



# *A Shared Community Vision*

## **Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,**

*Citizen's Committee Speaker Series*

*Community Diversity and Affordability Workbook Responses*

This document presents the community's responses to the questions and policy options presented in the workbook on community diversity and affordability. The workbook is available on the Official Community Plan review project website at [www.asharedcommunityvision.ca](http://www.asharedcommunityvision.ca), by emailing a request to [areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca](mailto:areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca), or by contacting the Regional District of Nanaimo planning department at (250) 390-6510

## **Policy Options**

### **Policy Option: Support Inclusionary Zoning**

1. A good way to promote market based affordable housing.
2. Would only support this option on currently vacant land within the UCB , or for properties directly on Cedar Rd in the UCB.
3. This is a good option provided the supply of affordable housing does not exceed the demand. The units being of the same 'quality design and construction' is important.
4. I support inclusionary zoning because it would mandate that developers include affordable, quality housing options as part of the development. This supports the community vision of having a more inclusive and diverse community.
5. I strongly oppose inclusionary zoning in Are A. High density housing would not satisfy affordable housing needs as there is little transportation in the Area and few jobs available. So called affordable housing would make automobiles necessary placing additional financial burdens on homeowners as well as tasking our over-used road system. This type of development would be suitable in Nanaimo.
6. I like the concept of inclusionary zoning. I support it because affordable housing units within the community provides greater opportunity for a broader range of individuals to be able to live in the community without segregation. It achieves the Community Vision by providing opportunities to young families, as well as seniors wanting to downsize.
7. Only with an expanded sewer system could this be possible.
8. Yes.
9. Support the notion of inclusionary zoning but this should not be applied to every high density proposal. In order to attract the professionals needed to manage and operate some of the services required to accommodate services for all ages of citizens as articulated in the "Community Vision" their preferred type of housing must also be provided. The most obvious example of this is medical professionals required to treat seniors and the disabled at modern medical centers. Two other disciplines synonymous with the goal of a diverse community, that often value the semi-rural lifestyle, are educators and IT specialists who often work at home. Many mobile professional people will want to purchase what they see as appreciating investment properties. This usually means condos and town houses or other projects of exclusively hi-end units in a scenic rural setting. They will look for a development where all the residents have and show an acute pride of ownership. Some will inevitably choose to stay in the community if their investment is protected and the other residents are compatible.

# Policy Option: Support Inclusionary Zoning

10. This option seems fine in principle but I have difficulty seeing it operate successfully in practice. If a developer can afford to provide identical housing at a lower price who is to say that the cheaper housing will only go to low income purchasers.
11. "The form and amount of housing would need to be determined and specified in the OCP."
12. NO. Concern: The reference data seems to indicate that this may not be an issue, in that this area is already providing more than its fair share of affordable housing.
13. This is one way to increase density in the UCB. Inclusionary zoning supports Sustainability Principles 1,3,5,7,9,10,11,12, and 15.
14. Yes as long as the community continues to have schools for the families. In the case of seniors housing the community needs to have appropriate services particularly health care services (doctor, laboratories, etc).
15. You assume that we want housing developments. Limit house building to 1 house per 5 acre lot and no subdivision style large projects. Area A does not need to be developed to its physical limits just because developers want more land for their development projects.

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support Secondary Suites, granny flats, accessory dwellings**

1. A good idea but it exists already and not good for the median group that is identified as younger families.
2. Support this option everywhere . The larger lots in Cedar are well suited for this option
3. I support this option especially when multiple generations of a family are on the same lot.
4. Secondary suites, etc. would provide for the goal of having more affordable housing and allow for more density within the UCB. They would also not change the appearance of neighbourhoods. Question: Would they be allowed in all UCBs or only those areas serviced by water or sewer?
5. This option is already being practiced. Most suites, etc, are occupied by family members.
6. I support secondary suites for all of the reasons mentioned as well as the option of farm land families being able to live and work on a farm without having to own the land. Provides the farmer with housing for onsite help. Reduces GHG emissions when living and working on site.
7. I believe the community would support secondary suites. Not so sure that granny flats or accessory dwellings would be so readily accepted by the community at large. Also smaller lot with higher density would require sewer. Current sewer hook up is very limited.
8. Yes this would be nice especially without all the bureaucratic red tape and costly and timely permit applications. Make the policy simple and user friendly.
9. Support this type of housing if properly controlled. Regional District of Nanaimo-A will need a wide range of housing options excluding only a few obviously incompatible building configurations. This shared type of housing will work particularly well for some single parents and seniors who are more sensitive to the concerns of safety and security which are mitigated by living in close proximity to others. It also fits well with the community environmental objectives of smaller footprints using less energy.
10. I don't have a problem with basement suites or over garage suites because they likely would have minimal change in the look of a neighbourhood but additional stand alone buildings would be a problem for me in the existing UCB. I don't think that is what the residents envisioned when they decided to purchase their home in a particular neighbourhood.
11. Yes.
12. Yes. We need more affordable rentals in Area A.
13. Yes - cost effective ways for families to live in the area which would increase density and allow for the development of services/jobs for residents.
14. In existing homes, sure , yes.

