

District of Lantzville

# Official Community Plan Update & Water Master Plan

## **COMMUNITY FEEDBACK**

June 28, 2017 Open House & Response Form Feedback

**July 2017**





# Lantzville- June 28, 2017 Open House

## OVERVIEW

### SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

#### 1. What is your age range?

Respondents: 45

| Choice               | Percentage | Count |  |
|----------------------|------------|-------|--|
| Under 19 years       | 2.22%      | 1     |  |
| 19 to 24 years       | 2.22%      | 1     |  |
| 25 to 34 years       | 2.22%      | 1     |  |
| 35 to 44 years       | 8.89%      | 4     |  |
| 45 to 54 years       | 22.22%     | 10    |  |
| 55 to 64 years       | 22.22%     | 10    |  |
| 65 to 74 years       | 20.00%     | 9     |  |
| 75 years and better  | 11.11%     | 5     |  |
| Prefer not to answer | 8.89%      | 4     |  |

#### 2. What is your gender?

Respondents: 44

| Choice               | Percentage | Count |  |
|----------------------|------------|-------|--|
| Female               | 38.64%     | 17    |  |
| Male                 | 52.27%     | 23    |  |
| Prefer not to answer | 9.09%      | 4     |  |

### 3. How long have you lived in Lantzville?

Respondents: 43

| Choice                  | Percentage | Count |  |
|-------------------------|------------|-------|--|
| Less than 1 year        | 0.00%      | 0     |  |
| Between 1 and 5 years   | 2.33%      | 1     |  |
| Between 6 and 10 years  | 13.95%     | 6     |  |
| Between 11 and 15 years | 16.28%     | 7     |  |
| Over 15 years           | 67.44%     | 29    |  |

### 4. Did you complete a Community-wide Survey?

Respondents: 42

| Choice       | Percentage | Count |  |
|--------------|------------|-------|--|
| Yes          | 71.43%     | 30    |  |
| No           | 21.43%     | 9     |  |
| I'm not sure | 7.14%      | 3     |  |

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU (CONTINUED)

### 5. Using the map below, please identify in which area of Lantzville you own or rent property:

Respondents: 49

| Choice                        | Percentage | Count |  |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------|--|
| A - Clark Drive Area          | 4.08%      | 2     |  |
| B - Owen Drive Area           | 6.12%      | 3     |  |
| C - Dickinson / Peterson Area | 14.29%     | 7     |  |
| D - Village Core              | 2.04%      | 1     |  |
| E - Foothills                 | 0.00%      | 0     |  |
| F - Winchelsea                | 14.29%     | 7     |  |
| G - Lantzville West           | 6.12%      | 3     |  |
| H - The Winds                 | 34.69%     | 17    |  |
| I - Bayview                   | 2.04%      | 1     |  |

|   |       |   |   |
|---|-------|---|---|
| J - Rural areas near Phantom Rd           | 4.08% | 2 |  |
| K - Rural areas near Harwood Dr           | 0.00% | 0 |   |
| L - Farm areas and Winchelsea Golf Course | 2.04% | 1 |  |
| M - Rural areas near Sywash Ridge Rd      | 0.00% | 0 |   |
| N - Rural areas near Lisa Lane            | 2.04% | 1 |  |
| I'm not sure                              | 8.16% | 4 |  |
| I don't live in Lantzville                | 0.00% | 0 |   |

## SECTION 2: DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

OCP VISION & GOALS (Refer to Display 4, link here) 6. Do you support maintaining the general intent of the vision and goals established in the 2005 OCP including: Foreshore to Foothills Village-like commercial centre Semi-rural and rural character Improvement in housing choices Expanded and resilient infrastructure An environmentally-friendly community with an abundance of trees, green spaces, and corridors, walking/hiking/bicycling paths and trails, clean beaches, and a healthy waterfront

Respondents: 38

| Choice                               | Percentage | Count |   |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|---|
| Support                              | 55.26%     | 21    |  |
| Support with refinements (see below) | 21.05%     | 8     |  |
| Don't Support (see below)            | 23.68%     | 9     |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Balanced community feel with affordable housing options.   |
| 2 | More Options for Entry Level Homes.  |
| 3 | I like many elements of the 2005 OCP. What I don't like are the actions currently being taken around "village-like commercial center" and "improvement in housing choices". Council and staff appear to have taken these broad brush statements and interpreted that to mean wide scale development. Mass development to revitalize the core - mass development in order to offer housing choices. I also do not like the path taken around "expanded and resilient infrastructure". Yes, some sewer expansion is welcome and needed. And yes, some water expansion is needed. But, it is evident there is more than enough water available from the wellfield for modest growth. Nanaimo water is simply not needed - but Council and staff are hell bent on that path. |

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 4  | Do not support housing choices that would affect the rural character of Lantzville, i.e. carriage houses or condo developments. Any development should need to be in keeping with character, with a lot of green space and nicer looking buildings. Agricultural land should stay agricultural. |
| 5  | I would like to see my land designation -Estate residential- be changed to match the other properties in my neighbourhood-residential- and have the same right to access the community sewer system and ability to use the land to offer a diversity of housing choices                         |
| 6  | yes leave it alone  |
| 7  | No more density   |
| 8  | Re: " Expanded and resilient infrastructure": support only if the expansion is supported by majority of residents in area being considered; do not support if purpose is to facilitate or increase development or density at the expense of rural/agricultural character of a neighbourhood.    |
| 9  | The "Improvement in Housing Choices" should only apply to the village core and immediate surrounding area. Why must an OCP include GHG policies? GHG polices should be outside land use.  |
| 10 | Land use changes recently have been limited by water availability. If owners want changes and meets standards, proposal should not be restricted because some few persons object to change.   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:



Respondents: 5

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | Keep the old OCP   |
| 2 | No but staff and council will not listen anyway, they do whatever they want  |
| 3 | yes leave it alone   |
| 4 | It is too blah. This community is dying and needs to focus on revitalization. We need more housing for young people and empty nesters. Encourage innovation and variety in new neighbourhoods, including some very small lots for those that don't want, need or can't afford more. Don't waste valuable land in the limited core area on single family dwellings with lawns. Need rental apartment in village for those just starting out. Secondary suites and carriage houses in every neighbourhood. |
| 5 | Vision: All the green font with safety first when developing trails. Goals: Only the green font  |

## SECTION 2 (CONTINUED): DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

7. REFER TO DISPLAY 6, LINK HERE Do you support the Land Use Designations map directions (as shown on Display 6) which maintain most Land Use Designations established in the 2005 OCP, with the exception of some expansion of the 'Village Residential' designation? (Note: There will be opportunity to comment on proposed policy updates for the Land Use Designations later in the response form.)

