

Results of Online Survey – Draft planNanaimo Presented to PNAC

2008-MAY-06

Draft Official Community Plan Survey

1. What do you like most about the draft Official Community Plan?		Response Count
		73
<i>answered question</i>		73
<i>skipped question</i>		12

2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?		Response Count
		77
<i>answered question</i>		77
<i>skipped question</i>		8

3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?		Response Count
		73
<i>answered question</i>		73
<i>skipped question</i>		12

Question 1.

What do you like most about the draft Official Community Plan?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	73
<i>answered question</i>	73
<i>skipped question</i>	12

Comments Received

#	Response Date	Comment
1.	3/13/08 5:50 PM	Nodes and corridors. Downtown revitalization (including Terminal Avenue) and core 'traffic slowing' initiatives. Green initiatives including commercial/industrial.
2.	3/14/08 8:53 PM	If it can be enforced by future legislators I think it is great.
3.	3/14/08 9:01 PM	The plan is a great step forward providing it isn't changed with each changing legislative body. Too often I have seen OCP's in many areas changed for development or other groups.
4.	3/14/08 10:42 PM	Very much agree with infilling, raising the density before expanding the city boundaries and have to raise taxes to cover new infrastructure. How you encourage developers to develop or sell raw land in a free capitalistic society, I don't know. However, there must be some sort of incentives that the City can offer to encourage development. Economic diversity is wonderful as long as the jobs created are not traditional service/retail low income jobs. The city should look at encouraging business to relocate from other areas to Nanaimo by offering tax cuts and other incentives. Housing is also a big issue and if not careful Nanaimo will find itself in the position of Ft. McMurray - not able to house the people that want to move there. Then you will see people renting garages and sleeping in them.
5.	3/15/08 2:24 AM	The blending of neighbourhoods with various residential type homes. This is good integration of peoples of all lifestyles.
6.	3/15/08 5:10 AM	It gives the impression that there is public input and consultation.
7.	3/15/08 1:57 PM	I like the fact that urban sprawl will be addressed. In particular, I sincerely hope that "lands within the UCB should not include those within the ALR" will in fact protect the working farm lands as well as environmentally sensitive areas. I live in the area formally known as Five Acres and appreciate the rural aspect of my neighbourhood.
8.	3/15/08 2:49 PM	Can't read it
9.	3/15/08 7:51 PM	I do not like the draft Official Community Plan and will actively work to defeat any elected official who supports it.
10.	3/16/08 4:14 AM	Not too much too like.
11.	3/17/08 9:04 PM	Goal 5 - Improving mobility is very important as it underlies many of the other goals. It also makes the city more accessible for lower income residents, and ready for a future where automobile transportation may become increasingly unaffordable.
12.	3/19/08 12:34 AM	I like that fact that there is a plan. In the past the City has been allowed to expand in an uncontrollable manner. It is not a destination city but a central hub for all coming to the Island.
13.	3/19/08 6:06 PM	I like the nodes and corridor concept; although I am worried there may not be enough emphasis on making the nodes mixed use, as they seem to emphasize their specialized nature without mention of the importance of creating mixed uses. Protecting the environment is good, although this should include the citywide adoption of at least the lowest levels of LEED standards for new construction, especially the environmentally destructive housing - single unit, detached housing (although this is a newly developing area - re single unit housing with LEED). I like that townhouses are being considered for neighbourhoods.
14.	3/21/08 12:00 AM	I agree that an official community plan is a good idea, and a useful statement of the intentions of our municipal government.
15.	3/28/08 10:35 PM	That social and environmental issues made the goals list.
16.	3/30/08 3:01 AM	I really like the fact that some thought has gone into this. We need to stop the sprawl and start pushing the height density up.
17.	3/30/08 3:37 AM	VERY LITTLE

Official Community Plan Online Survey, April 2008

18. 3/30/08 6:10 AM This is my second submission - I wanted to add something else. I like that you have decided to incorporate sustainability into the plan. Some good components such as food security, transit, density, etc.
19. 4/1/08 5:20 AM I like that the plan contains specific goals and that it seeks public input.
20. 4/1/08 9:34 PM The plan is well documented and for the most part is a reasonable blueprint for the future of Nanaimo
21. 4/1/08 11:40 PM The urban nodes make a lot of sense. For people to have the convenience of services near to where they live, cuts down on the amount of driving. I would like to see more 'affordable' housing above business premises as this would provide security for the businesses.
22. 4/4/08 4:03 AM The identification of an expanded shoreline walkway as an important project is good. However, it would also be good to recognize that the old concept that exists for the departure bay section needs to be completely revisited to minimize opposition from affected property owners. There is a need to start over, working with the neighbourhood to develop a concept (possibly scaled down from the previous one) to minimize opposition from those directly impacted.
23. 4/4/08 5:06 PM submitted previously
24. 4/4/08 10:16 PM I like the fact that the urban containment boundary will include the Jingle Pot area to the city limit.
25. 4/8/08 7:38 PM Expansion in the south seems to balance the city, as there does not appear to be anymore room in the north. Developments in the south should be positively encouraged, taking the negative assumption of the poor live in the south. The city's move to adjust the urban containment boundary should be applauded, the city needs to expand in order to prosper.
26. 4/8/08 10:16 PM I support more development/expansion in the south of Nanaimo. The Cable Bay development along with the First Nations development can bring a lot more taxes into the City of Nanaimo.
27. 4/9/08 6:25 AM Like most:
- broad tone has emphasis on sustainability and an attempt to define it;
- inclusion of food security and also pointing to the need to develop a strategy and utilization of locally produced foods;
- waterfront access to include trail, visual access, limits on use, with some increase for amenities for pedestrians;
- mobility: trails, walking areas.
28. 4/10/08 5:06 AM That community garden space is at least mentioned, albeit only once.
29. 4/10/08 5:19 AM I like the focus on sustainability, particularly food security on Vancouver Island because it's a major issue concerning our future and the future of sustainability in our community.
30. 4/10/08 8:28 PM The inclusion of Food Security. Increased densification. Environmental protection. Improved mobility. Sustainable Nanaimo. Social and cultural goals.
31. 4/10/08 10:37 PM I'm glad there is an OCP that should guide residents and developers about Nanaimo's development, but am not happy to see when it is successfully challenged.
32. 4/11/08 3:58 AM I like the fact that food security is mentioned although I'm not sure why it is listed under "Social Enrichment" rather than "Sustainable Nanaimo" or "Environment". Also good is the idea of preserving ALR mentioned in Goal #1.
33. 4/12/08 12:20 AM Not much. I give credit to those who are TRYING to do something positive about our city... but... "too little too late"? (very)... "barking up the wrong tree"? I liken what the city is doing to the effect a mosquito would have sitting on the rear end of an elephant! Not much! A slight annoyance at most!
34. 4/12/08 2:25 PM I love the development in the South end. The city and particularly the south end needs the progression as it is so far to travel to the North end. Also I can't afford to live in the North end. I support the expansion of the city limits in the South end and support the city's growth.
35. 4/14/08 6:18 PM The idea of "corridors" - assuming that they are developed in tandem with transit serving them. The preservation of parks - ample green space is what made me choose to live in Nanaimo.

36. 4/15/08 2:58 AM I like the idea of respect for citizens and neighbourhoods in particular and how the plan should be owned by the community. What I don't see is how this will be accomplished as there are no checks and balances there to ensure that neighbourhood wishes are heard and acted upon and that the rights of citizens to not have investments in their properties wilfully tampered with.
37. 4/20/08 12:36 AM The introduction of a food security goal.
38. 4/21/08 12:13 AM see below (#3)
39. 4/21/08 12:21 AM Thanks for all the hard work.
40. 4/22/08 5:06 AM I like the fact that the OCP outlines strategies to protect and enhance our environment, to ensure that there is affordable and adequate housing for our citizens and that more care will be taken to integrate Arts/Culture/Recreation development into City Planning, as this provides the soul of the City.
41. 4/24/08 5:37 PM The proposed land use information.
42. 4/25/08 3:43 AM I like the new developments proposed in the south end of town. They suggest we are a progressive community needing a flagship resort community within our boundaries.
43. 4/25/08 5:26 AM Not much.
44. 4/25/08 6:44 AM Provisions for the safe cycling environment.
45. 4/25/08 3:34 PM The idea that sustainability will form a central guide to all decision-making / planning.
46. 4/25/08 3:43 PM I like the development and expansion in South Nanaimo including the Cable Bay golf course project and the Sandstone/Wolf project. A south node for the city is progressive and should contribute to downtown as we develop nodes on either end, as well as improve the impression of the south end from being the poor relative. I also like the expansion of the urban containment boundary. This is a visionary step and the city should be applauded.
47. 4/25/08 4:54 PM 1. The availability (online and paper copies) of the draft document, and the public meetings to try and encourage input. 2. There have been some very good attempts to move in (or at least give lip service to) a positive direction: such as council's stated commitment to support the FCM's climate protection program, and also to the original directions identified by "Imagine Nanaimo". Unfortunately however, the public record shows that many of these good intentions ended up in the ditch. There are very specific reasons why this happened, of course - none of which are justifiable. (see question No. 2). 3. "great prizes are being offered to those who participate" !!!
48. 4/25/08 5:03 PM Nothing, it is too open ended. There is no substance to it
49. 4/25/08 5:03 PM Given that Plan Nanaimo goals and objectives weren't met (the creation of viable, walkable, self-sustaining (not car dependent) town centres, the management of urban growth (thru the best tool available - the maintenance of the urban containment boundary) and important transit goals for a future unlikely to be fossil fuelled put out of reach by the approval of development of our green fields to the south...don't have confidence that lofty goals set out in this plan will be met. It lacks the credibility a track record of earlier successes would have provided. So there's much to like - who could argue with broad principles of sustainability and "social enrichment". But it's academic and without any practical relevance.
50. 4/25/08 5:35 PM I like the fact that there will be densification. Also the neighbourhood focus is a good idea, creating the neighbourhood village focus. I feel having commercial areas within existing neighbourhoods will give people opportunities to get out of their cars. Also the proposals for trailway connections.
51. 4/25/08 5:50 PM The overall concept of allowing Citizen participation into planning of THEIR neighbourhoods is commendable
52. 4/25/08 6:51 PM The fact that it is a draft, which gives it ample room to be totally revised and to include the omitted part i.e. COMMUNITY. Such an omission IS CRUCIAL. The point is not whether I like or dislike it but whether it serves best the future of the community and its residents. This exercise is not a popularity contest nor should it be a process to "manufacture consent". Your leading question implies there is something to be "liked" about it, a ploy commonly used in marketing.

