

Summary of Comments Sheets 2008-MAY-06

Sheet	Media	1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?
N-1	Newspaper	In theory, it embraces sound ideas. Hopefully, it will assist, assuming adoption, in the revitalization of the downtown core, which is already in progress.	Your decision to allow the Cable Bay development contravenes Goal One. City Council, once again, has given in to an out of province developer whose sole objective is to make money at the expense of the local residents of Cedar and outlying areas.	I recently heard a speaker say "Cable Bay is good for Nanaimo." Wrong! It's good for MacKinnon and Associates, and their backers.
N-2	Newspaper		Very little maintenance around Buttertubs and Bird Sanctuary area - a lot of weeds, weeds and more weeds, and blackberries. Have received letter regarding for me to clean up vegetation (not my job).	Would like maintenance done so weeds don't encroach onto my property (come out and see the mess of weeds. Nothing has been done in years, only ribbons put up the last few months.
N-3	Newspaper	Nothing at all; 'draft' is highly suspect.	Artificial constraints on developers/builders/assorted riff raff.	Stop Cable Bay. Put City Hall staff back on their meds, especially Berry and Kenning. Fire all councillors, except Sherry.
N-4	Newspaper	It's easy to read and concise. Goal Five sounds good on paper. Does your commitment stretch to creating better mass transit options? You have to "walk the talk." People are smart enough to look beyond rhetoric.	Goal Three - Affordable Housing, where is it? Please address the dire shortage of affordable housing. Food Security - please set up community gardens throughout the city. This will enhance food security.	Please do not redefine the UCB to enable development. Please preserve agricultural land. We will need to grow more food locally in the future, as we are an island population and transportation costs will only get higher. Downtown waterfront views must be preserved, and highrises set well back. No highrises on the waterfront!
N-5	Newspaper		Full of airy fairy phrasology, which when translated into layman's language, means nothing.	Preparing a betting pool for the date when the plan is first amended; if so, put me down for the first council meeting after the one which approved the plan.
N-6	Newspaper	It touches on all of the important highlights, from economic emphasis through to social, environmental and structural aspects.	Nothing to really dislike, but there seems little emphasis on "promoting Nanaimo" to the outside community. Investors, future residents, visitors, etc. who could enrich our city might be considered somewhere in the plan.	One concern we have is the unofficial existence of illegal suites. If suites are to be permitted (legal or otherwise), then there must be some way to control the number of vehicles per home. Our street is routinely jammed up with the extra cars brought in by "illegal/legal suite" tenants. Parking issues must be addressed in any plan to increase density in single house residential neighbourhoods. Bylaws are currently not enforced except by exception (ie. complain) - this is not good enough. The front of my home should not become the parking lot for legal/illegal tenants next door - Goal 1.
C-1	Comments	It looks alright. I understand we need better transportation (green, train).		
C-2	Comments		I don't think the UCB should be changed at all - keep the buffer zone. Forget about the golf resort - we don't need it. This must be the concept of what "green space" is to the city! Leave Cedar as it is (I am not from Cedar). We have enough land within the boundaries to densify.	Do our suggestions or comments really matter? I don't think so.
C-3	Comments	Goal #6 - safe, convenient movement. Bikes! Foot transit! Excellent. Reduce auto reliance. Corridors for biking/wildlife. Protect/enhance watercourses. Increase density in urban, reduce sprawl.	Publicize Plan better - more in RDN; haven't heard about it in Parksville. Neighbours in regional district need a voice as we spend a lot of time in Nanaimo.	Looks like it's well thought out. Emphasis on marine ecosystem seems like an afterthought? Too important to city as a side note or lip service.
C-4	Comments	Transit improvements needed, but need to look strongly at fact that people working early hours in malls, etc. can't get to work now by bus, if they wanted to use it. Also, buses don't move well for transferring connections if working shifts at NRGH, etc.	My home is in the yellow of Corridor area (Hawthorne Heights) and am concerned re the future take over and devaluing my property/house as I am improving it with \$\$\$ and do not wish to have multi-family residences, etc in our beautiful older, homey neighbourhood. The new multi-complex at Wakesiah and Jingle Pot is ugly.	
C-5	Comments	Strongly support the expansion projects in South Nanaimo. Both concepts are enlightening and progressive. More residential development in South Nanaimo is needed.	We need more industrial land at Duke Point.	
C-6	Comments	Terrific plan!	I'm assuming with changes, there are some challenges.	Good luck!
C-7	Comments	Good job!	Right on!	You gotta do what you gotta do! Life is progress, not a station.
C-8	Comments	That we are planning at all and reviewing with residents.	That there has been no provision for acquiring rights-of-way for a waterfront trail along all of Nanaimo's waterfront. There was a proposed trail in the community plan of 10 years ago, going from Pipers Lagoon Park to Nottingham Drive in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (see Schedule B). This was eliminated when the NIMBY's who owned waterfront property hijacked the plan.	I would recommend that a freeze be put on all waterfront property (ie. no building permits, no crossing permits, or permits for any other changes in the property) unless a right-of-way for a waterfront path is granted. This would ensure that at some future date a path could be built. This would provide a level route for people to access the downtown area by foot, bicycle, etc without hindering traffic or going up and down hills. I understand this is how Victoria finally managed to obtain their waterfront walkway.
C-9	Comments	I like the wide variety of upgrades being planned. We have to look to the future and that means upgrades and expansions while considering the environment.		
C-10	Comments	I like the foresight and vision of growth.	No control on secondary suites in some areas that did not allow them before.	