Respondents: 36

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |   |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 55.56%     | 20    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 13.89%     | 5     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 30.56%     | 11    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Support maintaining existing land use designations. A SMALL expansion of village boundaries would be acceptable.   |
| 2 | Less Density   |
| 3 | yes as long as staff are not fooling around with it  |
| 4 | 2005 OCP   |
| 5 | Include the lands on the West Side of Harwood, South of Aulds in the residential zone.   |
| 6 | I do no support density bonus provisions.  |
| 7 | Do not support expansion of Village residential.   |
| 8 | Lots over 1/4 acre should be the exception and not the norm, we have lots of those already. Allow some very small lots in every neighbourhood, for affordability and variety, especially in new neighbourhoods to make up for those where there is no opportunity to integrate them. |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 5

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|---|---|
| 1 | The desired growth rate expressed by 67% of residents is < 1%. Our land use designations for the duration of this OCP update need to incorporate that in some manner in order to "plan" accordingly. Why permit doubling the size of the town when the majority does not want it.             |
| 2 | I dont agree that my land use designation Estate Residential property is excluded from access to the community sewer .I also want to be included with the majority of my neighbours that are designated Residential.Estate residential designation is too limiting and these properties could |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
|          | offer a diversity of housing choices and enhance the character and look of Lantzville while giving the residents the same choices as large developers  |
| <b>3</b> | no trying to turn lantzville into nanaimo  |
| <b>4</b> | Estate residential property at the end of Norwood Drive should be residential or rural residential, compatible with surrounding properties. Smaller lot sizes are supported by already installed services. |
| <b>5</b> | No density Bonus Provision.  |

8. REFER TO DISPLAY 7, LINK HERE The 2005 OCP required Comprehensive Development Plans for part of the Village and the Foothills to provide an opportunity for more detailed planning and engagement about these areas prior to rezoning. Do you support the concept of adding Comprehensive Planning Areas to include other larger properties with development potential (as shown on Display 7) to allow more specific local policies to be considered for these locations?

Respondents: 37

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |
|---|------------|-------|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 40.54%     | 15    |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 10.81%     | 4     |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 48.65%     | 18    |

| #        | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|----------|---|
| <b>1</b> | Input from residents is important   |
| <b>2</b> | Input from residents is important   |
| <b>3</b> | Strongly disagree with CPA inclusion of Upper Lantzville Superior Road parcel. Detrimental to the ALR parcels across the road, detrimental to the character of the neighbourhood. I believe the inclusion of this parcel is to facilitate increased development/density; it would be a benefit for the developer not for the community.   |
| <b>4</b> | Sure - bring it on, but retain the spirit of Lantzville's unique semi rural uniqueness. I mean seriously doubling the density in the Ware rd. area from 66 ph to 139 and Superior area from 129 to 270 is not what Lantzville wants -and really, adding secondary suites as well! Good grief. This kind of development appeals to developers and creating an unnecessary tax base. So - develop the larger properties but maintain 2005 directions  |
| <b>5</b> | The Farm Cluster concept is a concern. The identified parcels are designated residential and currently zoned residential and have been for many years. Encouraging farming opportunities on land available as a result of clustering is not acceptable. Land use conflicts with adjacent residential properties will arise. This has certainly occurred elsewhere. The presented displays provide no details on proposed policies or direction for Farm Clusters. Properties under consideration are predominantly cleared already (this area feeds a fisheries creek). The trade-off between larger lot single family and cluster housing would have to be beneficial. |

6 Absolutely, allows for both greater opportunity for public input and creativity.


If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 10

| #  | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|----|---|
| 1  | We need to allow developers to be able to succeed in creating new growth.   |
| 2  | Allow more freedom for developers to be creative.   |
| 3  | Comprehensive development zoning takes the decision-making of land use away from residents because it encompasses many possible types of development which remain unknown until a proposal is submitted. And recently staff has taken the position that development applications are protected by FIPPA, therefore residents have no idea what is unfolding until a PLA is approved. Staff and Council have clearly demonstrated that engagement from residents is merely a token step with no meaningful input taken from the process. |
| 4  | I want to see other properties owned by Lantzville residents outside the coloured areas to have the right to develop their land and not just these larger properties owned by developers and have access to the services offered to them  |
| 5  | Let the people decide, Community decision.  |
| 6  | leave alone   |
| 7  | do not believe you, no input into foothills   |
| 8  | we did not get any input into foothills, just words   |
| 9  | Residents should get input.   |
| 10 | No - Too many properties, too broad in scope.   |

9. REFER TO DISPLAY 8, LINK HERE Do you support undertaking Comprehensive Plans to help manage the pace of growth and encourage desirable development prioritized as follows (refer to map on Display 8)?: Commercial Core & Village Areas (Lowlands, West, and South) Upper Lantzville Infill Ware Road Area Upper Lantzville Infill Superior Road Area Care Precinct Area Waterfront Foreshore and Shoreline Management Area

Respondents: 36

| Choice                               | Percentage | Count |   |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|---|
| Support                              | 38.89%     | 14    |  |
| Support with refinements (see below) | 16.67%     | 6     |  |
| Don't Support (see below)            | 44.44%     | 16    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Other properties should be considered and development should happen to lands where geography and proximity warrant.  |
| 2 | 2. Upper Lantzville Infill Ware Road Area  |
| 3 | Remove 3. Upper Lantzville Infill Superior Road Area from the list for reasons given for Question 8. Also, recognizing the residents' preference for rate of growth, there is no need to increase development of land adjacent to ALR parcels.                   |
| 4 | Regardless of the real estate market cycle; the semi-rural character of Lantzville must be maintained.   |
| 5 | Comprehensive Plans should be developed in conjunction with actual development proposals so the public has a realistic picture of new development. Plans should be funded by developer, process determined by District. This would eliminate need to prioritize. |
| 6 | Influence of Council MUST reflect the wishes of the majority opinion. I see progress in this report being stymied in Council.  |
| 7 | I.e support existing; growth limited by pace of the approval process; first come, first served, but with priority being given to existing, long time residents. Should not interfere with marketplace  |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:


Respondents: 9

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|---|---|
| 1 | If developers are following the existing rules, I don't think we need more input.   |
| 2 | We have good guidelines already, no need for more paperwork.  |
| 3 | Staff cannot be trusted to ensure the needs of residents are met. This has been clearly demonstrated over the past two years. The pace of growth should be controlled by appropriate zoning designation based on the amount of develop-able land. Do not look at carving a 60 acre piece of land into 5000 ft <sup>2</sup> lots if it may result in the pace of growth being far in excess of residents wishes. |
| 4 | why does everything have to be in a comprehensive area. Just more reason for staff to control   |
| 5 | do not believe you  |
| 6 | let the community decide  |
| 7 | Manipulated by staff.   |
| 8 | I find this is too broad of a question covering too many areas. so while I agree with some of the proposals of the commercial core but not the village west area. Similarly the two infill areas are grouped too broadly with this question   |
| 9 | No need to prioritize at all.   |

## SECTION 2 (CONTINUED): DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

10. REFER TO DISPLAYS 9 & 10, [LINK HERE](#) Do you support the concept of maintaining Density Bonus provisions for 'Residential' and 'Village Residential' Land Use Designations, and adding Density Bonus potential for 'Estate Residential' Land Use Designations?