53. 4/25/08 7:01 PM What I would like to see in the OCP is a long-term vision of a community that will anticipate the effects of global weather changes, the impacts that will evolve on jobs, ability of people to live sustainably, ability to produce and purchase locally grown food. I think we need to be more self-sustaining. Global trade comes at a cost that has taken a toll on the environment. We need more efficiency. We need to curb development and have things in place before expanding the population. How can we handle more traffic now? Road rage from impatient people, stressed in trying to make a living, rushing around town, instead of living in a peaceful, self-sustaining community is the reality we endure. Every trip into town requires multiple stops and a lot of time to save additional trips using up extra gas and pollute. We need improved and expanded public transportation. If we have money to put into convention centers and airport expansions, we surely can put money into public transit. Again, self-sustaining communities are required. And self-sustaining communities require the ongoing participation of people in the communities. In Portland, Oregon, community participation appears to be paramount, creating living spaces that allow for a healthier city environment. Portland has also addressed providing housing for the homeless, which is where we need to put our emphasis. How can we ignore the people who are down and out, who have lost jobs, who have mental health problems and lack inner resources that others are fortunate to have, and put money into grandiose schemes that benefit those who are already well off? We need affordable housing for young people, for families, who cannot afford the high rents. We need safe neighbourhoods. People who are able to invest in their neighbourhood are more inclined to take care of it, to have pride in community and self, to feel that they belong. We need change, a focus that is redirected to the people of a community, not the corporate bodies that do not have personal investment in ensuring healthy communities. The City and the RDN need to go into the communities, listen and work with them.
54. 4/25/08 7:47 PM Not much.
55. 4/25/08 7:56 PM I don't like the way it is being done.
56. 4/25/08 8:24 PM Layout
57. 4/25/08 8:27 PM In truth I threw it away because I thought it was a decided plan so it made no difference what I thought about it.
58. 4/25/08 8:31 PM That sustainability is a primary focus, one that includes the environment, land-use planning (especially increased densities and cycle/walking pathways and increased public transit), social connections, and hubs. More densification is necessary to make the public transit system work. I think that the Plan is going in the right direction.
59. 4/25/08 8:34 PM Nothing
60. 4/25/08 8:43 PM A strong OCP would be of benefit if anyone on Council actually could understand or took the time to learn how a city develops in a sustainable manner. There is no evidence of this in Nanaimo.
61. 4/25/08 9:08 PM Having a plan, and sticking to it, is the best way to move forward. Making changes, ie. to height restrictions, as we go along, to please developers, is not a plan at all. Perhaps input on our plan should be limited to present households; we should not accept input from developers and land speculators. Let our local needs guide development, not investors bottom line.
62. 4/25/08 9:53 PM Nothing
63. 4/25/08 10:24 PM Not very much. Have you, in any way, made an outstanding effort to let the citizens of Nanaimo know that there are all these changes? The majority of people I have talked with feel the council does their own thing, with NO consultation with the people who pay their taxes in this city. It is totally pathetic that you have such an arrogant attitude towards the rest of our community.
64. 4/25/08 11:16 PM Nothing
65. 4/25/08 11:29 PM See #3
66. 4/26/08 2:11 AM I like the parts that correspond to the original draft made in the 1990's.
67. 4/26/08 3:22 AM Nothing
68. 4/26/08 4:24 AM NOTHING. ENTIRE PLAN IS NOT AT ALL ABOUT THE COMMUNITY.
69. 4/26/08 5:35 AM The title suggests that the exercise will yield planful, consistent actions.
70. 4/26/08 5:44 AM That there were still neighbourhoods where small businesses could still find a place and thrive. Not a congested tall building jungle like Vancouver.

Question 2.

What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	77
<i>answered question</i>	77
<i>skipped question</i>	8

Comments Received

#	Response Date	Response Text
1.	3/13/08 5:50 PM	Green initiatives should extend to residential developers too. Carbon DCC credits for things like solar, neighbourhood geothermal coop, tree retention. We need population density downtown asap - still too high a 'drunken and violent' factor in the evening hours that will continue to hold back revitalization.
2.	3/14/08 8:53 PM	So often I have seen things changed to appease some development or other group.
3.	3/14/08 10:42 PM	it is great that we have a development plan in place to control and manage growth - but the plan shouldn't hinder or disallow common sense ideas and changes because there is this plan. The plan needs to work for the city not the city for the plan. I heard that the original plan was implemented based on a 5% response from the public. I don't think that anything of this scale and importance should be passed with such a low response rate and it should have gone to a referendum at the next civic election. Makes one wonder whose agenda was being kept. Hope that that doesn't happen again this time around.
4.	3/15/08 2:24 AM	Goal 6. Improved mobility. Transit would be better served by there not being more buses available, but rather routes to include the newer developing areas, even if on a more restrictive timetable.
5.	3/15/08 5:10 AM	Any and all public input and consultation is completely ignored to appease land grabs by developers.
6.	3/15/08 2:49 PM	Can't read it.
7.	3/15/08 7:51 PM	The unrelenting "pro-development at any cost" frame of reference that it represents.
8.	3/16/08 4:14 AM	The so called 'living' plan' panders to the highest proposed tax base.
9.	3/17/08 9:04 PM	There does not seem to be enough effort or focus into bringing more economic diversification into the city. We have a beautiful location here that should enable us to attract high quality industries such as the technology sector but we simply do not have enough business space. Somehow we need to encourage the construction of commercial (office space) real estate so that we can create more of a Central Business District. Unfortunately, this seems to be missing from the plans for the Downtown Urban Node.
10.	3/19/08 12:34 AM	Development of Linley Valley. This is a beautiful natural valley within the city extending from Hammond Bay Road in the South northward to Rutherford Road. At present, part is designated as parkland - that's good, but why not the whole valley. It could be Nanaimo's own "Stanley Park". Please think ahead. There's lots of land to the west for future development. I urge all planners to consider this vision. Don't let current land owners abuse this valley with development.

11. 3/19/08 6:06 PM I don't like the timeline. I do not have time to go over the draft, and can only skim parts of it, but have mostly only looked at the summary pamphlet. The last month of university is very busy, especially for the student who would be most likely and able to give good analyses of the OCP - i.e. the "keener" students. In developing the goals of the draft OCP, it is important not to be too broad in the scope (esp. goal three). For example, the "social enrichment" document covers such a vast scope of issues that any significant implementation of them would be a very difficult task indeed, especially since one of the most basic goals, Urban Containment is experiencing such difficulty in its implementation. But the goals are important and should have a place, but it is overwhelming just to read them let alone implement them. General plan (but esp. regarding four sets of issues in goal 3): how are any of these goals prioritized? Sustainability gives equal weight to economic, social, environmental sustainability, although the true concept should recognize that they are not separate from each other but are self reinforcing (there is some recognition of this in the doc or by RDN - i.e. subsystem etc). Nevertheless, priority ratings (for example what weight is given to different goals) of different goals and the likelihood of their successful implementation should be included in a final version or should be a part of the planning process. Goal four: high densities of housing must be insured along corridors so as to prevent the corridor concept from becoming a "strip development" concept. In addition, these corridors will need traffic calming measures, street beautification (street trees, furniture, etc), and have a high level of walkability. Nodes: the development of higher density nodes needs some flexibility for infill. For the few remaining opportunities for infill, there should be flexibility with regards to "traditional zoning" practices. The Hawthorne development between Wakesiah and Third is a good example. "Traditional" zoning and bylaw regulations mutilated the original higher density concept, which would have lessened pressure on rural lands and provided more affordable housing. This represents a lack of vision by city bureaucrats and councillors. Further nodes must be integrated into the corridor concept and should also aim to be contiguous units (i.e. not bisected by major traffic arteries). Neighbourhood densities should be targeted at not less than 15 units per hectare not 10 (for reason of transit viability plus 10 units is just too low). Neighbourhoods should allow mixed uses, because that encourages walking and makes for a vibrant neighbourhood. Allow cafes, restaurants, convenience stores, etc. Don't use the antiquated distribution of uses according to Clarence Perry's neighbourhood unit. Further in nodes and corridors the potential for mixing light industrial uses that are compatible with other uses should be considered. Parking regulations should be thrown in the garbage where they belong. Do you actually force traditional parking requirements on commercial businesses downtown - if so get rid of them NOW! Road improvements should be limited to items such as potholes. No lane widenings or expansions are necessary. They induce traffic, and allowing people to drive faster offers little in terms of safety improvements. I also notice that community participation is no longer a part of the goals, except for being buried within goal seven as an aside. Given the abysmal participation the more recent community participation processes, it is in part understandable. But I would question a possible move from "consultation" (or tokenism) to placation (informing or convincing the public) of the plan that has been developed.
12. 3/21/08 12:00 AM In my examination of the community plan it appears that, with respect to land-use designations there is no designation for areas set aside for single-family dwellings. There are already many such areas in Nanaimo, and it would be, in my view, a grievous error to eliminate this designation, and to impose on these existing neighbourhoods multiple family dwellings. I am not persuaded that the goal of increased density is an essential one for Nanaimo. I accept that is practical in some areas, but I believe it is essential that the plan maintained existing single-family neighbourhoods, and provide for some additional neighbourhoods of this nature.
13. 3/28/08 10:35 PM The Plans definition of sustainability. To me the term means a lifestyle that can be continued, as is, without detriment to future generations. Obviously we, as a species of 'consumers' have not made that reality and to me it is foolhardy to think we can. Particularly in light of our compulsion to continue developing at breakneck pace and be sustainable at the same time. Can this Plan free Nanaimo from greed and ignorance? A better term might be "resilient", we can make mistakes, have setbacks which we learn from and modify our behaviour.