Summary of Comments Sheets 2008-MAY-06

Sheet	Media	1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?
C-11	Comments	The inclusion of sustainability, environmental protection of areas, serious reconsideration of our transportation systems, social enrichment and social housing. I also appreciate all of the displays, meetings and open houses that have been held. It's very disappointing to see such a low turnout at these events.	The proposal for a resort at Cable Bay. This is totally counterproductive both to a reasonable Urban Containment boundary for Nanaimo, and to the goal to reduce climate change activities. Council should not even be considering this proposal while talking about infill within the existing UCB. It is totally the opposite of Goal Five and Goal One. Either we follow the OCP or throw the whole thing out. I am very disappointed that you have changed the Urban Containment Boundary so drastically. I'm also still angry at the lifting of height restrictions throughout the city, but particularly downtown, and the green light for highrises along the waterfront. The only highrises allowed should be at higher elevations away from the water.	It's interesting that you don't mention a plan for dealing with our solid waste and moving toward improved reduce, reuse, recycle objectives. I understand this is a regional district function, but the city surely provides the most solid waste within the RDN. There are many significant developments and alternatives we should be adopting and we don't have any time to waste in this area. It's also disappointing that you haven't considered alternative models for lower rise residential / commercial / institutional mix in the Old City, despite many excellent professional presentations on this topic during the last few years.
C-12	Comments	Thank you for providing a forum to present our views.	Need more detail on food security. I am not sure you understand what sustainability is. Your plan reflects growth in construction/developments. A community focus would be more sustainable. Homelessness needs more focus in the plan.	Please include something in the plan for slow moving traffic (electric cars, bikes and scooters). We need to slow down traffic and consumption for fuel. BC is the only province in Canada that has legislated slow moving traffic. Nanaimo is the perfect city to do this in. Be the first city in Canada to have slow moving traffic lanes. Please allow provisions for community gardens in the corridor zones. Thank you for your hard work.
C-13	Comments	Mention of food security, affordable housing, sustainability, urban forest plan.	No backbone, not enough specifics. Lacks a complete food sustainability policy; a food provision plan; should be short term (immediate). It doesn't give any indication that the UCB won't be stretched continually and indefinitely to accommodate each new developer who comes knocking at our door.	Nanaimo's OCP should specifically provide for purchase of agricultural lands within our new City UCB to offer citizens plots (to rent/co-own/lease or other) to grow food. The OCP should make specific recommendations for development of transit and partnership with the island's railway development team to assist people in making a transition from an automobile-based transportation system to a public transit-based system.
C-14	Comments	It addressed all aspects of a city's function; clear maps. The metnion of working toward neighbourhoods that are not so automobile dependent.	Changing the wording without improvement in the plan. Need more concrete plans on alternatives to dependency on automobiles.	There has to be more concrete and committed plans for affordable housing. I suggest that affordable housing be evenly distributed throughout the city. It could be encouraged by allowing zoning for rooming houses. Without scaring off developers, they could be encouraged to have a set percentage of a development that would be available for less financially able people. Likewise, the social services that the poor need, like food bank, counselling, emergency shelter, laundry, lockers and showers, be able to be uniformly distributed throughout the city by zoning allowances.
C-15	Comments	Some parts are reflective of what exists; many changes are in the text and need to be digested. Some lofty ideals (goals) but how are these in sync with more development?	It doesn't reflect consensus and opinion from the infill and containment workshops. The infill needs to be reworked and expanded, and the containment boundaries kept at previous locations, NOT including S. Chase River and Cable Bay. This is a knee jerk reaction to developers' demands, NOT public opinion. Cable Bay is particularly difficult with ecological concerns on the sandstone meadows Garry oak habitat. Where is the sustainability and ecological sensitivity expounded in the Plan Nanaimo goals?	It is a plan that does not show the neighbouring zoning and use along the RDN boundaries. How is this plan sustainable? How does it provide food security? (mentioned on the cards at this forum). Where does this plan provide for low income people? In corridors? The juxtaposition of heavy industrial land and residential/resort centre is poor. Resort Centre will conflict - residents will soon complain about smell and noise - farmland adjacent to 'Resort Centre' may also be a conflict with noise and odours (pigs/chickens, etc). Poor turnout to such an important document may be because people become cynical when their voice is ignored along with others (consensus) - majority opinion.
C-16	Comments	In 10+ years, Nanaimo will possibly double in size. I happily endorse the city in looking at plans to improve quality of life for its citizens. Thanks to the city for support of community gardens.	Cities all around the globe have active plans NOW, not 10 year draft! The public is a great support with willing volunteers ready and green minded. We need the city to guide us NOW!!! Sustainability, edible landscaping, educated high school student gardeners, plans for water supplies, green space, support for farms are my desires.	Like your objectives for food security. See www.cityfarmer.info/school_year_gardens_a_toolkit_for_high_schools_to_grow_food_from_september_to_june . Appreciate your plans policies to improve mobility. Increasing energy costs will mean more bus rides. Please promote public transit...NOW!!
C-17	Comments	As a thesis, it gets an A grade.	Nothing. I have concerns that once implemented, it will suffer radical changes like its predecessor.	As a recent newcomer to the city, I've had to do some quick research, including the principles of the past 10-year OCP. Forgive me if I'm wrong, but it would appear that one of the fundamental principles of that plan was that there should be no high rise development along the waterfront. So what changed? In the present draft, "goal one" is to manage urban growth by focusing urban development within a defined UCB. How then can you reconcile the request of Cable Bay, which seems to have garnered Council support to develop a golf course, five acre lots, etc. This whole issue revolves around the word "credibility".