Respondents: 37

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |   |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 37.84%     | 14    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 18.92%     | 7     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 43.24%     | 16    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Estate residential should have more bonus provisions for providing park space as these properties could enhance the character of the area and offer diverse housing options for people wanting to live in Lantzville |
| 2 | Density bonuses are most useful in urban areas where development space is at a premium and densification is generally considered a good thing. Not sure Lantzville is there, for the foreseeable future.             |
| 3 | I support in principle, however not for the purpose of acquiring public parkland. Excessive public lands places too much maintenance responsibility on the public purse.   |
| 4 | I do not support adding density bonus provisions beyond what is in the 2005 OCP.   |
| 5 | Maintain current density bonus provisions only.  |
| 6 | As long as there is enough incentive to make it worthwhile so that it actually happens   |
| 7 | We are on "estate residential" zone, which I disagree with. Some of the criteria need to be clarified for smaller lots (2 hectares) as applicable criteria due   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 6

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|---|---|
| 1 | I would support Density Bonusing if: 1) You start with a very low base density. That way developers are more strongly encouraged to look at the amenities required in order get get Density Bonusing. However, the current plan does not do that. It starts with high density and then builds even higher. 2) Why do developers get bonusing credit for donating garbage land? If there is a ravine that is unusable, then they should not get a density bonus because it's donated as "park" - that's just foolish. However, I will not say support with refinements as I believe it will be counted as support and the refinement comments will be ignored. |
| 2 | too much density  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 3 | I like the current density   |
| 4 | Let residents have a say.  |
| 5 | Do not support adding Estate Residential for Density Bonus. These parcels were intended to be a transition/buffer between residential lands and rural/ALR/Resource lands. The need for that buffer has not changed so leave as is. |
| 6 | No density bonus. Too much empty space, too costly to maintain, safety and homeless camps. Use DCC for parks, etc.   |

11. REFER TO DISPLAY 10, LINK HERE Do you support the four proposed Density Bonus Types?:  
 ESA Dedication – dedication of Environmentally Sensitive Areas under watercourse or coastal development permit  
 Parkland/Trail Dedication – dedication of usable (i.e. not hazard or ESA lands) for park or trail corridor  
 Community Infrastructure – exceptional off-site community infrastructure benefits (beyond DCC requirements and normal subdivision costs)  
 Innovation – leading edge innovation in environmental, economic, or social sustainability

Respondents: 38

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |
|---|------------|-------|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 44.74%     | 17    |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 15.79%     | 6     |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 39.47%     | 15    |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | This makes sense to me.  |
| 2 | 1&2 - must be beyond required minimal park or other dedication. Recognize that these dedications are often good sales commodities for developers - ie., don't need to provide density option as developer may be quite willing without it. Innovation - density bonus is inappropriate incentive; may not be desired by developer and/or surrounding residents. Streamlined approval process or reduced fees may be more appropriate method. |
| 3 | I'm concerned with 2. Parkland trail dedication should be required only where it would result in a public benefit.   |
| 4 | ESA areas should already be in place regardless of the development. Community infrastructure goals should already be in place prior to density bonuses being appealed for.   |
| 5 | Density bonuses should not be considered where existing requirements under any development would necessitate meeting the bonus criteria. An example would be ESAs, parkland dedication, etc.   |
| 6 | Community amenity contributions should also be used for run-off infiltration "galleries" to recharge groundwater.  |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 6

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | Parkland cannot be created from all the junk land the developer will donate simply because it is not usable land for the development. Innovation is a fantastic idea. Would love to support this concept. Again need to start with a low base density and then add attractive density bonusing for the innovative concepts. ESA Dedication is a red hearing. ESA areas are not usable land for development. It has to be protected anyway via other regulations and mechanisms. Why would we give a density bonus for this? Community infrastructure density bonus is also BS (bull s*it). A larger development needs the infrastructure to begin with. Why give bonus density to them for that? |
| 2 | Leave alone.   |
| 3 | no more density  |
| 4 | This designation likely applied only to the larger properties, where there is more flexibility. Most 2 h properties probably aren't feasible to apply.   |
| 5 | About 8 yrs ago, the west end of Southwind Drive was extended by a 10 lot subdivision. One lot was designated as parkland. This is a joke. This lot is on about a 60degree slope. It probably could never have been sold as a residential lot and it is useless as parkland.   |
| 6 | NO density bonus. Use DCC for parks etc. As above in #10   |

12. REFER TO DISPLAYS 11 & 12, LINK HERE Do you support the draft Criteria / Requirements for Approval of Density Bonus (as shown in the Table on Display 11)?

Respondents: 31

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |
|---|------------|-------|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 48.39%     | 15    |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 9.68%      | 3     |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 38.71%     | 12    |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:                                       |
|---|---|
| 1 | Too many issues here to cover with one broad question.  |
| 2 | Keep it simple  |
| 3 | Some parts confusing. For instance, built-in surface water to groundwater recharge areas should be required at all times and not be a bonus criteria. |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 4

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | Come on folks. There is no way you can get meaningful results with this question with all of the content on display 11. This had to be broken into smaller segments in order to get better resolution on what people support or not. |
| 2 | This is all about density, not the community.  |
| 3 | Keep the same  |
| 4 | Leave way it is.   |

13. REFER TO DISPLAY 11, POTENTIAL DENSITY BONUS REQUIREMENTS LINK HERE Do you support the concept of Lantzville adopting a policy, outside the OCP, to support Community Amenity Contributions (CACs), which are voluntary payments associated with rezoning from developers to the District and approved by Council, for investment in neighbourhood and District priorities such as parks and trails, recreation amenities, community infrastructure, recreation facilities, fire protection, community beautification, or waterfront improvements?

Respondents: 37

| Choice                               | Percentage | Count |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|
| Support                              | 51.35%     | 19    |
| Support with refinements (see below) | 16.22%     | 6     |
| Don't Support (see below)            | 32.43%     | 12    |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Why voluntary payments? They should be required.   |
| 2 | Why voluntary Payments? They should be required.   |
| 3 | Absolutely. If the town is going to upzone a property, why would we not try and get maximum benefit for that lift. From a business perspective it just makes sense.  |
| 4 | Concerned that rezoning in one area that impacts the character of that area is traded for an amenity that is placed in another area and benefits only that area. Need to incorporate regulations on what funds can be used for. For example: a new firehall or civic hall or a pier benefit all residents/all areas. |
| 5 | I do not support adding density bonus provisions beyond what is in the 2005 OCP.   |
| 6 | Absolutely, get on with it   |

**7** There should be some criteria developed to allow a bonus for implementation of affordable housing.

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 6

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | what amenities from foothills?   |
| 2 | Need further clarification before supporting. We fear developers could potentially "buy" the type of development they wish.  |
| 3 | Too much density   |
| 4 | Making this "voluntary" could be construed as bribery. It should be compulsory for everyone that wants to develop land in Lantzville, if it is done at all. Also payments required should be the same, proportionally, for all potential developers dependent of the size of development. I hate the idea of council being "bought" by developer's "donations". It stinks of corruption. Lantzville mayor and council needs to take back control of future planning and stop encouraging developers to take advantage for profit and then walk away without giving anything back to the community. Parkland should be designated in advance of planning permission and not used in barter - we need to preserve the best of what Lantzville is for future generations. |
| 5 | No - this kind of policy should lie within the OCP   |
| 6 | No - the funds would not be used as intended. The water fund reserve is an example of how funds are not spent as intended.   |

14. REFER TO DISPLAY 13, DENSITY AVERAGING & CLUSTERING Do ou support the concept of Density Averaging & Clustering as an approach to encouraging a greater mix of lot sizes and housing choices in new development areas and potentially discouraging 'cookie-cutter' subdivisions?