14. 3/30/08 3:01 AM The plan doesn't identify the problems faced between MOT and the City with respect to the HWY 1 / 19 / 19A / Terminal / Northfield road system. We need more direct, higher speed, safer road design in these areas. Nanaimo must start to think (which it looks like we are) but now must act like a City of the 21st century. We need to limit access, remove traffic lights, remove left turns and get higher utilization out of existing corridors. This means the car, the train, the bike, the bus and one's feet.
15. 3/30/08 3:37 AM 1. I dislike the MANY changes to our original Plan and unless a person sits and proofreads from one document to the other, it is very difficult to locate all of the large changes and even more so, to locate the small ones! Surely to goodness, a method could have been devised to show the old plan and identify all of the changes in the new one! This is so unacceptable I can hardly write! 2. I am angry that you have negated the Old Goal FIVE. THIS absolutely must be returned to the document. 3. I am extremely upset to see the NEW GOAL FOUR! What purpose does this have in what is supposed to be a planning document?? I am not overjoyed with the Food Security area being included in a planning document. 4. The use of and your broad definition of the word "sustainable" is also unacceptable as are the density levels in most of the "nodes"! 5. Why is Public Safety left out of this NEW document? 6. There is a much larger list of unfavourable comments coming toward this document.
16. 3/30/08 6:10 AM I do not like the short thrift given to existing definitions and research on sustainability. The definition of sustainability should be based on what is considered sustainable, not as some definition that is Nanaimo's own special little creature. It's good that food security is mentioned later on in the document, although its importance is not given enough weight. The Nanaimo region produces a pathetic amount of its own food. This is a HUGE problem for the future of global warming, peak oil, and decimated agricultural soils from industrial agriculture that is essentially mining the soils of their nutrients (not to mention its dependence on mining for fertilizer materials and oil for production and distribution). Nevertheless, reducing Nanaimo's ecological footprint should be the primary goal of any planning document professing to be about sustainability. Why EFs are not even mentioned, I am not certain. There are many other components of sustainability that are definite, a number ARE recognized throughout the document (although they deserve more than just New Urban offhand smarmy recognition), such as transit, food security, density, environmental protection, restoration, and some other, so good on you for that planNanaimo!
17. 4/1/08 5:20 AM I see no direct tie between the plan and the expected demographic changes where you expect to see much higher numbers of retired people. How does the plan address their needs? Seniors have quite different needs than urban professionals, young families or maturing families (e.g. no schools, more walking areas, grocery stores, different housing needs (low rise)). You are also missing the most important goal: that of creating the most livable city for the current and planned residents.
18. 4/1/08 9:34 PM That the Urban Containment Boundary is being moved in the Jinglepot area when there is sufficient room within current zoning areas for population growth until 2031.
19. 4/1/08 11:40 PM An important segment of society is being short-changed. As baby boomers retire and adopt more leisurely lifestyles, they are adopting dogs at unprecedented rates. Condo / townhouse developments run by strata councils are becoming the norm and most allow residents to have one dog usually up to 25 lbs. These little dogs need places to run off leash. The area must be fenced but does not need to be huge. Little dogs do little damage to grass; dog owners I have spoken to would not object to paying more taxes / strata fees for upkeep. The waterfront is being transformed and green space for dogs is being replaced with parking lots and condos. The current off leash park / off leash areas are great for large dogs and people fit enough to hike to them. The token small dog park is not utilized for various reasons, one that it shares a fence with a large dog area and little ones are intimidated by large dogs running to the fence when they enter. Another reason is that many small dog owners do not have vehicles to get to the park, and need something within walking distance of home. I see a dog friendly environment where urban nodes include small dog friendly off leash parks and an aging population can take their little ones to play. The added benefit: dog owners will be socializing with others as they watch doggie dynamics. There would be less clean up for city crews. The City had a bylaw requiring developers include tot lots for every so many homes built. It would be great for the city to require developers to include safe off leash areas for every so many town homes, patio homes, or condos being built. The health benefits of dog ownership have been proven. The best form of exercise for any dog is to play with another dog. A tired dog is a good dog, a good canine citizen. A healthy community means serving the needs of all citizens.

20. 4/4/08 4:03 AM Although a long term vision for the City is stated in Part B, the goals that are subsequently developed don't seem to tie back very well to the vision. For example the goals make repeated reference to sustainability yet the word isn't even mentioned in the vision statements. Also the thriving economy goal isn't in the vision (there is mention of a diverse economy which is something different). The vision statement does make lots of reference to the importance of neighbourhoods and the need for community participation in planning yet these things doesn't seem to be the focus of the plan). Overall I find the plan too vague and with too wide of a range of goals. As a result it may be possible to use some aspects of the plan to support almost any undertaking- whether in the best long term interests of the city or not.
21. 4/4/08 5:06 PM Submitted previously.
22. 4/4/08 10:16 PM The timeline of 5-10 years to start study of the Jinglepot area - should be sooner. As a Jingle Pot resident, I think the individual property owners should have the option to subdivide their land into the smallest pieces that a septic can safely be constructed on rather than bringing a whole densely populated subdivision into the area.
23. 4/8/08 7:38 PM A 10 year plan should not be designed to consume all the vacant land, additional lands need to be sought in order to grow. As well city stats show:
-residential land will run out in about 20 years (as it is unlikely all potential persons will subdivide their land).
-vacant commercial land runs out in 10 to 15 years,
-heavy industrial land runs out in the next 10 to 20 years,
-light industrial land runs out in the next 5 to 15 years.
There is no "showcase" development for the future where Nanaimo leads the way in environmentally considerate, sustainable development.
24. 4/8/08 10:16 PM City does not have enough space for expansion. Perhaps more communication with Regional Districts to allow additional land needs (smaller acres = more development = more taxes). Would like to see heavy industrial expansion outside city limits.
25. 4/9/08 6:25 AM Dislike:
- lack of specificity in food security sections:
- lack of urgency for a food strategy development (only medium term)
- missed opportunity to identify specific locations for long-term community gardens development before the properties disappear to densification;
- failure to define zoning strategy to establish a 'community gardens' designation
26. 4/10/08 5:19 AM I'd like to see more specific focus and more immediate time frames attached to the goals for food security in Nanaimo. This issue cannot wait 20 years (long term goal); We are losing land today to development. Once that land had been developed, it will never be used for food production again. Increasing development is putting pressure on agricultural lands so this is an urgent issue to address. In the past (1940), Vancouver Island was about 60% food secure. Today, we produce only 1%-2% of our food on the island. The OCP should consider the increasing costs of food and fuel, and the decreasing availability of land that can be put to agricultural use.
27. 4/10/08 8:28 PM Expansion of Urban Containment Boundary, which appears contradictory with increased densification within boundary. Waterfront highrises - there are other suitable locations that do not block the lovely view, making it for an exclusive club of condo owners. Also, people coming into our harbour don't want to be confronted with a wall of buildings. South Nanaimo development plans to include more big box stores. We don't want another Wal-Mart.....PLEASE!!!!
28. 4/10/08 8:32 PM We don't have height restrictions on building within the urban nodes.
29. 4/10/08 10:20 PM All of the Old Island Highway strip should be designated as a Corridor. This is, in my opinion, the biggest oversight in the whole document. We may need a busy arterial running through town but we don't need a highway – why else did we spend so much money to build the Parkway? Also we have a wonderful trail system and rail corridor alongside – why not push development towards it? It seems visionless not to. Nanaimo stands the most to gain from that railway as it connects to most schools, the downtown and all the North End malls (AND the new South Nanaimo node). Why ignore it and pretend it's not an asset?? Maybe it isn't today, but it definitely will be in the future. I thought the whole point of the OCP was to help plan for the future? In order to get there, we need to the commercial, residential density to get us there.
30. 4/10/08 10:37 PM I think the Cable Bay proposal is in conflict with Goals 1, 2, 5, and 6. It will require a great amount of infrastructure, makes a mockery of densification in Nanaimo's core, pushes the UCB out, and doesn't build a more sustainable community.

31. 4/11/08 3:58 AM I notice that the area around Cottle Creek/Linley Valley is designated as an Urban Reserve...is there any way that we can leave it alone?
32. 4/12/08 12:20 AM Analogy: Have you ever been to Niagara Falls? It's like we're floating along in a row boat on the Niagara River - without paddles - and the rudder breaks. Now, no steering, too! And we then notice the speed of the river is quickening... we're approaching the edge of the falls! Are we going to go OVER the precipice? Some scientists say we are already past the "tipping point", ie: over the edge.
33. 4/12/08 2:25 PM The city has no balance between the north end and the south end. It is long and skinny. I hope that it will not get any longer but rather fatter.
34. 4/14/08 6:18 PM The "Resort Centre". This appears to be a case of the developer being completely out of sync with the existing/evolving plan. I don't understand why this is even being considered. The plan is for solidifying the vision of controlled growth - not for accommodating a developer's aspirations. With Nanaimo being such a hot-spot for development, surely we can start taking a firmer hand with developers to ensure they fit into our vision. I make these comments largely based on the geographical placement of the "resort centre". If a large development is allowed in this area, it seems to me the worst kind of urban sprawl. A true "resort", catering to tourists and with low impact on the surroundings, might be appropriate, but to have a large residential or commercial component in this area just doesn't make sense to me. I also freely admit, I have not researched this particular case as much as I'd like, so my comments are based more on principles than specific details.
35. 4/15/08 2:58 AM I do not like the fact that the best practices of other jurisdictions are not included in this plan. This would include the requirement for developers to go to neighbourhoods and present their proposed plan prior to going to city planning. If the plan cannot be endorsed by the affected neighbourhood why would the city entertain it if indeed the focus is on respect of the citizen and neighbourhoods? Victoria seems to have done a very good job of developing this idea. If the city has proceeded with something that citizens feel is not in their best interests or that of their neighbourhood, there is no appeal process or recourse available to them. Again, how does this garner and promote respect?
36. 4/18/08 12:15 AM At Duke Point the Zoning of Lot 4 and Lot 5 enable Industrial Use, however the future land use identified on Map 1 of the OCP significantly reduces the amount of Industrial Land. A significant part of Lot 4 turns into Resource Protection and the South end of Lot 5 becomes Resource Protection. We currently have an Industrial tenant investing a significant amount of funds, who is looking to occupy the south end of Lot 5. The tenant will be significant for the City, both in the respect of creating jobs, and the city becoming the hub of the island. We also have received interest from other business' interested in establishing on the property, however this will require us to expand our Industrial use from Lot 5 eastward onto Lot 4 to fulfill our vision for the property. We understand that the City is interested in finding lands to support economic opportunity. We request that the OCP be adjusted to be consistent with the current zoning.
37. 4/18/08 12:21 AM The lot west of Westwood Lake (Range 6, Section 8, West 1/2) is privately owned land and considered Managed Forest, however it is identified as Park in the OCP.
38. 4/20/08 12:36 AM The lack of substance to the food security goal. The 3-legged stool analogy of "sustainability". Environment (the surface of the planet on which we live) and social issues (the way in which people live together) are not co-equal with economic or commercial activity, which is properly a subset of social issues. One more example of accepting a piece of political compromise which is as unhelpful today as it was twenty years ago. Think again!
39. 4/21/08 12:13 AM See below
40. 4/21/08 12:21 AM I feel the Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan should take precedence over the City plan as much time and effort has gone into preparing our plan in terms of density, rezoning, etc.
41. 4/22/08 5:06 AM As a resident of Departure Bay I feel that the draft OCP allows for too great a density level in both Neighbourhood Commercial Centres and Residential Neighbourhoods. In the planning to develop the Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan the residents expressed a desire to see lower density levels and limit building heights to a maximum of three stories to protect public and private views. A maximum density of 25 units per hectare for Neighbourhood Residential densities should be reinstated.
42. 4/24/08 5:37 PM There is very little substance in the report. There are a lot of "motherhood" statements. What specific action plans are being addressed?

