Transportation corridors – High Occupancy Vehicles (needs more discussion).
- Need to talk/converse with Vancouver Island Railway Society.
- Upgrade sewer system to tertiary.
- Stormwater management – fish friendly, water quality, system.
- Park facilities for kids – tennis courts, etc.
- Solid waste management.
- Air quality – connection with OCP Goal #1.
- Next major challenge is need for transportation alternative.
- No integration between City needs and regional transit services; look at appropriate size of transit busses.
- Trails have detrimental impact when paved; they improve mobility, but result in an inappropriate solution when paved.
- Performance Indices
  - Lacking in current OCP.
  - Can be powerful educational tools.
  - Measurable indicators with annual or more frequent reporting by municipality.
- PNAC and Plan Nanaimo are intricately connected.
  - Only deal with “development” applications.
  - Only deal with zoning amendments (44 changes in 10 years, with 10 this week – almost all PNAC recommendations are accepted).
- Needs to be a rationalization for OCP implementation tools – need for other representative on PNAC (transit, social services).
- Urban Design – need for street trees, especially appropriate types.
- OCP is silent on urban design – potential for specific policies for protection of environment and greening the environment.
- Focus on water quality – on beaches; of water quality.
- Lack of decent transportation planning.
  - Disconnect between OCP and transportation planning.
  - Unique concern is the ferry.
  - Need more east west connectivity.
  - Density and diversity are critical elements for improved mobility.
- Successes include the new north – south highway with diversion of traffic from downtown, and the trail system enhancements.
- Improvements to include:
  - Sidewalk discontinuity in older neighbourhoods.
  - Poor quality asphalt sidewalks (there are institutional barriers to implementation of sidewalks).
  - No green delineation between roads and sidewalks.
- Neighbourhood plans provide opportunity for specific, locally appropriate design and alternatives (ie. permeable sidewalk).
- UPass is a good idea.
- Public transportation system is a shortcoming (convenience is not there).
- Selby Street is a good improvement, not not aesthetically strong.
- Can't be automobile oriented in the future.
- Good general infrastructure for bike / pedestrians.
- Positive – bike capability on busses.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
(Page 18 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

***Workshop B – Part B (Improving Servicing and Mobility) - continued***

- Bus shelters should have better design – a parklike setting preferred.
- Distance between homes and commercial services worth it if costs are down on fewer trips.
- Big box services – why substantial incentives to to; should be equal incentives to smaller commercial.
- E&N rail line should be used as rail corridor.
- Parkway – no exits; accessibility is a problem.
- Renewable energy – need to encourage alternatives; redundancy in system.
- Positive – E&N Rail walk.
- Positive – basic servicing to north.
- Sprawl – have to use car, there are no options.
- Awful public transit system – no service to Duke Point of ferry; waterfront walkway incomplete; need new transit terminal downtown.
- Ferry system – move ferry operations to Duke Point.
- Stewart Avenue.
- North – south splie; service levels need to be considered regarding service delivery (eg/ fire service).
- Focus on ferry system to Duke Point.
- Assembly lands – multi-modal transportation link to old Cameron Island terminal.
- Cliff Street location by Maffeo Sutton Park.
- Transportation hub location crucial – should be tied to growth centres; age is a consideration.
- Connectivity is essential.
- Regional perspective is crucial.
- Age related transport is a growing issue; many seniors depend on transit.
- Walkway connectivity is not what it should be in growth centres.
- Cruise ships – should improve and capitalize – need a pier.
- Road design must accommodate bike use.
- Encourage more commercial in south end.
- Better linkage to Newcastle Island – provide a foot bridge.
- Ensure we have water capacity over next 10-15 years.
- Look at alternatives for garbage disposal; dump is good for 15 years, but need to plan for new disposal system.

**Schedule B**  
**Summary of Conference Remarks**  
 (Page 19 of 19)



**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE**  
**2006-NOV-18**  
**Summary of Comments**

---

**Other**

- Need better access to Newcastle Island (eg. walking bridge).
- Need greater/improved partnership with aboriginal community.
- Focussing on complete communities with a range of services is a good goal.
- More local discretion regarding development in town centres.
- Improved sidewalks and bike paths.
- Importance of height limits on buildings; limit building height to maintain views.
- Look at densification and distribution of social interventions.
- Interpret and define OCP policies with more clarity and precision (use 'normal' words).
- Should there be some provisions that can't be "messed with" by politicians/planners regarding major amendments – policies above and beyond the basic legal requirements that are more difficult to change.
- What mechanism to engage...
- Need to change goals of OCP.
- Need to look at two levels – the needs of area residents and City-wide concerns.
- Encourage more public awareness.
- Need greater public education of community programs.
- OCP cost to planning is often not appreciated; costs currently hidden from consumer.
- Compounding costs of different controls.
- Perception that this will slow down development.
- Plan Nanaimo attempting to fix human behaviours.
- Need better education on benefits of densification.
- If public bears and appreciates cost, could be more buy-in.
- NIMBY syndrome for densification.
- A lot of development happening outside of city limits.
- Urban containment boundary not working? Role of RDN?
- City made gain in environment; "easy to do" things; look at social issues (eg. homeless).
- Plan Nanaimo needs measurable indicator of success.
- Implement "Progress Nanaimo" reporting – "Action Nanaimo."
- Success of Plan through 10 years influenced by state of economy (then vs now). Fewer development pressures when Plan Nanaimo first adopted.
- Disparate rate of growth between residential and industrial / commercial.
- Most plans focus on issues that are of limited relevance for the growth of a community.
- Goal should be on increasing efficiencies.
- Plan Nanaimo needs transit and broader range of participants.
- Perception of no progress over 10 years in spite of OCP.
- Current level of growth not envisioned.
- We have the power to make changes – controlled by citizens.
- Homeless – is strategy to ignore them and they will go away?
- Info centre hidden away.
- Monitoring Of Plan.**
- OCP – prioritization for new development is implicit; how do you prioritize improvements for existing, developed neighbourhoods?
- City needs to heed the challenge – greater emphasis for existing neighbourhoods and infrastructure (eg/ Harewood).