Respondents: 37

| Choice                               | Percentage | Count |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|
| Support                              | 35.14%     | 13    |
| Support with refinements (see below) | 29.73%     | 11    |
| Don't Support (see below)            | 35.14%     | 13    |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support (BELOW ALSO INCLUDES 'DON'TSUPPORT' COMMENTS FOR THIS QUESTION) |
|---|--|
| 1 | It would be depend on # of higher density properties and how close together they would be.   |

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | It would be depend on # of higher density properties and how close together they would be.  |
| 3  | Provided the clustering provides more green space at the end of the day and is not used as a tool to squeeze more units onto a property.  |
| 4  | any property should have the opportunity to look at options that increase density and enhance the area  |
| 5  | I favour small residence lots, such as Winchelsea   |
| 6  | No Clustering   |
| 7  | We are located in "N" zone and appear to be outside of the "comprehensive plan areas". We would like the opportunity to have carriage homes and secondary suites in our area.   |
| 8  | Keep 2005 OCP   |
| 9  | Should apply only to the village area. Outside the village area, this should only apply to presently undeveloped areas.   |
| 10 | Keeping lot sizes current with either the lot size style next door so to speak or 2005 OCP direction other than in the village core area  |
| 11 | This may have potential for some development. However, it should not be accepted as blanket policy. Rezoning, development permit applications will still require full assessment of benefits of any proposed averaging or clustering. |
| 12 | Yes, but not to just increase park or green space, more to facilitate achieving a variety of housing options  |
| 13 | Bonus for affordable housing  |
| 14 | Dont support - I like cookie cutter, everyone looks after all the property, its all safe and used. No vacant areas for homeless, etc.   |

## SECTION 2 (CONTINUED): DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

15. REFER TO DISPLAY 14, VILLAGE AREA OVERVIEW Do you support the expansion of Comprehensive Planning Area requirements to include all the proposed Village Areas: Village Commercial Core, Village Lowlands, Village West, and Village South (as shown on the Map on Display 14)? (NOTE: Questions that follow allow comment on specific policies for each Village Area.)

Respondents: 35

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |   |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 51.43%     | 18    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 14.29%     | 5     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 34.29%     | 12    |  |

# If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | all areas of Lantzville should be available to the services and have the ability to develop as those which are offered to these development areas.   |
| 2 | Would not want to see anything greater than 3 storeys in the Village Core due to the shading effect that will take away from the "sunny" feel of openness currently in Lantzville.   |
| 3 | No to including the village west area. absolute no to lane houses/carriage houses anywhere in Lantzville   |
| 4 | This is an important part of planning a vibrant village. The key to a vibrant village is people, we need housing for a lot more in close to the village core.  |
| 5 | A serious and dedicated team to "develop" the Village Centre. At present, there is nothing that incentives people to live in Lantzville because of what the Village Centre offers. The present "abandoned" properties offer nothing as they are. They could, however, be redeveloped as a "unit" if there was the will and vision. |
| 6 | I'd write something but it will only be ignored.   |


If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 2

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer: |
|---|--|
| 1 | no, residents should get to say what they want when a developer comes                              |
| 2 | NO - 2 story max, no condos, no underground parking NO thru Harby, Rossiter, Lynn or Mari to Ware. |

16. REFER TO DISPLAY 15, SENIOR & STARTER HOUSING CHOICES Do you support an approach that encourages development of Senior & Starter Housing Choices distributed among the Village and the Care Precinct, as well as some options in other neighbourhoods? Senior & Starter Housing Choices would encourage housing that considers all phases of senior and family housing needs, including but not exclusively focused on long-term care or assisted living. (NOTE: Questions that follow allow comment on specific policies for each Village Area.)

Respondents: 35

| Choice                               | Percentage | Count |   |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|---|
| Support                              | 48.57%     | 17    |  |
| Support with refinements (see below) | 11.43%     | 4     |  |
| Don't Support (see below)            | 40.00%     | 14    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support: |
|---|---|
| 1 | This is important to allow seniors to stay in Lantzville.   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 | This is important to allow seniors to stay in Lantzville.  |
| 3 | All land in Lantzville that have proximity to services but are outside of development area should be able to consider other uses for their land. this should include Carriage homes ,smaller more affordable starter homes and lane homes.This should give people the choice to live in Lantzville in a variety of housing choices but not limit it to these designated areas  |
| 4 | Senior Housing is a must.  |
| 5 | I think seniors housing in Upper Lantzville is not necessary. It involves crossing the highway to get anywhere and that may be an issue for many seniors who are cutting back on their driving and want to be able to walk to the village or N Nanaimo. It is too far for seniors to easily access facilities such as Dr., Dentist etc. Any seniors who are still very active would be able to live in single family homes and may want area for gardening if that is an interest. |
| 6 | Do not support senior and starter housing outside of the village area and care precinct.   |
| 7 | These housing choices should be focused in Village and Care Precinct.  |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 4

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|---|---|
| 1 | This care precinct is a joke. It has appeared in this OCP process simply because there is an active development application for this very type of development. The focus for years has been to target development around the core - including seniors housing - to help revive the core. It's also poor how you have mixed starrer homes in with seniors housing. People may support one type but not the other. It appears an effort to skew support to the positive - without a true intent to determine what specifically people prefer and where.   |
| 2 | No Care Precinct  |
| 3 | While, I do support the concept of Senior & Starter Housing Choices distributed in the Village area, I am very strongly opposed to the location of the purple "Care Precinct" for seniors. As a physician, I would NEVER recommend anyone live that close to the Island Highway, but most particularly seniors. Because of the pollution from car exhaust and noise alone, I think that it is appallingly bad location for seniors from a health perspective. Many people of that age have difficulty breathing due to heart disease or other chronic conditions and may others find background noise of any sort challenging to deal with due to hearing loss - constant 24/7 traffic noise and pollution is amongst the most difficult to manage and will significantly d |
| 4 | Care Precinct, just care, no starter homes. Each proposal should be looked at , at the time, not a blanket approval for whatever.   |

17. REFER TO DISPLAY 16, VILLAGE COMMERCIAL CORE & LOWLANDS Do you support the policy updates being considered for the Village Commercial Core and Lowlands as summarized on Display 16?

