

Attended by 69 participants, the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) workshop saw a division between those residents who felt the UCB should remain in its existing location, and those who proposed numerous amendments. Those who opted for no change to the UCB cited the Land Capacity Analysis report, indicating sufficient residentially zoned land to meet projected population growth to 2031 and beyond. Those participants who suggested amendments to the UCB flagged the Jinglepot neighbourhood, Snuneymuxw First Nation/Northwest Properties lands, and Northfield industrial area as potential areas for inclusion within the UCB.

Other topics of response are as noted below.

### General

- 69 people in attendance.
  - 61 worksheets submitted.
  - Approximately 45% of attendees currently reside inside UCB, 40% reside outside UCB, and 15% unknown.
  - Attendance included six Cedar area residents, two Lantzville residents, and two “out-of-town” residents.
- 

### Changes to Urban Containment Boundary

- Generally, people not in support of expanding the UCB until satisfactory density has been achieved within the existing UCB.
  - Several comments made that any changes proposed for the UCB should go to referendum.
  - Some support for changes to the UCB where extenuating circumstances occur, benefits offered to significant portion of community, no negative effects to areas already within UCB.
  - Some support if suitable land not available within UCB, or if protects environmentally sensitive areas.
  - Generally, people in agreement that ALR / farming lands and environmentally sensitive areas should never be located inside UCB.
- 

### Existing UCB Criteria

- 18% of participants did not respond to this question.
  - Strongest support for criteria related to ecosystem protection (79%), resource productivity (67%) and ALR lands (61%); only 54% in favour of cost effective servicing as a factor.
  - Confusion over what is meant by ‘documented community need’.
- 

### UCB Review Process

- UCB review should incorporate better public notification (eg/ referendum, notices, surveys, newspaper articles, TV, website).
  - Discussion on length of cycle (that is, when UCB should be reviewed); 31% indicated review every 15 years, 26% indicated now, 8% indicated every 5 years. 34% provided no response or indicated other timelines, such as 3 years or 10 years.
-

### UCB Location

- Respondents indicated the following should be located within the UCB:
    - i. Sewer servicing (48% yes, 23% no)
    - ii. ALR lands (8% yes, 74% no)
    - iii. ESAs (23% yes, 56% no)
    - iv. Large open spaces (25% yes, 59% no)
    - v. Public Transit Servicing (36% yes, 26% no)
  - 25% of respondents indicated UCB should be determined by political boundary (51% no), and 8% indicated should be determined by major infrastructure (52% no).
  - Other items discussed with respect to UCB location:
    - Harewood Plains outside
    - Impact on neighbourhoods, financial costs (infrastructure, taxation, etc).
    - Effect on neighbouring areas.
    - Sustainability; climate change.
- 

### Potential Forms of Development Within UCB

- Respondents indicated the following could be located within their neighbourhood:
    - Two family/duplex homes (74% yes, 5% no)
    - Townhomes (62% yes, 11% no)
    - Low rise apartments 3-4 storeys (51% yes, 23% no)
    - Mid rise apartments 4-10 storeys (23% yes, 44% no)
    - High rise apartments > 10 storeys (18% yes, 54% no)
  - Respondents indicated the following should be located within the UCB:
    - Northfield Industrial Area (30% yes, 33% no)
    - Duke Point Industrial Area (26% yes, 43% no)
    - Large Lot Residential Lands (26% yes, 34% no)
    - Jingle Pot Neighbourhood (26% yes, 31% no)
-