**Schedule C  
Summary of Conference Backgrounder  
2006-NOV-30 Nanaimo News Bulletin**



# PLAN NANAIMO

## COMMUNITY CONFERENCE SUMMARY

You are invited to help decide where we live, work and play. The 10-Year Review for the City of Nanaimo Official Community Plan (Plan Nanaimo) is a public process intended to reaffirm and build on strategies for meeting the many growth challenges the City continues to face.

This review is intended to update the City's Official Community Plan (OCP), which will guide Council in making development decisions for the next 25 years.

Over the past six weeks leading up to the 2006-NOV-18 Community Conference, backgrounders have been presented to discuss the various goals laid out in *Plan Nanaimo* (available on the City website at [www.nanaimo.ca](http://www.nanaimo.ca)). This "Backgrounder" is intended to summarize input received during the Conference, which was attended by almost 200 residents.

**What Is An Official Community Plan?**

The BC *Local Government Act* defines an Official Community Plan (OCP) as "a statement of objectives and policies to guide decisions on planning and land use management, within the area covered by the plan, respecting the purposes of local government."

In broad terms, an OCP sets out the location, type, and density of all types of land use, from residential and commercial to industrial, utilities and parks. An OCP can also include policies relating to social needs, agricultural activities, and preservation, protection, and restoration of the natural environment.

The 10-Year Review is intended to determine:

- How well have we done in meeting the *PLAN NANAIMO* goals for shaping development, land use and other aspects of living in Nanaimo?
- Where are the successes and the shortcomings?
- Are these the right goals to carry forward through the next 25 years?

The City of Nanaimo needs citizen involvement to help answer these questions.

**Building Complete, Viable Communities and Managing Urban Growth**

Residents provided comments on building complete communities and managing urban growth:

**Building Complete, Viable Communities**

- Residents identified the need for mixed uses and densities throughout the community, including within town centres and neighbourhood areas.
- Town centres are currently focused on shopping malls. As such, the Plan has not achieved targets for residential densities within these areas.
- A variety of opinions were expressed on the siting and design of high rise buildings.
- A new goal is required within Plan Nanaimo to address social issues within the community. Social issues were recognized as an important part of the community, and there is a need to focus on providing affordable housing, early childhood development, and seniors facilities.
- Need to create economic development opportunities to attract and retain all segments of the workforce, particularly young people.

**Managing Urban Growth**

- When the Urban Containment Boundary was established in 1996, was it drawn in the right location? Does it need to be amended? (*Some participants felt it should not be changed; others recommended a variety of changes.*)
- Density distribution and availability of commercial and other services throughout the community. Should density be focused along major arterials to support public transit?
- Plan Nanaimo should recognize Malaspina University-College as a growth centre.
- The Urban Containment Boundary needs to protect agricultural lands as food security will increasingly become an issue in the future.

**Protecting the Environment and Improving Mobility and Servicing**

Residents provided comments on protecting the environment and improving mobility and servicing:

**Protecting the Environment**

- Residents identified the need to protect active, parkland areas for use by the community, and conservation areas that would provide wildlife habitat and protect ecologically sensitive areas.
- Expansion of the recycling program, with emphasis to provide additional opportunities for composting programs and expanded curbside pickup.
- The City should provide opportunities for community gardens and develop food policy and green building initiatives as positive steps to protecting the environment.
- Given what is known about climate change, should the OCP consider, for example, 100-year policies within its scope?



**Improving Mobility and Servicing**

- Residents identified the need to continue to encourage alternative forms of transportation, including public transit, cycling opportunities and pedestrian opportunities.
- Continued extension of the trail network throughout the community to provide for alternative transportation methods.
- Residential densities in neighbourhoods are too low to support viable transit services.
- The City needs to consider alternative stormwater management techniques to meet sustainability goals.
- The City needs to determine whether it is cost-effective to extend servicing to areas beyond the urban containment boundary prior to infill development in other parts of the community. What are the long-term cost implications?



*10 OCP amendment applications have been received for consideration as part of the 10-Year OCP review. A summary of these applications will be provided in next week's 'Backgrounder'.*

**Get Involved!**

**Attend a Public Open House!**

Tuesday, 2006-DEC-05  
6:00 pm – 9:00 pm  
John Barsby Community School Library  
550 7<sup>th</sup> Street

**Upcoming Sessions**

Watch the newspapers and City website for more information about upcoming public consultation sessions and opportunity for input into the OCP 10-Year Review. These sessions are scheduled to be held in the new year.

**Need More Information?**

Contact us to find out about other ways to obtain information or participate in the *PLAN NANAIMO* 10-Year Review.

Email: [plan.nanaimo@nanaimo.ca](mailto:plan.nanaimo@nanaimo.ca)  
Web: [www.nanaimo.ca](http://www.nanaimo.ca)  
Phone: (250) 755-4483  
Fax: (250) 755-4479  
Mail: City of Nanaimo Community Planning  
455 Wallace Street  
Nanaimo, BC V9R 5J6

View *PLAN NANAIMO* on the City website, or at the Vancouver Island Library downtown branch, Malaspina University-College library, or City Hall (copies available for purchase).