Respondents: 34

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |  |
|---|------------|-------|--|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 41.18%     | 14    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 23.53%     | 8     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 35.29%     | 12    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | I don't want to limit commercial to the core.   |
| 2 | Commercial development should be allowed wherever it is logical.  |
| 3 | Why are we "encouraging" various aspects. If they are supported, then require those various aspects be in place. If the residents want residential over commercial - demand it. Seniors housing - don't encourage it. Specifically zone portions of the land for use only as seniors housing. |
| 4 | all lands in Lantzville should have the flexibility to use their land in ways that offer diversity and housing choices  |
| 5 | Seniors assisted living housing and long term care facilities should only be in the care precinct.  |
| 6 | Not clear on what 31uph would look like. This is a significant increase from existing OCP.  |
| 7 | I don't support some of the lower density areas, we have one opportunity and only so much available land within the core area, don't waste it in sir especially patio homes   |
| 8 | Yes, if the Village Centre is developed as a special case to encourage the development of surrounding areas. NOT the other way around.  |
| 9 | NO - no bonus density. 2 storey max. No seniors care. no "stepped building"   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 1

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer: |
|---|--|
| 1 | Too much   |

18. REFER TO DISPLAY 17, VILLAGE SOUTH Do you support the policy updates being considered for the Village South as summarized on Display 17?

Respondents: 34

| Choice         | Percentage | Count |  |
|----------------|------------|-------|--|
| <b>Support</b> | 38.24%     | 13    |  |

|   |        |    |   |
|---|--------|----|---|
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 20.59% | 7  |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 38.24% | 13 |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | SS, S1, SC, How would people access these ( the ones "north" of Ware Rd.) - I WOULD NOT SUPPORT ACCESS FROM LANCEWOOD - but would support access from WARE RD. with no link to Lancewood. |
| 2 | SS, S1, SC How would people access these (the ones "north" of Ware Rd.) I WOULD NOT SUPPORT ACCESS FROM LANCEWOOD - but would support access from WARE RD. with no link to Lancewood.     |
| 3 | All lands in Lantzville should have the choice to supply diverse options for housing  |
| 4 | Not Familiar  |
| 5 | Density bonus remains as per 2005 OCP   |
| 6 | Yes but with no SS suites etc.  |
| 7 | Yes but no low density, this needs to a people place.   |


If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 2

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:        |
|---|---|
| 1 | Not enough protected green space. Base gross density too high. 1/4 acre should not be the starting point. |
| 2 | No - no bonus density   |

19. REFER TO DISPLAY 18, VILLAGE WEST Do you support the policy updates being considered for the Village West as summarized on Display 18?

Respondents: 34

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |  |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 38.24%     | 13    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 20.59%     | 7     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 41.18%     | 14    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Providing that access was via Lantzville Rd and Peterson Rd.  |
| 2 | Providing that access was via Lantzville Road and Peterson Road.  |
| 3 | All areas of Lantzville should have the opportunity to offer housing choices that would enhance the area and give options to develop where proximity to community services and land warrant |
| 4 | Density bonus remains as per 2005 OCP   |
| 5 | Do not support expansion along Lantzville Road. Support designated area in current OCP.   |
| 6 | Yes but limit park or green space and focus on people oriented social amenities   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 3

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:        |
|---|---|
| 1 | Not enough protected green space. Base gross density too high. 1/3 acre should not be the starting point. |
| 2 | Maintain 7.5 uph for new development and no secondary housing   |
| 3 | No bonus density  |

20. REFER TO DISPLAY 19, UPPER LANTZVILLE INFILL AREAS Do you support the concept of undertaking separate Comprehensive Plan processes for the Ware Road and the Superior Road areas in Upper Lantzville Infill Areas and the general policy updates being considered for these areas as summarized on Display 19?

Respondents: 36

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |  |  |
|---|------------|-------|--|--|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 41.67%     | 15    |  |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 13.89%     | 5     |  |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 41.67%     | 15    |  |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support: |
|---|---|
| 1 | Superior Rd Infill area look like it would be pretty high density. I'd have concerns about traffic flow.        |
| 2 | Superior Road Infill area look like it would be pretty high density. I'd have concern about traffic flow.       |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 3 | All areas with proximity to services should have the right to use their land in the same way  |
| 4 | Yes, there are areas requiring infill.  |
| 5 | Omit the Upper Superior parcel "Gee property from the Comprehensive plan process to: protect the character of this neighbourhood, to protect the ALR parcels; to protect the buffer between higher density residential and rural/resource areas. Leave Zoning as is or downzone this parcel whose highest purpose would be agriculture. |
| 6 | I do not support adding density bonus provisions beyond what is in the 2005 OCP.  |
| 7 | Don't over regulate or over complicate, just get on with it. Make sure there are a variety of housing options starting with small lots that the community now lacks   |
| 8 | Development must support the expansion of infrastructure in the adjacent areas.   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 5

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | You folks really need to revisit the plan for Superior Road Infill. From the water survey data, most residents in the winds either didn't want water - period - or would pay for it on their own. Why are you still presenting an option for a significant amount of development on this piece of land. The lot sizing with density bonusing in place is not consistent with the winds residential area. It is in no way consistent with the estate residential lots on the south side of Superior Road. The max gross density with all density bonusing should be 5 uph. Not 10-11 as proposed. |
| 2 | 2005 OCP   |
| 3 | Gee property needs to be left at > 1 acre lots.  |
| 4 | Maintain 2005 OCP directions of 5 uph rather than more than doubling this number in both these areas ( which also has allowances for SS housing as well) - not the spirit and uniqueness of Lantzville - lets not create a Nanaimo north!  |
| 5 | No bonus density   |

21. REFER TO DISPLAY 20, UPPER LANTZVILLE WARE ROAD AREAS To understand how draft Land Use Designations and Density Bonus policies may guide development in the Ware Road Area, a density bonus case study for a 13.2 ha property on Clark Drive was completed. The following three scenarios summarize the approximate number of units which could be developed with the application of different density bonuses. Key assumptions include: The Base Density would be the same in the OCP Update as it was under the 2005 OCP Development type would be mainly single-family, but may include some multiple-family in higher unit options Height would be limited to 2-storey plus allowance for slope The scenarios below are illustrative only for obtaining community input. Development applications may range from base density to maximum density depending on amenities offered. Which option do you support?