Summary of Comments Sheets 2008-MAY-06

Sheet	Media	1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?
C-18	Comments	Goal 6 - Improve Mobility and Servicing. I think it is vital to ensure that we are planning to use less vehicle traffic to make us healthier and protect the environment from unnecessary pollution. Please contact our school boards to let them know that we value the ability to walk to school. Keep neighbourhood schools open. Insist on funding for education - we should insist on at least matching 2001 funding levels.		Neighbourhoods need schools. Keep walking and biking - a priority that will keep us healthy.
C-19	Comments		There is not enough reference to neighbourhoods. Pictures in this document show the nice building, but does not represent new neighbourhoods where sterile designs with garage door presentation are the norm. If back alley and front porches were required design components, we would have more livable neighbourhoods.	
C-20	Comments			Andrew Tucker, in his presentation, referred to people of the downtown area who do not want higher density. This is a groww misinterpretation of disucssions at Bowen Park meeting to talk about densification. People who were there, as I was were against high rise densification. There are many other models of higher density housing which would be acceptable. If it is possible for staff to misinterpret community concerns with that comment, then what value is there for people to go to such meetings and put forward their ideas and opinions.
C-21	Comments	Sustainable neighbourhoods. Preserving parklands and open space. Social enrichment. These are great plans, how will they actually be achieved?	It does not protect school lands. Schools belong in neighbourhoods within realistic walking limits! The plan should include preserving existing school lands and public lands, making it impossible for them to be sold to private developers or interest groups. Currently, is very little joint cooperation with SD68 to include social enrichment within existing social centres, schools.	
C-22	Comments	An attempt to focus on sustainability and protection of the physical and social environment. Inclusion of a food security strategy.	Lack of specificity on categories within the fod security policies (eg. develop a food system strategy"). Lack of urgency for a food system strategy, placing it into a medium term timefram of 5-10 years, when arable spaces within the city (and possibly the region) will have been depleted by development.	Strongly urge that an organization such as Foodlink Nanaimo be asked to make a proposal for funding to implement the development of a "food system strategy", such a report to be tabled within 18 months. That the food system strategy recommend objectives with specific action steps and suggested timelines for implementation. That the food system strategy identify funding concerns and solutions affecting the implementation of such strategies. Include community information, education, and involvement strategies.
C-23	Comments	Suggest improvements. (1) Conserve water - composting toilets and graywater systems for gardening. (2) Ban pesticides, herbicides, etc for home and city use; hire students to chop weeds, provide employment and be truly green. (3) Food security now - community gardens, encourage backyard gardening, save farm land for active farmers now. Do not build houses on it, encourage farming with reduced taces and local markets. (4) Keep our waterfront lands public - buy back Cable Bay and keep it for public use. These lands are polluted with pulpmill discharges - not safe for kids. We need trees for oxygen. Keep our trees, encourage naturesscaping in all housing developments for birds and small creatures, corridors for deer, etc.		You are human too, equally affected by congestion, pollution, lack of water, food and air - please get back to basics because \$\$ won't matter when you're sick. Trust me, I've been there.
C-24	Comments		There seems to be a disparity between the goals of Plan Nanaimo vis a vis the densification and the Plans objectives to control urban sprawl. Witness the number of huge homes being built in north Nanaimo, in which it appears only a couple of people live. There is too little emphasis on the constructiono f housing for the disabled and for low income families. I would far rather see my tax money spent on tis type of housing than on infrastructure for new areas housing only the wealthy.	I am a person with a disability for hich I need a scooter, not a wheelchair. I see a time coming when I will no longer be able to drive and so will be required bus transportation. What service (other than handidart) is available on public transit? So far I have never seen anyone get on or off a bus with a scooter.
C-25	Comments	Encouragement to mixed density areas. Also the social aspects of the plan, but we need more residential areas; all need to include some affordable housing and some of the social programs.	Two things: (1) I do not believe we should extend the UCB; we need our greenspace; we should encourage higher density and using vacant land within UCB. (2) I do not believe we should zone for resort - high end community at Cable Bay. I believe in mixed housing (that is mixed valued), we need affordable housing not resorts.	