Official Community Plan Online Survey, April 2008

43. 4/25/08 3:43 AM We need a model sustainable community.
44. 4/25/08 5:26 AM No teeth and not much substance. It has become far too diffuse. Too many internal contradictions. Rather than build on Plan Nanaimo, planNanaimo starts over with very little input, and much of what was done last year has been ignored, particularly public input on the OCP and the advice of the experts who came to open the OCP process. It is the work of rhetoreticians.
45. 4/25/08 6:44 AM No protection at all for the existing agricultural land within the city boundaries. Not enough foresight in the areas of Affordable Housing, Public Transit, Local Food Production and Food Security - see # 3.
46. 4/25/08 7:03 AM The changes to the UCB. Densification means continuing with development within the present UCB, before spreading beyond, which would likely take approximately 25-30 years. To extend the UCB now ensures urban sprawl. Fill in the spaces within the UCB with careful planning to include large parcels of treed land. Please, stop the surgery before it is too late. 2. The Linley Valley area and Westwood Lake area should not be in an "Urban Reserve" to be developed at a later date--ever! Why can Nanaimo not employ creative and forward-thinking planning that would allow our City to maintain the natural green spaces that we are blessed with? Leave trees/forests in and around the buildings as a part of the development process in Nanaimo. We could be very special and more desirable than any other place in this part of the world.
47. 4/25/08 3:34 PM The weasel words which suggest to me that sustainability will not be required - but will remain a greenwash approach to appease those who wish to retain important environmental and ecologically important features and systems intact.
48. 4/25/08 3:43 PM There is no grand plan in the 10 year plan for the future. Has a sensitivity analysis been completed relative to our population growth? (Perhaps this exists, but is not published?). For example: - We should have enough Residential land until ~2031 (~23 years). However we will run out of residential land sooner if the rate of growth ends up being higher than 1.5%, and we acknowledge that it is unlikely that maximum density will occur on all lands. If the max density is not realized we could run out of residential land in 20 years. If the rate of growth is actually 2% we could run out of land in ~ 18 years and if the rate of growth is like Surrey's at 2.7% we could run out of residential land in about ~13 years. The addition of Cable Bay and South lands adds about 5 years of growth.
-vacant commercial land runs out in 10 to 15 years,
-heavy industrial land runs out in the next 10 to 20 years,
-light industrial land runs out in the next 5 to 15 years.
A 10 year plan should not be designed to consume all of the vacant land. Additional land will be needed. Discussion with the cities neighbours needs to commence. There is a significant risk of OCP failure if the population grows faster than anticipated. There no 'showcase' development for the future where Nanaimo leads the way in environmentally considerate, sustainable development?
49. 4/25/08 4:54 PM 1. Elimination of UCB. 2. Elimination of "Neighbourhoods are the building blocks of the city." 3. Failure to defer hearings into major land use alterations (South Nanaimo and Cable Bay in particular) until after the review is complete. 4. It is unfortunate, but sadly understandable, that a lot of residents with legitimate concerns and valuable suggestions have become cynical and don't participate. I think the reasons for that include a widely held perception that public hearings have become a mere "pro-forma" exercise to meet minimum legal obligations. Council has been very rude to some delegations, and many people also observe that planning proposals (including this Draft OCP) appear to originate from, or under pressure from, outside developers with no real interest in the Nanaimo other than making a fast buck; and the perception that many decisions have already been made behind closed doors. In my own personal experience, advisory committees haven't always welcomed constructive criticism, and have instead relied excessively on "in camera" meetings. Many good ideas have been ignored, not only from outside experts, but from local experts.
50. 4/25/08 5:03 PM I participated in the old plan and I feel city council should have started with the original plan and reviewed what worked and what didn't, instead of starting with a clean slate. This is just typical of what is happening all over the world. For example as a former Telus employee, we had negotiated a very good contract with the company and union, but Telus did not want anything to do with the existing contract, they only wanted to start with a brand new contract so that they could change all the wording to suit the corporation. The city of Nanaimo is no different, only they are catering to the developers and friends. I am getting sick and tired as a taxpayer having to pay for city council's mistakes, they should not be in the development business.

51. 4/25/08 5:03 PM The ideas and concerns presented at the OCP review conference and workshops from both the experts brought in by the Planning Dept and citizen participants aren't represented here for the most part. The process deserves for instance a follow up analysis by SmartGrowth BC and Anne McAfee, former co-head of Planning, City of Vancouver to provide a helpful perspective on what they feel we got right here and what we didn't. They and others are mentioned in the preamble of the draft appropriating their influence and expert opinion, suggesting they support this plan. That may be the case, but we should ask them...
52. 4/25/08 5:35 PM The expansion! We do not need this. Taking our park at Cable Bay and giving these Albertan developers that much sway, on city services is unacceptable. This practice is truly unsustainable.
53. 4/25/08 5:50 PM The hijacking of the plan by the Development community.
54. 4/25/08 6:51 PM The travesty/pretence that this document aims at a COMMUNITY consultation. I refer you to Ucluelet where they started with true public consultation including all citizens, gathering data from all venues for months (didn't you say you spent 2 years working on this document?), then using the input to come up with a draft submitted again to all PEOPLE living in the community. That was an authentic consultation, conscientiously carried out and with great respect for the people/taxpayers. Did you have the curiosity to study their methodology or do you always "know best" what is good for us? I attended, still hopeful, the April 10 Community Forum at Beban Park --as I did former "public consultations"--. The Chairman, perhaps as a joke, claimed that the poor attendance was proof that most people were satisfied. No Sir, I would suggest that most people try & avoid being ridiculed and/or used in a sterile exercise with a concealed agenda. Previous public consultations have shown that our wishes are NOT heeded. In this instance, you have compiled buzz-words: "sustainable", "food security", "affordable", "user friendly", to list a few. What do those terms mean? Have you defined any of them? Words, as the Chairman stated in his opening comments (April 10 Forum) are indeed important. Yet ironically no definition anywhere, anything can then be listed as a goal. Who could disagree with terms such as "containment", "increased density", "thriving economy", "enhance our environment", your wish list is endless, seemingly meant to attract and/or pacify people. However how exactly will such goals be implemented? Is it not what we need to know?
55. 4/25/08 7:01 PM I dislike that there is not sufficient public participation and input. I attended some OCP meetings in Nanaimo. We were put at separate tables, so we didn't know what others were saying. We never received any reports on the total outcome. The organization of it all was faulty. It seemed a useless process to me. As I watched community development in and around Nanaimo over the past two years, it was as if what we had said was completely disregarded. The ability of the City of Nanaimo and the RDN to make amendments to the OCP is also faulty. I think that amendments must be taken to the public at large, because the bending and flexing of the policies that goes on weakens the original intent to protect what we have. I also want to see more emphasis on protecting our natural wilderness, park spaces, trees, ALR, especially for increased food production. It doesn't make sense to buy food from other countries, when we have the capacity to produce fresher food here. We need to anticipate risks to our natural environment, our local rivers, our water supply, our aquifers. I understand that the City of Nanaimo and the RDN support the local airport's intentions to expand over the Cassidy aquifer, which is a red zone for vulnerability. Where is the process to protect that aquifer, if not already in the OCP? To protect our environment, our Urban Containment Boundaries should be the framework, within which any growth in this area is contained. The OCP should not be changed to capacitate further growth, before we truly know what we are going to be contending with, in light of weather changes and the economy. Everything in life moves in waves. To maintain balance, we need to be in tune with these waves, not charging ahead, creating a higher peak of development, which will eventually evolve into a crash for which we are unprepared.
56. 4/25/08 7:29 PM Lack of citizen involvement which was the major component of the original Imagine Nanaimo approach.