Respondents: 34

| Choice  | Percentage | Count |  |
|---|------------|-------|--|
| <b>SCENARIO A:Base Density (66 units) + 1:ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Dedication Density Bonus (40% dedication would add 40 units) to a total of approximately 106 units.</b>  | 26.47%     | 9     |  |
| <b>SCENARIO B:Base Density (66 units) + 1: ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Density Bonus (40% green space would add 40 units) + 3:Infrastructure Density Bonus for water/sewer supply (up to 20 units) to a total of approximately 126 units.</b>  | 2.94%      | 1     |  |
| <b>SCENARIO C:Base Density (66 units) + 1: ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Dedication Density Bonus (40% green space would add 40 units) + 3: Infrastructure Density Bonus for water/sewer supply (up to 20 units) + 4: Innovation Density Bonus if criteria are met (up to 13 units) to a total of approximately 139 units.</b> | 29.41%     | 10    |  |
| <b>Don't support any of the above (see below)</b>   | 41.18%     | 14    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:                           |
|---|--|
| 1 | Have to wonder why Clark Drive was chosen as the case study?   |
| 2 | All lands in lantzville should have the right to use their land to provide higher density and provide green space,parks ect. |
| 3 | I support all of the above.  |
| 4 | have done  |
| 5 | I like the current density   |
| 6 | I do not support adding density bonus provisions beyond what is in the 2005 OCP.   |

Are there refinements to your chosen Scenario that would increase your support? Please describe below:

Respondents: 3

| # | Are there refinements to your chosen Scenario that would increase your support? Please describe below:                        |
|---|---|
| 1 | These options should be available to all lands that are in proximity of services and could be used to develop housing choices |
| 2 | Protect our neighbourhoods  |
| 3 | Possibly is an area available to "low cost housing, ie mobile home park   |

22. REFER TO DISPLAY 21, UPPER LANTZVILLE SUPERIOR ROAD AREA To understand how draft Land Use Designations and Density Bonus policies may guide development in the Superior Road Area, a density bonus case study for the 25.83 ha 'Gee' property was completed. The following three scenarios summarize the approximate number of units which could be developed with the application of different density bonuses. Key assumptions include: The Base Density would be the same in the OCP Update as it was under the 2005 OCP Development type would be mainly single-family, but may include some multiple-family in higher unit options Height would be limited to 2-storey plus allowance for slope The scenarios below are illustrative only for obtaining community input. Development applications may range from base density to maximum density depending on amenities offered. Which scenario do you support?

Respondents: 35

| Choice  | Percentage | Count |
|---|------------|-------|
| <b>SCENARIO A:Base Density (129 units) + 1: ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Dedication Density Bonus (35% green space would add 76 units) to a total of approximately 205 units.</b>   | 22.86%     | 8     |
| <b>SCENARIO B:Base Density (129 units) + 1: ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Dedication Density Bonus (35% green space would add 76 units) + 3: Infrastructure Density Bonus for water/sewer supply (up to 39 units) to a total of approximately 244 units.</b>                             | 2.86%      | 1     |
| <b>SCENARIO C:Base Density (129 units) + 1: ESA Dedication and 2: Park/Trail Dedication Density Bonus (35% green space would add 76 units) + 3: Infrastructure Density Bonus for water/sewer supply (up to 39 units) + 4: Innovation Density Bonus if criteria are met (up to 26 units)</b> | 25.71%     | 9     |

|  |        |    |  |
|--|--------|----|--|
| to a total of approximately 270 units.     |        |    |  |
| Don't support any of the above (see below) | 45.71% | 16 |  |

| #  | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:  |
|----|---|
| 1  | Again, you folks really need to revisit the plan for Superior Road Infill. From the water survey data, most residents in the winds either didn't want water - period - or would pay for it on their own. Why are you still presenting an option for a significant amount of development on this piece of land. The lot sizing with density bonusing in place is not consistent with the winds residential area. It is in no way consistent with the estate residential lots on the south side of Superior Road. The base density needs to be far lower than 129 units. The max gross density with all density bonusing for this area should be 5 uph. |
| 2  | All lands in Lantzville should have the option to develop and not be limited to just large land lots. This gives choices to Lantzville residents who have land that could offer these choices of housing  |
| 3  | Not familiar  |
| 4  | 2005 OCP  |
| 5  | This is too many homes for this rural area. Getting across the highway or on the highway would be extremely difficult. There would have to be changes to the highway access or crossing to support this number of homes. A variety of lot sizes would be acceptable. The water provision is always an issue. We are further up the winds and have acceptable water with our well but what would happen with this development. Would I be paying for the infrastructure with my taxes.   |
| 6  | Gee property needs to be left at > 1 acre lots. Please try another plan. You've been driving the same plan through for this area from the get go. It is not well supported in this area - the survey data shows this. Plus, it is not wanted to help pay for water. The survey data also shows this. The majority either wanted no water, or would pay for it entirely themselves. Please listen to the data and plan accordingly.  |
| 7  | What is proposed for the Gee property is a mockery. LARGE LOTS PLEASE. Ie. 2.5 acres. down to 1 acre maybe as an absolute minimum.  |
| 8  | No bonus density.   |
| 9  | I do not support adding density bonus provisions beyond what is in the 2005 OCP.  |
| 10 | Make it pedestrian friendly but as it is surrounded by rural don't push for a bunch of park or green space over and above the park shown along the creek  |
| 11 | Completely unacceptable what is being proposed. As a 40+ year resident of Lantzville it is extremely frustrating & disappointing to see this proposed across from our acreage. For what purpose and whose benefit?  |

Are there refinements to your chosen Scenario that would increase your support? Please describe below:

Respondents: 5

| # | Are there refinements to your chosen Scenario that would increase your support? Please describe below:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | this is not about the community  |
| 2 | keep the 2005 ocp  |
| 3 | keep it the same   |
| 4 | Congestion around this area is a concern and if this is developed then the Superior Road merge lane on highway MUST be lengthened. Currently a hazard especially during summer months. |
| 5 | No lane houses   |

## SECTION 2 (CONTINUED): DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

23. REFER TO DISPLAY 22, DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREAS The OCP Update draft directions suggest retaining the existing Development Permit Areas in Lantzville with updates to provide further direction on environmental requirements for future development. Do you support the suggested updates to Environmental Development Permit Areas outlined on Display 22?

Respondents: 35

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |   |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 65.71%     | 23    |   |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 5.71%      | 2     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 25.71%     | 9     |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Not sure how this works  |
| 2 | Agree to changes re. watercourses. Re DPA 4 Coastal - think very carefully about using 'original property boundary' as the measure for riprap. More jurisdictions are using present NB. Interestingly, I've seen recent lot surveys that show "NB from plan" AND "Present NB". Also, recognize the option of buried bulkheads - essentially trenched riprap with overlay of beach sediment and plantings to mimic a soft shore, but with underground reinforcement. Being used on properties in QB and RDN, and still counting as 'green shore'. |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 0

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer: |
|---|--|
|---|--|

24. REFER TO DISPLAY 23, FORM & CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PERMITS The OCP Update draft directions suggest updates to Form & Character Development Permits to: Expand their application from the Village Core only to all areas in Lantzville that propose intensive (i.e. smaller lot single-family) residential, multiple-family, institutional, industrial, mixed-use, or innovative developments to evaluate form and character prior to development. Add a new Development Permit in areas adjacent to Island Hwy to require maintenance of or creation of treed buffers. Do you support the suggested updates to Form & Character Development Permit Areas outlined on Display 23?