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support Manufactured Home Parks inside the Urban Containment Boundary**

1. Yes these are good. They promote density as what exists in Cassidy.
2. No , there are better options
3. Yes. But care must be taken to ensure good design that is in keeping with the desired theme of a neighbourhood. Our building and infrastructure should be designed and build with longevity in mind.
4. I imagine that a manufactured home park constructed nowadays could be aesthetically pleasing. Instead of a grid layout, parks could be designed with curved lanes, green spaces and playgrounds. They certainly play an important role in housing in Cassidy. A diverse range of people reside in Manufactured home parks from young families to the retired. I'm not in favour of 55+ parks because they defeat the value of a diverse community. Manufactured home parks maximize the use of land space for housing. They are affordable and a needed area of housing. Residents in Manufactured home parks do have worries like rent increases and the possibility of being evicted from the park. Options to buy lots would be ideal.
5. There are already a number of parks in Are A which satisfies needs for affordable housing in Are A. Expansion of established parks would be acceptable.
6. I support manufactured home inside the UCB as an upgrade to the traditional concept of trailers and pad rentals. I like the quality of the manufactured home. Yet another affordable housing options in keeping with the Community Vision.
7. Nowhere in Cedar for this to go within UCB. Cassidy and South Wellington perhaps, but Cedar has nowhere for this to go.
8. There are already lots of trailer parks so to have a few more, yeah, why not.
9. Support managed manufactured home areas and especially the notion of pad ownership. Apart from the obvious financial benefits “pride of ownership” leads to an increased “sense of community” as well.
10. I support this option.
11. no. manufactured homes are unhealthy on many levels. there are much improved plans for affordable housing available.
12. YES: Assuming new and infill renovations follow the building form pictured in this workbook
13. Yes. Its affordable and can be done well.
14. No. I believe there are better land use options such as townhouses/condos within UCBs.
15. Why home parks. Instead of trying to maximize housing development, why aren't we discussing how to build truly energy efficient homes? Fewer houses that are better made, including for low income. Money is available instead of paying dividends to share holders, we could put profits into more green features.

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support a range of housing options**

1. Yes this promotes community diversity.
2. Yes , but with reservations . Support for this option is not a blanket endorsement.
3. Diversity is required to meet everyone's needs. We should establish village themes to guide planning and building design. Consider lanes for servicing and parking access. No vehicles or garages on the streets.
4. I agree with this option because it allows controls over the development and can keep new housing consistent with the neighbourhood. It would also allow for a more diverse approach to housing like housing over a business.
5. Area A is a rural area. Allowing a broad range of housing options is not acceptable. Specific zoning allowing smaller sized lots is ok.
6. I feel the time has come to support a range of housing options, so that simply subdividing land down to provide additional housing is no longer the only option, keeping these larger parcels of land in tact while providing options for properly planned higher density.
7. Yes
8. Yes.
9. Not high rises, condos, apartment complexes. Keep it rural. No higher than 3 stories.
10. Strongly agree as stated above.
11. I can support a policy that provides for a range of housing option provided the options are in "scale with its surroundings".
12. smaller homes.
13. Yes.
14. Yes. Area A will grow so we should plan a range of housing types.
15. This is a great idea as long as it is monitored to ensure it compliments existing neighbourhoods.
16. No subdivision. We need to take more time to develop this Official Community Plan. We could learn so much wisdom from other countries, who are developing more in tune with nature, to better protect the environment, use resources more efficiently.