Summary of Comments Sheets 2008-MAY-06

Sheet	Media	1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?
C-26	Comments	That it exists. Inclusion of food security.	Lack of focus on neighbourhoods / community centres. Lack of a concrete and specific plan for promoting cycling and discouraging driving. Centralization of hospital / health services.	Complex document and broad implications; give the public more time to review, discuss and imagine these changes, and to come up with alternatives and have many opportunities to voice these. When consensus does not exist or when the way forward is unclear (eg. Cable Bay), err on the side of caution and preservation. The process of densification requires that people know each other and desire to live closer together; this means getting used to sharing space (eg/ gardens, recreational areas, beaches, marketplaces, etc). People need public places to gather, share, celebrate discuss and exchange ideas if this shift is going to happen. Consider other definitions of "growth" besides physical and economic. what about personal growth? Community growth?
C-27	Comments	That we have one! That the community is invited to give input. That it is a working document. Social mix of housing mentioned. Please provide more specifics (ie. 1/3 affordable, 1/3 intermediate, 1/3 market housing).	Changes to Urban Containment Boundary. Deforestation of the Nanaimo community. Elimination of ongoing planning and community involvement. Lack of specifics with policies that back up the words re: affordable housing and food security.	Focus on neighbourhood densification and put the brakes on any expansion to the Urban Containment boundary; this will encourage community and protect the little wilderness left for our citizens. Secure land for food production and encourage farmers in their work; establish targets with the farmers. We need specific targets long-term for the city housing policies - we have had much talk about affordable housing over the past two years and no buildings constructed; we need policies that demand affordable housing as part of contractor's deals - not just a donation to a fund; along with buildings, we need maintenance standards in place. Nanaimo has been designated a cultural centre; where is the support for the arts in this plan? Include air security in the plan, with specifics to keep our air quality excellent. Include a component on public education.
C-28	Comments	Forces us to think and develop a slight bit of consensus.	Urban containment boundary is threatened and there is nothing to protect green spaces, Linley Valley and adjoining properties (eg. provincial lands). Worry that this is window dressing for piece by piece cutting of trees and disappearing green spaces.	Please consider granny suites and an 'urban farm' designation with tax credits.
C-29	Comments	Some of the corridors, sustainability still not clear enough, but like that it is used. I would like sustainability on the draft more if it included ecological footprint reduction. Sustainability is a good goal. I support environmental protection.	Why economic goal...land use planning is not economic planning. Why are you adding Cable Bay and southlands to UCB - I disagree with destroying OCP! I do not want the Cable Bay development proposal to be put inside the UCB. I also do not agree with the southlands development, especially the big box component. I especially disagree with the golf course and "resort" designation and features. Sustainability should include elements in the definition, such as ecological footprints. reducing carbon emissions, reducing or maintaining current quantities of land for urban use.	Are there too many corridors and/or nodes? How much development is expected. Maybe there should be fewer nodes and corridors. Put highrises on Bowen Road. Corridors could be as dense as urban nodes. This would better promote transit such as in the case of Curitiba in Brazil. Corridors need to be mixed use. I don't think this is addressed in draft OCP. Stores should be required on the first floor of any residential development that is put in corridors.
C-30	Comments	Urban Nodes (don't like the term) make sense. We need to densify.	The UCB should not be changed! The boundary was put in to prevent urban sprawl. Now more than ever we need to protect our rural areas. Every time you move the boundary, you put more pressure on adjacent lands which then get swallowed up. It's time to say no. That's it, no more UCB expansion.	Better coordination between School District 68 and the RDN re a regional growth strategy. Maintain any surplus school property as public open space for use by the neighbourhoods. Increase funding to acquire more parkland within the city; once the land is developed, it's gone. Much stiffer penalties for illegal cutting of trees on city property, eagle trees, etc; fines of \$200,000 to \$500,000 depending on the number of trees cut down.