Respondents: 35

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |  |  |
|---|------------|-------|--|--|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 54.29%     | 19    |  |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 2.86%      | 1     |  |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 40.00%     | 14    |  |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Not sure how this works.  |
| 2 | Remove 'Hidden Residential'. There is nothing detrimental about a driveway winding through trees and shrubs to the house; if anything it adds character to a neighbourhood. |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 1

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer: |
|---|--|
| 1 | Dont support this outside of the village core  |

## SECTION 2 (CONTINUED): DRAFT DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW

25. REFER TO DISPLAYS 24 & 25, WATER SERVICING Based on public input and review of the existing infrastructure, the Water Master Plan is considering recommended phasing for future extension of community water service. Do you support the draft phasing being considered as shown on the map on Display 25?

Respondents: 32

| Choice         | Percentage | Count |  |  |
|----------------|------------|-------|--|--|
| <b>Support</b> | 31.25%     | 10    |  |  |

|   |        |    |   |
|---|--------|----|---|
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 9.38%  | 3  |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 53.13% | 17 |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Water (ground) for everybody  |
| 2 | In order to make water service more affordable in the winds area, the district should provide the large water main to our neighbourhood. If the Gee property development is approved soon, then it will expedite the expansion as more properties would pay into the project.   |
| 3 | Areas in Lantzville that have poor water should be serviced and not just large development areas. Some people have lived in Lantzville for a long time and should be taken care of not just large developers  |
| 4 | Not sure how this will work.  |
| 5 | So, the connection to City of Nanaimo's water system is complete; what will actually trigger turning on the valve? Is there a known consumption threshold to be reached? By whom - existing properties in WSA? new development? What will be the process and what are the criteria for determining when the valve is turned on? |
| 6 | Phasing requires more water. More water requires 'Support' for question 26. Majority of new water comes with Nanaimo connection. Constraints are placed through agreement. Details, details, details.   |
| 7 | But not set in stone. Anyone who wants or needs water and is willing to pay for it (with or without grants and or development) should get it - whenever, use phasing as a guideline only  |
| 8 | I think the survey results are questionable. I do not think people know. That the costs are so uncertain that a rational answer cannot be given.  |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 9

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:   |
|---|--|
| 1 | I don't support forcing people in the winds to pay for infrastructure for water when they already have good wells. (I know a few don't)  |
| 2 | 1) The extension phasing presented is a shameful effort. Phase 1 is essentially all the areas that will likely/reasonably receive water. Phase 2 contains the areas that are highly unlikely to receive water. It's bordering on useless for guiding subsequent decisions. |
| 3 | do not city of nanaimo water   |
| 4 | We are not affected so withholding our vote.   |
| 5 | Don't want to pay for it.  |
| 6 | The phasing is not supported by the responses from the residents in some of the areas designated. Decisions must be based on support feedback of residents which supersedes pressure from developers wanting to profit.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 7 | Do not support water service extension to the winds.   |
| 8 | Also, the social necessity of everyone having a potable water supply of standard quality has never been discussed. |
| 9 | Only service those with private well water quality issues.   |

26. REFER TO DISPLAY 26, WATER SERVICING - INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATES Before additional properties (existing or new) are connected to Lantzville's water system, several key infrastructure improvements are being considered. Do you support the System Upgrades to be Considered Prior to New Connections as outlined on the map and summary on Display 26?

Respondents: 33

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |
|---|------------|-------|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 30.30%     | 10    |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 12.12%     | 4     |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 54.55%     | 18    |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support:   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Put a reservoir on Sywash Ridge.  |
| 2 | The District should undertake a phased 20yr. expansion upgrade for the whole water district unless areas vote it down. This could be achieved with government grants & the new federal infrastructure financing. This would give certainty to the future & allow Lantzville to expand & progress instead of stagnation.                       |
| 3 | Have the foothills property supply the water storage for the benefit of all and not just the developer. Just like it was in the memorandum of cooperation to approve the Foothills  |
| 4 | Supply water as required  |
| 5 | Are there some areas that could be permitted to develop during upgrading of the infrastructure? Suites etc.   |
| 6 | Do not believe municipal water reservoirs should be located on private property ie. R2 to be replaced in same location. Very concerned that the new 'middle pressure zone' to be drawn from groundwater wells could seriously impact existing ground water wells in Lantzville benefitting new development at the cost of existing residents. |
| 7 | As a guideline not set in stone, if it is possible to go ahead with a particular area do it   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:


Respondents: 9

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer: |
|---|--|
|---|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | I want water as soon as possible  |
| 2 | If there are options for areas to get water before the upgrade then those projects should move ahead.   |
| 3 | Nanaimo water going to Lower Lantzville to service the Ryeland development. Is staff really wanting to play Russian Roulette with Nanaimo to see if they are ok with that? It seems the Middle Pressure Zone is redundant. Why not have R3 serving both the Upper Zone and what is shown as the Middle Zone. It would remove the requirement for rebuilding the R2 reservoir and save a substantial amount of money. And funny to see Nanaimo water is going to R3 - the Foothills reservoir. That should help out Councillor Colcloughs development partners nicely. |
| 4 | We are not affected so withholding our vote.  |
| 5 | It is ridiculous that there will be 4 reservoirs will be in place for all these different zones, plus the Foothills.  |
| 6 | Why a new middle zone? That creates an extra reservoir. Extra cost, extra maintenance, etc.   |
| 7 | A complete survey of residents water needs. No survey has been honestly done. No input from residents except my neighbours and myself. It is incomplete We need water now! I have waited 40 years and this is my reward. More thousands of \$ to fork.  |
| 8 | Water infrastructure improvements costs should be 100% paid by properties presently connected to the water system.  |
| 9 | I don't trust this information.   |

27. REFER TO DISPLAY 27, WATER SERVICING - DRAFT DESIGN STANDARDS Design Standards indicate the amount of water that must be available for each connection to the water system and are used to determine how much water will be needed to effectively service all connected properties. An analysis of current design standards and demands was completed to determine if the existing standard of 3,400 Litres/day per connection could be reduced. Based on this analysis, the following updated Design Standard ranges are being considered pending completion of required infrastructure updates and further monitoring: 2,800 - 3,000 Litres/day per connection for Single-Family Residential 1,400 - 1,800 Litres/day per connection for Multiple-Family Residential Evaluation of Institutional, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses on a case-by-case basis to recognize demands will vary depending on type of development Do you support potential updates to Water Servicing Design Standards to lower the water allocation for single-family residential and to add new standards for multiple-family residential?

Respondents: 30

| Choice                                      | Percentage | Count |   |
|---|------------|-------|---|
| <b>Support</b>                              | 43.33%     | 13    |  |
| <b>Support with refinements (see below)</b> | 10.00%     | 3     |  |
| <b>Don't Support (see below)</b>            | 46.67%     | 14    |  |

| # | If you selected 'Support with refinements' above, please describe what refinements would increase your support: |
|---|---|
| 1 | Read memo to council in support of 2,000 L/d for SFA ; prepared by P.E  |
| 2 | Answer to 2nd question on board 28 is obtuse.   |
| 3 | Why so high if current residents don't use anywhere near that amount?   |

If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:

Respondents: 4

| # | If you selected 'Don't Support' above, please describe alternate directions that you would prefer:                          |
|---|---|
| 1 | Can't consider supporting any change in design standards until the final results from the wellfield improvements are known. |
| 2 | no this is just water for developers  |
| 3 | We are not affected so withholding our vote.  |
| 4 | I don't trust this information.   |

### SECTION 3: GENERAL COMMENTS

Do you have any additional comments about either the Official Community Plan Update or the Water Master Plan? Please use this space to tell us your ideas, concerns, or feedback.