57. 4/25/08 7:47 PM Encourages sprawl. Doesn't recognize urban containment boundary. Pro - business, Pro- developer, Anti taxpayer/citizen. More of the same Friedman economic policy that is proving so devastating for once vibrant social democracies. No Vision for the future. No future for Nanaimo ever being a healthy sustainable community. Nanaimo becomes a resort destination for the corporate elite where they can jet set in from the oil patch, play a round of golf , gamble to their hearts content, pickup some recreational drugs, a working girl and PARTY, West jet back to Alberta for a bleary eyed Monday morning start. This seems to be the real vision our city council has for our beloved community, with expanded casinos, conference centres, cruise ships, golf courses and Hummers parked in every monster house's drive. Shame on council and their spineless approach. Leaders without vision are simply followers / sheep / lackeys. More of the same unsustainable bs. There was no need to reinvent the OCP. The only reason to reassess was because it had been so bastardized by amendments that it no longer resembled the original. We had a vision. City council chose to ignore and undermine it.
58. 4/25/08 7:56 PM It, like this survey, seems to be drafted to confuse taxpayers. Your survey is written in such a way that most people will not fill it out. Is that what you want? No more highrises on the waterfront! Leave our parks intact! We have enough zoned property in the city already.
59. 4/25/08 8:21 PM The draft Official Community Plan is weak in several areas. Goals 2.7, 2.8, 3, and 5 needs to be strengthened and rewritten. Specific requests regarding those goals are itemized in the "other comments" section.
60. 4/25/08 8:27 PM 1. The give away of the land at the old Arena to commercial enterprise instead of expanding the area of the waterfront park. I think it is extremely short sighted for a growing community with a City Council that says it is acting in the best interests of the people that live here & wants to make it attractive for people to come to the down town area. I don't know about you but it has never been my idea that a nice place to go would be in someone else's front yard. 2. It seems there haphazardness of the building of the new ice sheets near NDSS & now another proposed ice complex to a waterfront area. Given a clean slate how & why would you plan to use the land that we do have to it's best prospective?
61. 4/25/08 8:31 PM I do not see how the City has indicated how it will actually follow the Plan. As far as I can tell the present Plan has not been entirely enforced. I suspect that any elected council will continue to have the power to ignore the Plan whenever it feels the desire to do so. More checks and balances need to be put into place.
62. 4/25/08 8:34 PM Everything
63. 4/25/08 8:43 PM With the pro-development municipal government currently in office in Nanaimo, the OCP has been used only if it suits the needs of a developer who is trying to increase their profit. It will be ignored. Nanaimo is driven by a few financially motivated souls. The OCP is ignored and simply adjusted when the Plan gets in the way of those plans. Nanaimo is proving to be the land where business goes when one needs a handout. Ridiculous "revitalization" projects that will fail and yet there are still no new downtown residents.
64. 4/25/08 9:08 PM I see no plans to entice development of vacant lands in our downtown and south end. All the old gas stations, Texaco at the Pearson bridge, 7-11 at Milton and Nicol, Esso at Bowen and the highway, all vacant for many years. Much of Nicol Street, our entrance to the city, is in need of development. Also, we are seeing a lot of residential areas and industrial areas, growing closer to each other and touching, without any effort to harmonize the sidewalk bylaws. Why is it that a developer can build on "light industrial" land, in between residential and retail, and not be compelled to put in sidewalks? These workplaces generate a lot of truck traffic, and the very least we should expect is a sidewalk. I also am very concerned that what little farm land we have is being rezoned and developed at an alarming rate. With rising fuel and ferry costs, we will need to produce our food here.
65. 4/25/08 9:53 PM It is a travesty that speaks only to Nanaimo Council's ignorance about appropriate and citizen-driven urban planning and Council's adoration of developers, mostly from out of town, who are able to easily persuade Council that they know what is best for our community....NO.
66. 4/25/08 10:24 PM There is a loss of community spirit and a feeling of belonging. Too many people are here to make a bit of money and then disappear to somewhere where the housing taxes are far less, and there is a better feeling of "bonding" within a community.

67. 4/25/08 11:16 PM We should stick with the official ten year plan and not extend the boundaries.
68. 4/25/08 11:29 PM See #3
69. 4/26/08 2:11 AM Extension of urban containment boundaries.
70. 4/26/08 2:54 AM Extension of UCB. Release of rural resource lands, "Urban Reserves."
71. 4/26/08 3:22 AM 1. It was not created by citizens of Nanaimo. 2. Has not addressed that condos can be built (again) in our parks. City has not closed the laws so that any and all parks can never be negotiated by councils to advance any cause. Condos in parks should only proceed by a referendum vote in the community, with a 60% approval.
72. 4/26/08 4:24 AM The lack of intelligence and any sense of community mindedness. The plan has overturned all that was set up in the original plan of 15 years ago. It speaks to the inability of city council to have any sense of community or history. You might as well blow up Nanaimo and start from scratch as if it never existed. Shameful, there is no long term vision. The convention centre is a perfect example. I have heard numerous programs on CBC that talk about difficulties places like Victoria and Vancouver have attracting conferences. With the increased capacity of computer technology, people who would normally have networked at a conference are now doing it in virtual reality. Where is the human decency to look at issues of homelessness and poverty in Nanaimo?
73. 4/26/08 5:35 AM OCP does not relate terms in earlier Plan Nanaimo such as nodes to actual development, and issues such as recent school closures. Urban containment and development such as Cable Bay does not demonstrate consistent support for nodal or town centre development. Including words like "trends" suggests that future principles will again be waived for developers advantages, i.e. additional heights on high risestoo much "wobble room."
74. 4/26/08 5:44 AM Lifting of the 15-storey building cap in Nanaimo's historic downtown to permit more high rise towers along the waterfront- this is ridiculous that our parks that we strived so long and hard to get will now be hemmed in by highrises. We all know that these people will soon be complaining about all the noise and the parking problems that are bothering them.

Question 3.

Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	73
<i>answered question</i>	73
<i>skipped question</i>	12

Comments Received

#	Response Date	Comment
1.	3/13/08 5:50 PM	I think you're doing a pretty nice job.
2.	3/14/08 9:01 PM	I didn't understand all the gray areas in Map 1 Future Land use plan. There didn't seem to be a legend of that colour and it covered a lot of the city.
3.	3/14/08 10:42 PM	This town and the region in general should be aggressively marketed to big business, by that I don't mean "box stores", but R & D companies, manufacturing and multi unit housing projects with both rental and purchase units. The planning and development departments, along with city council need to start thinking outside the box. As for housing - affordable rental housing is great - but a social issue. Affordable housing to purchase is also an issue; there is a pool of affordable housing for renters to purchase right under our noses. Strata titling units strictly so that tenants can buy where they are living is a political win for this city, council, the tenant that is now a homeowner, and the landlord has free capital to reinvest.
4.	3/15/08 2:24 AM	I would love to take a bus, but Harewood Mines Road up to and past Western Acres Road is apparently not even to be considered in the next 5 years, and being already a senior, walking up and down the hill is not an option, so therefore like many of my neighbours, vehicles will still remain the only mode of transport.
5.	3/15/08 5:10 AM	This process is waste of time. Recommendations are rejected for benefit of special interests. Any promise of future tax revenue, no matter how speculative by developers, results in abrogation of any and all recommendations / public interests. What is point of consultation when overwhelming adverse reaction to a project is ignored and project is forced upon the electors and taxpayers?...often to the severe detriment of citizens who ARE DENIED ANY VOICE, for example the destruction of the village character of Cedar for the enrichment of non-resident profit seekers.
6.	3/15/08 1:57 PM	As part of OCP, hope services like roads/sewer will be addressed in areas where currently fall short. At Park and Ninth, residents currently don't have sewer system available, although pay annual maintenance fee for that service. Hope poor road condition of Park Avenue between Ninth & Tenth will be addressed. Hope other areas in Nanaimo without some of these services will also be addressed.
7.	3/15/08 2:49 PM	Can't read it.
8.	3/15/08 7:51 PM	No
9.	3/16/08 4:14 AM	A travesty of "Democracy" - lip service to idea of democracy when, at drop of hat the next biggest/best developer will have his way with Council no matter what OCP says. Be honest; OCP will be amended to suit development no matter long term impact. Why waste taxpayer time & money, & time of self serving Committees for this sham.
10.	3/19/08 12:34 AM	Yes. Press hard to ensure that the airport is extended and the appropriate landing requirements are installed to attract larger jet aircraft. If we don't Courtney/Comox will become the Island "HUB" and Nanaimo will lose that advantage.
11.	3/28/08 10:35 PM	Please consider rewriting the section on Nodes, it is much too verbose and technical for me and I have a Masters Degree. Seems to have been developed from graduate level textbook in Planning and personally I do not have the time or inclination to study this text, no doubt as many other of us laypeople. Tell us what it is, paint a picture. The concept seems to me impossible to attain in a fully developed community such as ours without major zoning and reconstruction program; however it is an intriguing principle. Do our City leaders and bureaucrats have the fortitude to pull it off? I hope so. As a 61 year old individual easy access to necessities is quite appealing. I am a bicyclist and exclusive ped/cyclist thoroughfares are appealing. Provide more than one safe major arterial and safe tributaries (no 6" deep ditch to fall into). Thank you and entire PNAC for all the effort and volunteer labour you have put into this effort.

12. 3/28/08 10:43 PM I just completed the survey and went to the next page where it is disclosed that I am eligible for a prize drawing, very nice thank you. Perhaps you might consider making that known on Nanaimo Homepage.
13. 3/30/08 3:01 AM I look forward to the Beban Park discussion.
14. 3/30/08 3:37 AM WHY ONLY THREE QUESTIONS? WHY do I have to identify myself to have this submitted?
15. 4/1/08 5:20 AM I'm disturbed that City Hall is considering ultra high density high rises in outlying areas such as Woodgrove. These are only suitable for high density urban areas and will ruin the great natural beauty of Nanaimo. Some of the most livable and beautiful cities in the world (e.g. Paris, London, Amsterdam, Rome, Athens) all restrict the construction of high-rises. High rises typically create more problems for cities than they resolve and cities take these on only when they have to. Usual residents of these high rises are young urban professional couples who can afford their high cost of construction and wish to live close to the urban core where there are high rise office buildings, high rise parking garages and the specialized services they need. The unit sizes are too small and expensive for young families and most retirees.
16. 4/1/08 9:34 PM Do not move the current Urban Containment Boundary. Let the residents who purchase in this area continue to enjoy the semi rural atmosphere!
17. 4/4/08 4:03 AM The proposed densities for neighbourhoods and neighbourhood commercial centers are of a concern. I question the application of the upper limit of 50 units per hectare on existing neighbourhoods. In Departure Bay for example recent multifamily development densities of 25 units per hectare appear very dense when compared to surrounding areas (3008 Hammond Bay rd for example). Fifty units would be totally out of character. The upper limit of the commercial center designation (150 units per hectare) would seem to be totally in contradiction to the Departure Bay neighbourhood plan which called for 2 and 3 storey buildings only, in the commercial area. I am disappointed that the document does not try to deal with the conflict that exists over the densification issue (everyone thinks it is a good idea but nobody wants it in their neighbourhood). Why not recognize this contradiction and develop some policies to try to deal with it (ie as the vision statement says- allow meaningful community participation in planning decisions. Rather than the current approach of involving the community too late in the process).
18. 4/4/08 5:06 PM The location of the identified urban reserve areas is of concern to me as there has been very little discussion with the public about what areas of the city (if any) would be best suited for this. A more reasonable approach in this draft would be to identify that there is a need to have an in depth discussion on locations of very long term growth centres. Several options could be identified for further consideration. The two locations proposed could be one option; another might be a southern extension of the downtown core, possibly including the assembly wharf lands. This area is already serviced by a major 4 lane roadway (Nicol street) and a well developed road network and will likely be prime for redevelopment in the longer term. This may also provide much needed economic opportunities on the adjacent First Nations reserve lands. This approach would seem to be more consistent with sustainability goals. The proposed Linley Valley urban reserve is of particular concern to me. Currently there is no arterial road network serving the area, therefore major roadway expansion will be required, potentially having a significant impact on surrounding neighbourhoods and park land. The OCP mentions the need to develop an area plan for the reserve area but it doesn't mention developing a plan for how surrounding neighbourhoods and the park will be impacted. We need more discussion on what the long term vision for the city is, and how very long term urban growth can best be accommodated.
19. 4/4/08 10:16 PM I also believe that residents should be able to subdivide their land to gift or sell to family members at any time without a waiting period.
20. 4/8/08 7:38 PM What is being done to encourage quality development in the City, besides the Conference centre? Is city working with industry and private landowners to ensure a coordinated approach to future development in the City?
21. 4/8/08 10:16 PM Would like to see city working with private landowners, regional districts and industry to ensure successful future development. I believe the new Conference Centre was a very bad deal to all tax payers of Nanaimo.