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support the concept of aging in place through Flex Housing**

1. A good concept for the urban environment or a rural area close to urban.
2. No , don't see any practicality in this.
3. This is a concept which should be built in to all housing for people of all ages.
4. The community vision is to have people reside in area A for as long as they desire and flex housing would allow seniors to remain in their houses for as long as possible.
5. I do not support this concept because I do not understand it. A properly built house allows for ample area for basement suites if necessary.
6. I support the concept of flex housing to enable the incorporation of means to accommodate the changing dynamics of families as they age. Sustaining families within the community through housing supports our Community Vision.
7. Don't have enough information to comment on this concept.
8. I guess. We are closer to the cemetery than the hospital so it makes sense.
9. Support modifying existing structures and relaxing rules to allow more flexibility for seniors in the community. Specifying over 50 residential housing buildings and/or developments designed to accommodate a particular life style is legal in B.C and is often used to create a suitable and attractive environment for seniors. We are only at the leading edge of the increasing percentage of seniors that will want to stay in the community if the right accommodation is made available.
10. I think that this is some any purchaser should consider and not the OCP.
11. there are advantages to the aged (esp. those who require care )aging closer to the urban center of Nanaimo.
12. amenities, arts and culture, health care, transit, handy dart etc. rather than duplicating services in rural areas centralize the best available in housing and care.
13. Yes.
14. Yes. We're all getting older but would like to stay in our home as long and safely as possible.
15. Yes.
16. Too much emphasis on housing development for Area A. Not wanted by agricultural community. "Manufactured Need".

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support clustered housing (density neutral) throughout the Plan Area**

1. Yes because it creates green space and efficient use of space.
2. No , Cedar is a rural community . People move and live here in order to have larger lots , and this largely defines us.
3. This is a good idea. It may be a function of topography and natural features such as watercourses and rocky outcrops. Flexibility will be required with this concept.
4. Clustered housing would be a great concept for area A. This would lessen the footprint on the land, create more green space and allow for additional opportunities like community gardens, playgrounds, trails, etc.
5. No, cluster housing means giving up personal space (back and side yards) in exchange for a common area. This concept has not been successful in most cities. There public areas become cluttered and unkept creating a slum-like appearance.
6. I support the concept of clustered housing for the future efficient use of land, making available housing to more individuals, therefore encouraging the possibility of becoming eligible for public transit in an effort to address GHG emissions. Cluster housing provides an opportunity for folks to share in community gardens who might otherwise not be able. Food sustainability
7. I don't know if the community would support this.
8. Only in the UCB.
9. Support this option as it fits in with the wide range of housing types that must be utilized to accommodate the goals of diversity.
10. May satisfy the need to develop areas with open space but doesn't do anything for people who see large lot size as their idea of rural character.
11. I think the emphasis should be on creating the highest possible density within the UCB of Nanaimo, that being said future housing will need to be high density and smaller in size.
12. YES. Particularly relevant in area A.
13. Yes. This is a wonderful design.
14. Good concept - appears to meet the goal of reducing ecological footprints.
15. 5 acre lots for any new housing - minimum.

# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support Small-scale townhouses inside the Urban Containment Boundary**

1. Yes , but only on currently vacant lands ,not re-development in existing subdivisions and perhaps a small percentage of row housing, on small lots, close to amenities and no garages.
2. Small scale townhouses would also fit the bill of increasing density with a smaller footprint. On a 1 hectare property four or five townhomes could be built with a shared green space etc.
3. Not acceptable in Area A. No transportation and few jobs. These belong in cities. Not in rural areas.
4. I support small scale townhouses and apartments housing to provide individuals an opportunity to live in the community by renting if purchasing is not an option. It addresses our Community Vision of affordability for young folks and seniors.
5. No room in Cedar –Townhomes are ok, don't support apartments.
6. Sure, as long as they are designed with rural character to fit in with the country lifestyle.
7. Support this option as it fits in with the wide range of housing types that must be utilized to accommodate the goals of diversity.
8. Provided they are "in scale with their surroundings".
9. do not increase the UCB in cedar or Cassidy.
10. NO
11. Yes. Great for lower income folk.
12. Yes - I would encourage large scale townhouse development with commercial services and/or health services on the main floor.
13. Which UCB? Nanaimo City OK. Cedar is losing its rural character. Looking more like a suburb. Next thing will be driving by another McDonalds, Tim Hortons, Rona, Superstore, etc. Just like across all cities in Canada. Its not what the residents of this area want. Its what developers and the cities want.