Summary of Comments Sheets 2008-MAY-06

Sheet	Media	1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?	3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?
C-31	Comments	<p>Wow! The OCP for Nanaimo has words and phrases like trail extensions, preserving views, treeplanting incentives, food security, protecting environmentally sensitive areas, bicycle pathways. This can't be possible. This must be the OCP for some other city. No wait, it is for Nanaimo! This is hard to believe because, in my lifetime, the words 'forward thinkin' and 'Nanaimo' have never been used in the same sentence. On that note, I'm highly wary of any new 'plan' for this funny city, but the mere fact that an OCP exists and that it has a positive tone about is highly encouraging and a small step forward for Nanaimo.</p>	<p>The biggest problem with this draft is that it is clearly not for the people and that has always been one of the major failing points of this city. As I've heard said too many times, 'Nanaimo is a city without soul.' This draft is not addressing that issue as an immediate concern. Nanaimo will never be anything but a big blob on the map until it acquires a strong sense of community, nurtures its heart - the downtown, and showcases the strengths of its residents and its natural environment. It needs to find its creativity and show that it is (could be) distinct here on this beautiful island on these lovely shores in the Pacific Ocean bordering the western coast of Canada. People want to come here for that point alone, but many are so disappointed when they see what has happened to that potential. It's time to restore. This OCP says "let's charge around like a bull in a china shop" - faster, bigger, more frenzied - instead of saying 'we're alive like a child' - we can do anything. We can be world leaders, we can make the world proud, we can learn from our mistakes, we can be one of the most vibrant cities in Canada where the</p>	<p>Urban transit continues to have lots of room for improvement in Nanaimo. I read in this draft OCP that people will be encouraged to use their cars less. I don't see mention of any urban rail line and yet the infrastructure is already in place. What happened? If I missed where it is written that the city will get off its butt and provide free continuous rail service from north to south Nanaimo throughout the day on the old E&N line, then pardon me; if not, please go forth, it's a no brainer as they say. There is some sort of plan to extend the waterfront trail into south Nanaimo. Wonderful! But why oh why is this not given IMMEDIATE priority? You want the community to have something to call their own? You want tourists to come here for a man made activity/project - give them a trail to walk, but don't put it so far down the list. Start today! Keep it organic - make it creative - it's a lovely view, don't make a benign walkway please. Encourage a foot passenger ferry to Vancouver - just do it. Preserve views along Stewart Ave. of Newcastle Channel and the inner harbour. This is meaningless as worded. I don't care what colour you</p>
			<p>people are proud to be from. This OCP draft has an emphasis on quantity - it should have an emphasis on quality. Make the next draft for the people - it's not too late. There is way, way too much emphasis on 'encouraging growth' and 'increasing density.' as a matter of fact, this seems to be the main goal of this OCP draft. I don't get it. Getting bigger isn't making Nanaimo better. The senseless sprawl, the shameful loss of natural environment, the huge car culture, the crime, the exploitation of its core community, the endless vinyl villaages - this is the Nanaimo of GREED that this city has become and continues to want to be according to the draft OCP. This is the Nanaimo that makes the