22. 4/9/08 6:25 AM Encouragement: Nanaimo has a beautiful setting: it should not yield the downtown to vehicles any more: start by experimenting with pedestrian focus during tourist season and cruise visits, then build on the successes.
- make the downtown a uniquely pedestrian experience with street kiosks for vendors, food, planters and plants, public art, and street entertainment, all radiating from the library plaza (Munich and Freiberg provide substantial car-free zones; we walked the 2km long Marienstrasse in Munich from our hotel for two days before looking for transit services)
 - Include more emphasis on public art, especially along seawall development below Stewart Ave. (Malecon in Puerto Vallarta)
 - consider more emphasis on providing dockage for tourist boats in the inner harbour to bring the people into the downtown core (e.g. Ganges example)
 - missed opportunity to focus on a more pedestrian oriented downtown, one supported by a frequently scheduled continuous downtown-loop bus circuit to remove/reduce vehicle density from core (free rides on the loop bus)
23. 4/10/08 5:06 AM I can't stress enough how important I think it is to promote community and urban agriculture in Nanaimo. I have heard statistics that upwards of approx. 94% of our food is imported here. We are living in the most fertile place in Canada, peak oil is a very real factor and I think it will be of GREAT benefit to people, Nanaimo and community to work towards having a little(or some) food security. In addition to that, the quality of food that is imported is abysmal and still declining. The Nanaimo community gardens are now located in Chase River which, for many people, is not very convenient and, to me, barely justifies the carbon footprint of the necessity to drive out that far. Anyways, just my two cents. I believe there are even personal health benefits to be realized by people growing their own food and then eating it. MMMMM, it's so tasty, I love it! Thanks for reading. I would appreciate your help with this.
- 24.. 4/10/08 5:19 AM The above points are corroborated by Stats Canada: Between 2001 and 2006, Nanaimo's population rose from 88,257 to 93,903. In that same time the number of farm operators fell from 410 to 295 - a drop of 30% in 5 years. The number of hectares dropped from 8105 to 3965 in this same time - a drop of 50% of the land in agricultural production. We are losing agricultural land in the city at a great rate. The recently announced ministry of Agriculture and Lands plan also emphasizes community agriculture. Nanaimo has the potential to plan for the support that will come with that plan, and to be ahead of the curve of increasing food prices and decreasing food production on the island - if we have concrete policies to support urban agriculture and community gardens. The City of Langford just went through their review. They have an entire section titled, "Our food system". Please see the excerpts below:
- Objective 1 Promote and Support community agriculture. There is a map of the ALR lands in the city
- Objective 2 Promote and support commercial agriculture as a viable business venture. (*In Vernon, one orchard operation has created 500 jobs!) Section 10.3.2 Support municipal purchasing of farmland that is not being actively farmed to protect it from future threat of speculation and the set up of a community trust to manage intensive farm operations on this land for the benefit of the community.
- Thank-you for listening to the citizens of Nanaimo that are working hard for the right to be able to purchase food and food products locally. Many of us believe that it's essential to sustainability, in all ways.
25. 4/10/08 8:28 PM How is building a new arena and sports field in the Buttertubs marsh protecting the environment? Have you seen the state of some streams? Clogged with garbage and eutrophication. Please make the roads more bike friendly, esp. Bowen, Terminal. KEEP THE ROLLOVER curbs!!! The other ones are horrible and destroy and prospect of a natural bike lane because of crack between curb and asphalt. Please make sure that all three "legs" of the sustainability stool are actually equal. It seems that large scale development is on top right now. Also- WE WANT A RE-VOTE on the Referendum re: NNC. It was an unfair outcome what with the Yes side getting funding and the No side struggling to be heard amongst the glamour. Meanwhile the No side actually has the real interests of people and the environment in mind, with SMART GROWTH, low profile, go with nature not against it.
26. 4/10/08 8:32 PM Yes we need development, and I would rather it go in the city then out around lakes and on the waterfront, but I do think that there needs to be SERIOUS consultation with the citizens within the urban node areas.

27. 4/10/08 10:20 PM Generally, I find the OCP weak and lacking vision. It seems like things are worded in such a way that the City really doesn't have to DO anything about it. For instance... "The impact of any proposed development on energy use and air, water, and land quality shall be examined by the applicant for development and they must provide an evaluation of impacts on energy use and the environment." So you will examine things. Big deal. What happens beyond evaluation? How will you actually use this to create a better Nanaimo? I would be interested to see a map showing the changes in Nanaimo's Urban Containment Boundary since it was established in the 1980s. I would also be interested to know why the new UCB seems to go against the policies laid out in the RDN Regional Growth Strategy. Policy 2 of this section states that future changes will be considered based on ... "the City deems there is a community need". I would like to see a definition of "community need".
28. 4/11/08 3:58 AM I would just like to stress the increasing importance of urban agriculture and community gardens. The fact that Vancouver Island now imports about 90% of its food is truly shocking.
29. 4/12/08 12:20 AM The following is somewhat of a summary of comments I made at the meeting of April 10. My focus is on the "big picture". That is, what's happening to the WORLD we live in, not just the very small little part we call "City of Nanaimo". The real issue (to planning at all levels) is our overconsumption of ALL our natural resources, world wide. We are just now starting to come to some realization of what we have done (to ourselves) to our planet and the effects that are now coming home to roost! It is about Global Warming... but that is just an EFFECT. The CAUSE is our patterns of consumption and over-use, world population, etc. etc. etc. Most people (all?) are still in denial about the truth of our situation, perhaps especially so in the very comfortable West Coast setting we find ourselves, here, living in. The world is a finite resource. Some scientists now estimate that for us to continue on with the level of resource consumption we are now living at, it would take 4.5 worlds to sustain / support us! Clearly, given the emerging nations like China & India, etc. our present level (of world consumption of resources) is going to pale in comparison to what it will be only a few short years down the road. So, when the city puts all this energy into planning an OCP for our future, it really is like a mosquito on the rump of an elephant! Of absolutely ZERO consequence in anything like a "bigger picture" setting. None the less, following a few ideas more in keeping with what I think you were hoping to receive as feedback on this OCP. The plan has a number of (unchallenged?) assumptions underneath it. One is the idea of "growth" or "constant growth" as a necessity for our lives. Is that actually true? The word "sustainability" is used often in the OCP but nowhere do I see a definition of what is meant by sustainability. It's like it's such a 'given' no one thought to identify what it is we are really saying or moving toward! A corollary idea is that of "sustainable growth". I suggest that is an oxymoron! Certainly, given our global problems, it is becoming ever more abundantly clear that we cannot sustain even the level we now are at, never mind thinking of GROWING in a sustainable way! So, my point is: the premises underlying your work as OCP planners is faulty at its core assumptions and ideas! But, I think this is too big a concept for you to address, so you likely will simply ignore it. So, I'll try & make what I hold to be some constructive, more concrete suggestions. Please add a VISION statement, or a statement of purpose addressing some of the issues I have raised above. "Without vision the people perish". That is, address (first) why you think an OCP is necessary - what you're trying to accomplish as a goal for Nanaimo by doing this exercise, relating it to the "big picture" or what's happening globally! at least acknowledge the relationship! THEN, with you're assumptions about the way the world is, stated, you can try & move to a deeper level of specificity. Similarly: OCP goal #4 talks of a link between "prosperity and quality of life". Again, this seems to be a statement of BELIEF with a whole bunch of assumptions underlying the belief that have not been given any supporting data. Too, what are the definitions of those terms? How can one go forward in trying to plan for things like "prosperity & quality of life" when you haven't taken the time to clarify what they mean to you? I think, given the state of the world as I allude to above, my idea of "prosperity" and "quality of life" might well differ considerably from what your idea of those things is! So, who are you planning for? Me, or you? My understandings or yours? Nowhere do I see those kind of questions addressed in this plan... thus the "mosquito and the elephant" analogy. Example: One of the staff reported the population of Nanaimo will rise 50% in the next 25 years. (80,000 to 120,000) And, the "Cable Bay" project was raised. Please tell me (in the plan) how a population increase of that magnitude, or the addition of a project

like Cable Bay, will add to my "prosperity or quality of life" as a present and future resident of Nanaimo? I think, given my arguments about global overconsumption of resources, and recognizing Nanaimo is but one small microcosm that equates very well to the larger perspective, that my prosperity and quality of life CANNOT be enhanced by either of those factors! Indeed, I suggest those kinds of factors CANNOT but DECREASE my quality of life, given our finite resource base that is being continually depleted! Mother Nature is, right now, teaching us harsh lessons (globally & locally) that will only be getting more and more harsh until we look beyond the level you seem to be focused upon in this planning exercise! "Densification" is one buzz word for Nanaimo's future. I understand the concept in relation to trying to make things more efficient. But, a theoretical question (or is it?) What is the "perfect level" of densification you are striving for as a goal? What is the level of densification for Nanaimo at which I could identify, for my own personal life as a citizen of Nanaimo that my "prosperity and quality of life" are enhanced and beyond this level they will deteriorate? What are the upper limits of densification that you might 'plan' as successful for Nanaimo? Does Nanaimo want (are you planning for) densification at the level of Victoria? Vancouver? New York City? Hong Kong? Unless you've considered these kinds of questions, you're "whistling in the wind" I suggest! You're not planning for prosperity and quality of life, rather your planning to limit the out-of-control affects (harm reduction strategy) that are absolutely coming with a 50% increase in population. Nanaimo (as microcosm) has an even more limited resource supply than the macrocosm (Mother Earth) has! Last point: I think City Council has a large credibility gap with its electorate that seems has developed and expanded over the past few years. Seems to be a trust issue - why else so many angry people coming out to the meetings, those that bother to come at all? Of course, this is not limited to Nanaimo, but seems endemic in any/all political arenas now-a-days. Could there be a clue here? My sense is that this has developed because the council has not addressed the REAL issues at the level of CAUSE... and so people re feeling left out, resentful and distrusting every time an issue arises. The Cable Bay issue (discussed by many at the meeting) can serve as a good example. bill Holdom said it is not the case, but the OPTICS are that is a "done deal" and I don't think anything Bill Holdom said changed anyone's mind about that at that meeting at least. It's a shame! It will be interesting to see what the final outcome is to that specific issue.