# Policy Options

---

## **Policy Option: Support affordable housing programs and strategies**

1. Support market based affordable housing that does not rely on government subsidy.
2. Support the concept ,but this is not a blanket endorsement . Let the Region develop a program and strategy for consideration before it actually becomes a policy of the Official Community Plan.
3. I support it so long as supply and demand are balanced. Good affordable housing should not make the residents feel “branded’ in any way. They are a part of our community too.
4. I think the RDN should definitely look into affordable housing strategies and programs. The OCP should support this idea.
5. The Regional District of Nanaimo has already got affordable small lot housing in place in Cedar (Cedar Estates). A need for more such high density development is not needed in near future.
6. Yes I support affordable housing programs and strategies, as I believe it provides the Regional District of Nanaimo more options when dealing with potential developers and realistic guidelines in keeping with our Community Vision.
7. I support investigating the feasibility of an affordable housing program. Need more information.
8. Yes as most people are friendlier and have more common sense and are more community minded than stuck up rich, millionaire folks from posh cities.
9. Agree with this approach subject to the concerns expressed in #1 above. Increased density approvals should not always be conditional on the inclusion of affordable housing units. Modify existing policies to allow for changes to existing buildings.
10. Part of the "Main Street" concept? OK.
11. NO: At this juncture it does not seem to be an issue. Other issues are more pressing in the next five -ten years.
12. Yes. This should be looked in to.
13. Yes affordable housing will bring families to the area. More population will result in more services available to communities which will create jobs closer to home.
14. Yes, in Nanaimo.

# Other Ideas, Comments, or Suggestions

---

**Please use the space provided to share any other ideas, comments, or suggestions you have with respect to community diversity and affordability.**

1. Affordable housing needs to be complemented with commercial/industrial land use nearby so peoples jobs are close. As well park space needs to be close, and transit must link the area to a bigger city centre.
2. I agree with the concept of community diversity, but I wouldn't like to see the localization of the affordability factor. In other words I don't think it's diverse to have all the affordable housing in one area and all the mid range housing in another area and all the high priced housing in another area. That is not diverse neither is it inclusive. That's why I really like the idea of inclusionary zoning. What percentage of the houses developed would be "affordable" ? 5% , 7% 10%. With this OCP we have the opportunity to ensure that our community is diverse, inclusive and vibrant.
3. I am at the age where many of my friends and neighbours are selling their homes to move to the city where essential services are readily available (i.e. transportation, medical services, and pharmacies). There is no need at this time for high density housing at any price within Area A. There are some low paying service jobs in Area A but on the whole young people must seek employment in the city and choose to live near employment to save transportation costs. The near and intermediate future show no need for high density housing. Also statistics show that increased density causes higher crime rate.
4. We live in one of the most affluent and wasteful societies on earth. We must stop continued expectation of growth and at the same time reduce our consumerism. Encourage urban densification by NOT providing all services and amenities to rural communities. provide transportation alternatives for rural dwellers to access services in urban centers. do not bring urban centers to rural areas. reduce noise and pollution in cities, create urban housing with green space and gardens so that people are not forced to move to the 'country' to enjoy nature and natural surroundings. Give preference to 'green' developers, builders, planners.
5. The RDN's Sustainability Co-ordinator presentation to the Citizens' Committee referenced one slide related to possible initiatives with regards to encouraging cleantech or green business. That would be a strategically better use of his limited resources in my opinion rather than affordable housing at this juncture, and will accelerate critical portions of the Community Vision economic and environmental sustainability execution.
6. We need to set the Official Community Plan aside, while we meet as a community with planners, who are experts in the field of environmental protection, protection of natural resources (water, trees, wildlife). By the way, there is no mention in these workbooks about protecting wildlife habitat. I am referring to keeping trees as shelter and homes for deer, birds, rabbits, etc. That needs to be part of our Vision. The lot turn our of participants in the Official Community Plan process has been reflected in the low voter turnout in our last election (may 2009). If people are to be encouraged to participate, they need to know that, not only is their voice heard, but it is honoured and expectations and needs are met. When developers are given more opportunities to carry our their projects at the expense of local residents, we feel we are being ignored. The implicit promotion of development in these workbooks is misleading. It does not come from the voices of local residents, local developers aside. I appreciate the opportunity to participate and express my views, but I do not see this Official Community Plan moving in a truly beneficial direction. There is so much work to do to truly meet future needs and to protect our environment. Without a healthy environment, economy cannot exist as we know it.