news! Some of the best communities have capped growth, have small populations, and are forward thinking. Come on Nanaimo. Endlessly encouraging growth and increasing density is not a step forward for this city. It's already too big for its britches. We need to play catch up and heal this disease. Accept the size. If we focus on issues for the people, then watch</p>	<p>paint Cameron Island, I would much rather see Protection Island and all the other real islands nearby. This is part of the distinct feel of Nanaimo - the harbour, nature, the islands. Every highrise that goes on the waterfront destroys that one unique thing that Nanaimo has a little more. Then what will they come for? There is so much that this city could be. Instead of being "NOMINDO" or "the city without a soul". Nanaimo could lead the way in green cities, artistic communities, beautiful cities in beautiful locations, cities that grow the most food.... There is a lot of good in this draft OCP, but unfortunately there is way too much emphasis on intensive growth and development. Do all the other things first - the growth will come and amazing people will be attracted here and amazing things will happen. Continue on the bigger, faster, fatter theme and Nanaimo will always be playing catchup. Please step up the priorities on the issues I have mentioned.</p>
			<p>who comes - see the quality of new residents, watch the visitors flock to experience a healthy city, it will happen naturally. Don't force growth any longer. I strongly disagree with the CofN supporting the airport expansion in all its ways. This is contrary to so much of the draft OCP - the noise pollution, air pollution, danger to residents, reduction of greenspace, threat to our watershed, reduction of agricultural lands and ALR areas, the especially the degradation of the quality of life of the residents of Area 1 without their blessing and using taxpayers monies to push backroom deals. If the OCP is really going to come to fruition, then it must omit support of the airport expansion. It is contrary to so much of the good the plan is trying to achieve and it is in very bad form to include that statement. If that statement remains, then I believe it effectively cancels any good the OCP is aiming to do. Besides that, I don't think Nanaimo needs any airport expansion right now. There are plenty of nearby airports in convenient locations and we all know that airplanes (and cruise ships) are the most environmentally damaging</p>	

Sheet Media

1. What do you like the most about the draft Official Community Plan?

2. What do you dislike the most about the draft Official Community Plan?

3. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide?

forms of transportation. I DISAGREE with plans (more backroom deals) for "intensive retail service" / "big box" plans for south Nanaimo - highly unnecessary / unwanted (except by SFN / others wanting to grease their pockets). This 'development' further increases blightful urban sprawl that destroyed this lovely city. It does not highlight unique flavour of the existing community - effectively destroys it for more GREED. Think again, I beg of you. I am very concerned food security is not rated for immediate attention. You eat, don't you? Get on it. Preserve and increase farm lands. Encourage urban food gardens and small animal farming within the city. Plan fruit and nut trees, and food plants along with native plants city wide. Edible boulevards. A food rich city. Imagine it. This is one of the best growing locations in the country. Showcase it! A distinct feature of our geography. How could this have been so brushed aside in this draft OCP? Move it to HIGH PRIORITY - public market space in a prime location. Get a community garden downtown and in every neighbourhood. Our future depends on it.