30. 4/12/08 2:25 PM Further expansion of the south end will enhance the downtown area. Also when the airport expands it makes sense to expand the South end.
31. 4/14/08 6:18 PM I am torn on the idea of the "urban reserve". I agree that it is reasonable to set aside space for future development. What I don't like is the implication that it could be developed at any time if certain conditions are met. The primary condition on development of "urban reserve" land should be that all other areas have reached their densification target. Otherwise, we are not controlling growth, we are just making different rules under which urban sprawl will continue.
32. 4/15/08 2:58 AM Point 1 (p3) which states "There is sufficient capacity of vacant or underutilized lands....seems to be in conflict with Goal 1 (p13) paragraph 3. Point 2 (p3) is disturbing. Does this mean that any people who want to live in new single family housing will be unable to get it in Nanaimo? How is that progressive?
33. 4/18/08 2:21 PM Why are you diminishing the role of neighbourhood plans?
34. 4/20/08 12:36 AM I am pleased to note that the offer I made to provide an advisory committee to the social planner to help draft food security policy was accepted and meetings will soon be under way. Good global warming policy is also needed. Have you noticed that the pursuit of agrofuel solutions is now fully exposed as a false trail?
35. 4/21/08 12:13 AM 1. We would like the Departure Bay Neighbourhood plan to be considered more important in respect to the Departure Bay Area. Specifically, with regard to density etc. 2. Linley Valley arterial road access to decongest Hammond Bay Road is crucial especially if any residential development in the area occurs. 3. Extending the waterfront walkway from the ferry terminal to Departure Bay Beach as soon as possible should be a priority.
36. 4/21/08 12:21 AM I am very concerned with the amount of traffic on Hammond Bay Road and Departure Bay with a school nearby. There really needs to be a road through Linley Valley to take some of the pressure off these roads. I was very disappointed to read that the walkway from the BC ferries to Departure Bay is such a low priority. I would suggest doing it in stages so that the Cilaire part could allow the walkway to at least reach the road in DBay. We have waited for years for this development and feel it would be a tremendous addition to Nanaimo's walkways.

37. 4/22/08 5:06 AM I feel that the integrity of our existing neighbourhoods must be protected. New developments should be in harmony with their surroundings. The Departure Bay area should be developed with the guidelines outlined in the Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan to preserve its unique character.
38. 4/24/08 5:37 PM What are the sewer and water plans for north Nanaimo and specifically Lantzville?
39. 4/25/08 3:43 AM The neighbourhood signs on our streets need to be updated in the Hammond Bay area.
40. 4/25/08 5:26 AM This document is the child of consultants and staff without a community driven vision.
41. 4/25/08 6:44 AM Affordable housing: for any building permit to be issued, require explicitly that each developer builds a certain percentage of new affordable housing units out of all new units in a given project. Food security, Local Food Production: protect all existing land used for farming or any other (small scale) vegetable/fruit production also within the city limits from speculation and from rezoning. Provide environment in which citizens who are so inclined are encouraged to produce at least part of their food consumption locally. Public Transit: make it more affordable: bus fare for two people should be less than the price of gas needed to drive a smaller car from one end of the city to the other. Then people would switch from cars to public transit in droves, and public transit would pay for itself easily even with reduced fares. Explore the introduction of an equivalent of "route taxis" very popular and successful in some countries (Russia, Turkey, ...). These are essentially van running along fixed routes very often but at irregular intervals so that they are always as full as possible. The fare is just a little bit higher than for city buses. Try to do something about the lack of family doctors. Encourage the establishment of community clinics (see initiative of Co-op in this field). Could it be possible in cooperation with RDN to extend the E&N cycling trail as far towards Parksville as possible?
42. 4/25/08 7:03 AM Besides the urban sprawl that is advocated by City council, I am very much against the wall of towers that are going along the downtown waterfront. No character there. Very sad.
43. 4/25/08 3:34 PM The City should stop being a bully as far as imposing its decisions on other areas in the RDN. The urban containment boundary should be put back in place, and densification carried through. All development plans should be open to public review, and should be assessed for their impact on costs to taxpayers as well as the environmental long-term impacts.
44. 4/25/08 3:43 PM The City does not have enough space for the future; more well considered schemes should be actively encouraged by the City. The city needs to look at the future 50 years and understand who its neighbours are. The shape of the city will need to change from being long and skinny to full-figured. The impression that we are hemmed in on the west by Mt. Benson is only partially correct. The city needs a model sustainable 'like' development that incorporates the new features and quality of developments that are occurring elsewhere in the Province and beyond. A 30 year plan should be developed.
45. 4/25/08 4:54 PM I have provided a separate, more specific comment; which I have emailed to Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee. Thanks....
46. 4/25/08 5:03 PM Yes I live in Townsite and feel there should be restrictions on high rises. It should not be city council who has the final say, but the citizens who live there. Maybe you could take some pointers from the town of Ucluelet. I attended the last meeting at Beban Park and the people of Nanaimo took time out of their busy schedules to attend and they voiced some very good points, but I felt the plan is a done deal as well as Cable Bay. I don't believe that any changes will be made and the only way to make change to get a new city council. As a long time Nanaimo resident , I will not be voting for any of the current counsellors and mayor except Lloyd Sherry, he is the only one who listens to the people.
47. 4/25/08 5:35 PM You work for the people on our money, act like it!
48. 4/25/08 5:50 PM Return to the original OCP, and the original wording which was agreed upon by the citizens.

49. 4/25/08 6:51 PM I meant to speak out during the April 10 Forum. But when I am faced with administrators so obviously uninterested in the common good, I feel ashamed for them. I say to myself: How can they plan other people's lives with disregard? Emotions aside, a linguistic analysis of your proposal is most revealing. Tell me how you can reconcile:
-"containment", "condense" and actually extending the City limits.
-"thriving economy" and building another huge commercial centre, in effect once more killing a struggling downtown. Nanaimo is indeed known as the "Mall City" not the "Harbour City".
-"protect the environment" and constantly rezoning at will to please developers.
-"water shortage" "reduce demand for water" and plans for more golf courses & extensive development.
-"public input" and obscure, undefined, trendy jargon.
Do such contradictions not strike you as odd? Does it imply you don't mean what you say/write or say what you actually mean? What are we to conclude? What is your experience in urbanism? Do you ever use Transit? Do you know that a healthy City is a walkable City? Do you ever question your credibility? I do.
50. 4/25/08 7:01 PM If I didn't have a computer and if someone had not sent me this survey I would not have known about it. I feel that I have to comment on something that I do not have time for, to reflect on, since the deadline to submit is tomorrow. How do the people living on the street get to participate? How do the busy parents and people who work all day participate? Between driving children to their various functions? We don't even live in a society that allows the citizenry to have time to participate in the democratic process. And, nowadays, when people think they can rely on elected officials to represent them, they find that is not the reality. Our representatives are not representing us. They seem to be representing developers, who have the money to pay the taxes that allow for some rich growth for the select, not for the average person, who puts in the labour, without which our societies could not continue. We are all a part of this society, but we are not all equally represented. I would like to know what you are going to do with my/our, the citizens, comments. Will they be written into the OCP? Will they be posted on the Internet? Will others get to see what concerns we have? Do I get to know the outcome of this whole process, by viewing others' comments? Or, will it be like those OCP meetings I attended, that we get to express ourselves, think that our concerns are being taken seriously, and they disappear into never-never land or some weak phraseology that panders to developer desires that are contrary to the intentions of local citizens and the environment?
51. 4/25/08 7:29 PM Although over the last 3 yrs I have not been as able, because of health reasons, to be as active in following community affairs, at the same time I have become increasingly disillusioned with what has been happening in Nanaimo. Despite meetings--back to when I was able to attend--with many citizens expressing concerns of proposals which would be contrary to the OCP, only to have Council amend said plan time and time again. It truly gave the impression that they had already made up their mind(s) and the meetings were mere empty window dressing. The lack of citizen involvement (see 2) in arriving at the draft OCP reinforces this impression.
52. 4/25/08 7:47 PM You flagrantly ignored concerned citizenry, high paid experts and your own skilled and knowledgeable staff. You had a chance to create a healthy sustainable community and you consistently caved into the interests of the corporate elite over the citizens and taxpayers of Nanaimo. At such a critical juncture in history you lacked the courage to take the necessary steps to make Nanaimo a vibrant city, instead it has become a hyper individualized, me first, to Hell with everyone else, ugly, drug and gang ridden, needle strewn mess. You paved paradise and built condo towers, casinos, cruise ship terminals, and expanded roads and airports. Anyone who isn't fortunate enough to have a high end vehicle/personal fortress and is forced to actually walk downtown at night should be afraid. I know I definitely don't feel comfortable and have been unwillingly confronted and verbally assaulted on many occasions. City council needs to get out of their cars once in a while and go for a walk downtown at night and see what our city is really like.
53. 4/25/08 7:56 PM The people of Nanaimo (who pay the bills!), have already spoken and the city is not listening. Of course they haven't filled out this survey. It doesn't ask questions that the taxpayers clearly understand. Is that all the input we have? Listen to the people!