Respondents: 26

| # | Do you have any additional comments about either the Official Community Plan Update or the Water Master Plan? Please use this space to tell us your ideas, concerns, or feedback.  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Thanks for hosting the open house!!!!  |
| 2 | Water is my main concern. I appreciate the work that has gone into collecting information and planning for future water development. ?? up the good work. I look forward to being able to drink and cook with safe water.  |
| 3 | Growth is healthy and needed. Too much regulation will kill small communities. Water should be available to as many people as possible. Thanks for your hard work!!  |
| 4 | Finish the reports ASAP. We have over 4,000 cm/d of water resources proved in Lantzville   |
| 5 | It's really unfortunate the direction staff and the consultant took this process. In the first survey, the desired growth rate was asked. 67% of people wanted < 1% growth rate or less. This should have been one of the fundamental guiding facts behind how the subsequent body of work was crafted. Instead, a piecemeal approach was taken. Individual areas were carved out, approval was sought on an area by area basis, and then it was all lumped together. The net result is an OCP build out target that far exceeds the population desired when based on the desired growth rate. This is a tremendous problem. If the target is "x", Council and staff then start working to reach that target. Amenities are pursued, development is encouraged, etc. And it is all based on a faulty OCP build out target - because the desired growth rate was ignored. |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 6  | The District of Lantzville must enact the nanaimo water agreement so it can provide water to all properties within the boundaries or risk shrinking instead of expansion of this community. Lets be proactive.   |
| 7  | In my view the large developers are given more choices than the long term residents that have helped to make Lantzville what it is today. I am not in favour of estate residential being limited and not having the same choices as other land packages. These properties could be used for higher density while maintaining the look and direction of Lantzville. It should not give favourable treatment to developers over residents who live in and love Lantzville and could offer more diverse housing choices throughout Lantzville   |
| 8  | Both are well planned.   |
| 9  | Village core - It is a catch 22 - until there is more population in the village there is no support for a small corner type store for groceries. If there was such development then the area could probably support a corner store/coffee shop. There needs to be another focus for Lantzville Village - the arts, or? A nice coffee place - Riso is great but not casual enough to just pop in for a coffee visit with a friend. Medical support services? Specialty shops? We are so close to shopping that most never would venture here unless it has a specific draw.   |
| 10 | Time to move Lantzville forward. Quality development is needed. We have too much vacant land that is adjacent to roads and water and sewer infrastructure but these properties are not adding to the tax base in any significant way. The possibility of a large seniors care facility near the Nanaimo border would provide a large tax base, create jobs and have little impact on the community. Save the core area for families and active seniors. Unfortunately years of delay on development means the core has turned into an ugly empty space. No store, no gas, what else is next?   |
| 11 | We are impressed with how you are including residents and information provided. We do note area N is entirely excluded which is fine, however ourselves and neighbours have strong expressed our desire for carriage homes/secondary suites which are entirely compatible with the size of our lots and we are fully serviced with our own infrastructure. Your failure to include area doesn't allow other residents to give feedback.  |
| 12 | Please respect the desired growth rate. It is clearly being ignored. The end result of this OCP will be a population target far above that which residents supported in the first survey.  |
| 13 | There are elements that I would like to support. They are lumped in too broad of categories however, and I do not trust that the consultant or staff will adequately incorporate the "refinements" expressed. The growth rate is a key facet is creating the community plan. To not respect and incorporate the growth rate is shameful and seriously undermines the credibility and validity of the entire plan. The desired growth rate has been casually tossed aside, and we have an OCP that is currently targeting a build out somewhere around 7800 people. Where in the word did the majority of the community express support for that?? 67% wanted < 1% growth. Did the survey(s), staff, or the consultant clearly state that the cumulative results of "support" for the all individual CDA's would double the size of the town? Was there any effort to cross reference the desired growth rate data, with the cumulative population target based on all the density mumbo jumbo. No there was not. Shameful. |
| 14 | Are you really going to listen to us anyways?  |
| 15 | Clarify how water servicing, particularly connecting to City water, will influence the rate and scale of development. Some possible scenarios would be helpful.  |
| 16 | This process has been very poorly done. It's abundantly clear that this is all being driven for the benefit of big developers. The residents were asked about the desired growth rate. 67% of  |

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>people wanted 1% or less. There were more residents that wanted no growth compared to those that wanted &gt;2%/yr. Why were there no scenarios presented to the public to reflect no growth? No need to answer - it's a rhetorical question. The answer is clear based on the population target that is the result of this current OCP. The OCP is not intended to be a roadmap for development - yet that is what the consultant and District staff have created.</p> |
| <b>17</b> | <p>Please to see that watercourse and wetland protected areas are being expanded.</p>   |
| <b>18</b> | <p>It is ironic that the reservoir is at the Ware - Aulds junction. A proper survey is required. A vague plan. For the phantom road area; Something you can not plan on. It is not inclusive of ALL the community tax payers. I do not support it. I am very very disappointed. This plan will cost me at least 10- 15 thousand to improve my water system.</p>   |
| <b>19</b> | <p>No additional comments.</p>  |
| <b>20</b> | <p>I would like the OCP to reflect the uniqueness of Lantzville. Higher density housing will not do this. It is not Lantzville's obligation to help augment the affordable housing shortage rather than providing a measured growth plan that ensures the Village retains its character and does not becomes like everyone else.</p>  |
| <b>21</b> | <p>this process has been great. So many opportunities to participate, and always the option of really detailed input for those that want to take the time to do. These surveys are a great example</p>  |
| <b>22</b> | <p>Development means contributions to infrastructure and that of Lantzville still needs sewer and water. Sewer and water go together.</p>   |
| <b>23</b> | <p>This plan does not adequately address "affordable house". Perhaps a good place to address it is as a "bonus". On page 11 - Potential density bonus requirements - a couple of requirements (on street stormwater green infrastructure) are on - lot infiltration of run-off zones should be mandatory for all developments, not a bonus.</p>   |
| <b>24</b> | <p>It's all a bunch of BS.</p>  |
| <b>25</b> | <p>I spoke to Mr Reid at the June Open house, he was not honest about Harby Road going thru. He first said no, only foot and cycle, then said only exist for vehicles, his answer was very evasive and not forthcoming at all. I do not trust this process, nor this consulting company at all.</p>   |
| <b>26</b> | <p>This process has been horrible. Please stop trying to develop the hell out of Lantzville &amp; ruin it in the process! 67% wanted 1% growth or less! Listen Please.</p>  |