54. 4/25/08 8:24 PM This is to reiterate what was brought up at OCP public meetings and not addressed in the present OCP draft. Please add to the final OCP the following:
Re: 2.7 Resource Protection. Under Objective: "To protect and preserve Environmentally Sensitive Areas", add another Policy statement: "Nanaimo will follow Best Management Practices in their resource protection and land development approvals.
Re: 2.8 Parks and Open Spaces, add another Policy statement: "Nanaimo will not encourage high volume access to Nature Parks or SEAs; and, only 1.5 m boardwalks will be used to enter these sensitive areas.
Re: Goal 3: "Encourage Social Enrichment". Serious consideration for putting a community-based conflict resolution mechanism into to OCP is needed to help resolve conflicts around the interpreting and application OCP objectives and policies. For example, a policy that encourages alternative transportation by using asphalt trails vs. community stewards saying no to asphalt trails because the are following Nanaimo LUP principles, sound science and government guidelines.
At the public meeting for the development of the draft Plan Nanaimo (OCP) the concept of a "Community Ombudsman" was brought up to help with dispute resolution. It is requested that the following policies be added to the OCP:
1. That the position of Community Ombudsman be created; and 2. All Land Use Plans be adopted by making them formal Bylaws.
Re: Goal 5: "Protect and Enhance the Environment" - Request a clear objective be developed that ensures restoration initiatives will be undertaken to repair Sensitive Ecosystem Inventories within Nanaimo SEI Sub-unit. And, enhance the policy statements with the following:
1. Nanaimo will have a "zero-SEI depletion" policy and will ensure No SEI disturbances;
2. In determining access into ESA, Nanaimo work with local environmental stewards and reach agreement on the interpretation of environmental guidelines before a development begins;
3. Nanaimo will follow Best Management Practices at all times;
4. Nanaimo will access the Conservation Data Centre (CDC) at all times and use SEI data;
5. Nanaimo will never cut a wildlife corridor in half or inhibit the movement of wildlife;
6. Nanaimo will never expose wildlife to polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons or build asphalt trails near wetlands or waterways;
7. Nanaimo will follow the following guidelines:
A. Access Near Aquatic Areas; A Guide to Sensitive Planning, Design and Management.
B. Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory: Volume 2: Conservation Manual.
C. Environmental Requirements and Best Management Practices for Land Development Proposals.
D. Land Development Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Habitat.
Thank you!
55. 4/25/08 8:27 PM 1. I think there is certain Dictatorship as to the actions & decisions made for our community. I see the previous official community plan that was worked on by so many & was accepted, being so ignored & discarded and a totally different agenda is being actually followed. It seems we are asked for input but there is an agenda that has been decided & feed back is going through deaf ears & so really it becomes an exercise in futility. No wonder we become jaded & seem to throw up our hands & withdraw. 2. This whole thing seems like a "fast cats" type of thing, build as we go, it might work, at east we will be seen as doing something. Part of this is to do with the Aquatic Centre that doesn't seem to have a place to watch the swim meets or other competition type events. It has meeting rooms that are connected to the noise of the cafeteria area making it sometimes impossible for the meeting presentation to be able to continue. "Room" A & "Room" B are not really separate rooms but 1 room with a divider that does not preclude the sound from one section from interfering with the other section. These things like the roof of the Beban Park pool arena unit also make one scratch their head as to the "Planning" that was put into the facility before it was built. 3 The message you send to our children & visitors & citizens should not be that we embrace & glorify PIRATISM that is a BIG MISTAKE. I think the Nanaimo community "decorating" & presenting PIRATES are good & or it is fun should never have been entered into. Because it doesn't literally happen in our waters does not give us the liberty to glorify it as is done with the decorations. BUT maybe it is happening figuratively in our waters, the waters being our community.

56. 4/25/08 8:31 PM As noted, growth needs to be planned with the close cooperation of the Regional District, otherwise the desire to contain urban growth is unachievable. Mention of this was made on page 17. Concretely, how will the Plan do this? The fact that the City is proposing new communities to the south shows that the urban containment plan is not working. How will this Plan change this? And how can the City entertain adding more communities at the same time as it is adopting this Plan? Too many inconsistencies. Concretely (a bit of a pun here) far more funds need to be put into creating a cycle-friendly infrastructure that avoids mixing pedestrian traffic with bicycles. Bowen Rd. should have two lanes (one in each direction) dedicated to vehicles having multiple passengers, as well as for taxis, buses, and bicycles.
57. 4/25/08 8:34 PM Developer driven as usual.
58. 4/25/08 8:43 PM Please try not to elect pinheads next fall. A dumber group of municipal politicians would be difficult to find. Has anyone on council ever travelled or read a book?
59. 4/25/08 9:08 PM Drive-through fast food outlets are a huge source of litter. Every week I pick up Timmys, A&W, Subway, Mac's wrappers in front of my home. If you are going to license these businesses, then find a way to make them responsible for cleaning up the roads. People, who are too lazy to make a sandwich, are also too lazy to find a garbage can! Also, you could enforce the "loads must be covered" rule at the dump. Presently it is not enforced, and a lot of crap blows off of the back of pick-up trucks heading for the dump. When I phoned the dump, they told me that they clean up the road in front of the dump every week. I explained that the garbage blows off all the way there, not just on the final approach to the dump, they had no good answer for me, but still insist that only commercial vehicles need to be covered? Litter and graffiti create a slummy environment that only gets worse.
60. 4/25/08 9:53 PM Please listen to urban planners who are sensitive to the needs of local people and are able to help create citizen safe, friendly and green urban spaces to live and work.
61. 4/25/08 10:24 PM Yes, but cannot express these without offending some of the council members.
62. 4/25/08 11:16 PM Not at this time.
63. 4/25/08 11:29 PM The following are some thoughts on the revision of planNanaimo. The font originally chosen was COMIC, unsupported in this venue, which fairly describes my view of the revised plan and the process to date. In my opinion if one loses the ability to laugh at the process, despite the ramifications of the stated revisions of planNanaimo, the only alternative would be to leave Nanaimo for a city more progressive in its views towards urban planning. It is extremely disappointing that Goal 5: Ongoing Planning and Community Involvement, has been removed. This enhances the view by many that their input is of little value which has been prevalent throughout this process i.e. the blatant disregard of the opinions of a majority of citizens speaking against the expansion of the urban containment boundary. As stated in Goal 3: Manage Urban Growth of the OCP; "Manage urban growth' means preventing the spread of residential and commercial development into the rural land areas and accommodating growth in the urban areas of the city," accomplished by the establishment of "an Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) to clearly define the boundary between urban and rural areas." The draft plan has, through the machinations of developers and council, effectively eliminated the urban containment boundary expanding it to the very limits of the municipality.
- Neighbourhood Planning
- The current OCP used the methodology that where a conflict exists between a neighbourhood plan and the OCP; the neighbourhood plan would take precedence. The current OCP "Neighbourhood Plans - Old City Neighbourhood Plan " states that "The Old City Neighbourhood Plan, policies and designations take precedence over, and replace, other policies in the Official Community Plan where they conflict. " The draft of the revised OCP has been changed so that the OCP now takes precedence and new Neighbourhood Plans will only be considered for adoption if they are in harmony with the policies of the OCP. This radically undermines the concept of neighbourhood plans and is a serious setback for those neighbourhoods wishing to do Neighbourhood plans. "Each City neighbourhood has a unique character - that combination of history, housing style, physical setting, location and people. They are the 'building blocks' of the city and their diversity and identity contribute to the city's vitality". While 15 neighbourhoods were, at the time, identified only 5 neighbourhood plans have been completed to date which indicates the cities lack of commitment towards ensuring the identity and diversity stated above. The whole philosophy of neighbourhoods as building blocks of community has literally been flushed down the toilet.

New Goal Three: Encourage Social Enrichment

The notions of “encouraging social enrichment” and becoming a more “socially sustainable community” were more appropriate as underlying goals, objectives & principles of Building Complete Viable Communities when identifying where affordable housing, schools, recreation centres, and urban agriculture will be permitted. Likewise, how to achieve safer neighbourhoods, a former goal in and of itself, since removed and now encompassed by two policies, as well as how to create healthy urban environments could be addressed by developing urban design plans for each of the City’s neighbourhoods – not just by applying city-wide guidelines for all neighbourhoods. The Goal, Objectives and Policies around affordable Housing are a tremendous disappointment. Like the majority of this new goal this section has simply been cut and pasted from the original OCP. To add insult to injury the policy “adopt a municipal Property Standards bylaw with effective enforcement provision to maintain accepted health, fire, and building requirements in order to protect the city’s existing stock of rental housing” has been removed altogether. There are simply no new recommendations, with the existing policies weak and ineffective at best. I would strongly suggest perusing Kelowna and Victoria OCP’s with regard to Housing as both, on the issue of housing alone, are extensive. The 1.25 pages devoted to housing in the Nanaimo OCP is shameful to say the least. The objectives and policies to protect heritage resources are commendable even if the majority were simply cut and pasted from the original OCP; removal of the sections pertaining to Heritage in Chase River is however extremely disappointing. Past performance by the City in the area of heritage conservation has been abysmal with a number of Heritage buildings torn down without notice or simply to accommodate development such as the PNC. This clearly demonstrates that the OCP provides no protection for a community’s heritage resources if “new trends” or “changing conditions” are cited, by City Council, to support such destruction. Social enrichment should be inherent throughout the OCP. Policies not just of the proposed goal but all other goals must have strength and not be simply weak kneed statements subject to change at the whim of a spineless council coddling to developers. Relying on other strategies i.e. Social Development might be admirable if in fact they too were not vague and without the teeth necessary to be enforceable. While there is much more that could be stated my passion lies with the above and I will leave it for others to hopefully cover the rest.

64. 4/26/08 2:11 AM We need to consider interests and needs of all residents not just developers. VERY careful consideration should be made re new use of land and to the ENVIRONMENT. Young people in elementary and secondary schools should be included in community planning as well as community elders. Many young people have good foresight and are not focused on simply making profits. Many elders can contribute wisdom and guidance. As global citizens we have a responsibility to make wise decisions as to what we do even on a relatively small scale since our actions/non-actions affect others world wide. Let's do what we can do to eliminate homelessness and hunger. Let's encourage more participation rather than competition particularly in the schools!
65. 4/26/08 2:54 AM Don't disregard the current OCP. Any changes should be well thought out and by consulting and "Listening" to citizens bring the OCP back to where it should be, the will of citizens/taxpayers, NOT developers! Developers should be doing what WE TELL THEM TO DO, NOT developers telling us what they will do and then do it.
66. 4/26/08 3:22 AM No credibility for this city council in their deliberations to a community plan. This should have been done by citizens of the community, taking in a wide range of all kinds of residents.
67. 4/26/08 4:24 AM It is shameful how the city council has put the interests of big business on top of everything else. I am quite disappointed in Diane B. as a city councillor who has done nothing to support the common people despite what I would expect from an NDP member.
68. 4/26/08 5:35 AM Plans need to be reviewed regularly using the same language to better judge how close to plans actual development has been.
69. 4/26/08 5:44 AM This is just another example of Nanaimo council screwing the citizens with Bureaucracy and paperwork then shredding their OCP and letting progress proceed but not in the best interests of the community. Convention centre yes new highrises no!
70. 4/28/08 3:37 PM Faced with the implications of \$100 oil and GHG reduction targets, the City should appoint a Transportation Advisory Committee.