

Belcarra Open House 2 Feedback Summary

As of October 12, 2017

I have lived in Belcarra for:

| | Less than 1 year | 1 – 5 years | 5 – 10 years | 10 – 15 years | 15 – 20 years | More than 20 years | Not Answered |
|--------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Total | 8 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 18 | 43 | 3 |

My home is approximately:

| | Less than 1,000 | 1,000 – 2,000 | 2,000 – 3,000 | 3,000 – 4,000 | 4,000 – 5,000 | 5,000 – 6,000 | 6,000 – 7,000 | 7,000 – 8,000 | 8,000 – 9,000 | 9,000 – 10,000 | 10,000 + | Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Total | 2 | 11 | 14 | 26 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |

Question 1

The Zoning Advisory Committee is currently considering two options for floor area ratio and maximum home size. The “Current Bylaw” Option permits the same Floor Area Ratio and Maximum Home Size as the current Zoning Bylaw (502) (for example, 5,333 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). The Average Existing Homes” Option permits Maximum Home Size based on the average size of existing homes in the village (for example, 3,050 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). Which do you prefer?

| | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I’m Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | 86 | 10 | 3 | 5 |

Question 2

How important is the value of your home to you? Please circle on a scale of 1 – 10, 1 being not important and 10 being very important.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Didn't Answer |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---------------|
| Total | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 76 | 7 |

Question 3

Currently, the permitted coach house size is 800 ft². The Committee is considering increasing the permitted size of coach houses to accommodate a 2-3 bedroom suite. The Committee is considering either 1,000 ft² or 1,200 ft². Which size do you prefer?

| | 1000 ft ² | 1,200 ft ² | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| Total | 36 | 51 | 4 | 7 | 6 |

Question 4

The Zoning Advisory Committee is currently considering two options for floor area ratio and maximum home size. The “Current Bylaw” Option permits the same Floor Area Ratio and Maximum Home Size as the current Zoning Bylaw (502) (for example, 5,333 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). The Average Existing Homes” Option permits Maximum Home Size based on the average size of existing homes in the village (for example, 3,050 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). Which option do you think best supports the Official Community Plan?

| | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| Total | 81 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 3 |

Question 5

The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

See attached comment transcriptions.

Question 6

The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

See attached comment transcriptions.

| A. I have lived in Belcarra for: | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Comment form # | Less than 1 year | 1 – 5 years | 5 – 10 years | 10 – 15 years | 15 – 20 years | More than 20 years | Not Answered |
| Total | 8 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 18 | 43 | 3 |
| 1 | | | | | | | X |
| 2 | | | | | | | X |
| 3 | | | | | | | X |
| 4 | | | | X | | | |
| 5 | | | | X | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | X | |
| 7 | | | | | X | | |
| 8 | | | | | X | | |
| 9 | | | | X | | | |
| 10 | | | | X | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | X | |
| 12 | | | | | | X | |
| 13 | | X | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | X | |
| 15 | | | | | | X | |
| 16 | | | | | | X | |
| 17 | | | | | | X | |
| 18 | | | | | X | | |
| 19 | | | | | | X | |
| 20 | | | | | | X | |
| 21 | | | | | | X | |
| 22 | | | | | | X | |
| 23 | | | | | | X | |
| 24 | | | | | | X | |
| 25 | | | | | | X | |
| 26 | | | | | | X | |
| 27 | X | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | X | | |
| 29 | | | X | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | X | |
| 31 | X | | | | | | |
| 32 | X | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | X | | |
| 34 | | | | | | X | |
| 35 | | | | | X | | |
| 36 | | | | | | X | |
| 37 | | | X | | | | |

| Comment form # | Less than 1 year | 1 – 5 years | 5 – 10 years | 10 – 15 years | 15 – 20 years | More than 20 years | Not Answered |
|----------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 38 | | | X | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | X | |
| 40 | | | | | X | | |
| 41 | | | | | | X | |
| 42 | | X | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | X | |
| 44 | | | | | X | | |
| 45 | | | | | | X | |
| 46 | | | | | | X | |
| 47 | | | | X | | | |
| 48 | | | X | | | | |
| 49 | | | X | | | | |
| 50 | | | X | | | | |
| 51 | | X | | | | | |
| 52 | | X | | | | | |
| 53 | | X | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | | X | |
| 55 | | | | | | X | |
| 56 | | | | X | | | |
| 57 | | X | | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | X | |
| 59 | | | | | X | | |
| 60 | | | X | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | | X | |
| 62 | | X | | | | | |
| 63 | | X | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | | X | |
| 65 | | | | | | X | |
| 66 | | | | | | X | |
| 67 | | | X | | | | |
| 68 | | | X | | | | |
| 69 | | | | | X | | |
| 70 | | | | | X | | |
| 71 | | | | | | X | |
| 72 | | | | X | | | |
| 73 | | | | X | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | X | |
| 75 | | | | | | X | |
| 76 | | | | | | X | |

| Comment form # | Less than 1 year | 1 – 5 years | 5 – 10 years | 10 – 15 years | 15 – 20 years | More than 20 years | Not Answered |
|----------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 77 | | | | | | X | |
| 78 | | | | | | X | |
| 79 | | | | | | X | |
| 80 | X | | | | | | |
| 81 | | X | | | | | |
| 82 | | X | | | | | |
| 83 | | X | | | | | |
| 84 | | | | | X | | |
| 85 | | | | | X | | |
| 86 | | | | | X | | |
| 87 | | | | | X | | |
| 88 | | | | | | X | |
| 89 | | | | | | X | |
| 90 | | | | | | X | |
| 91 | | | | X | | | |
| 92 | | | X | | | | |
| 93 | | | X | | | | |
| 94 | | | | | | X | |
| 95 | | | | | | X | |
| 96 | | | | | X | | |
| 97 | | | | | | X | |
| 98 | X | | | | | | |
| 99 | | | | | X | | |
| 100 | | | | | X | | |
| 101 | X | | | | | | |
| 102 | X | | | | | | |
| 103 | X | | | | | | |
| 104 | | | X | | | | |

| B. My home is approximately: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Comment form # | Less than 1,000 | 1,000 – 2,000 | 2,000 – 3,000 | 3,000 – 4,000 | 4,000 – 5,000 | 5,000 – 6,000 | 6,000 – 7,000 | 7,000 – 8,000 | 8,000 – 9,000 | 9,000 – 10,000 | 10,000 + | Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
| Total | 2 | 11 | 14 | 26 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| 4 | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| 11 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| 13 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |

(1) The Zoning Advisory Committee is currently considering two options for floor area ratio and maximum home size. The “Current Bylaw” Option permits the same Floor Area Ratio and Maximum Home Size as the current Zoning Bylaw (502) (for example, 5,333 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). The Average Existing Homes” Option permits Maximum Home Size based on the average size of existing homes in the village (for example, 3,050 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). Which do you prefer?

| Comment form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I’m Not Sure | Didn’t Answer |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | 86 | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| 1 | X | | | |
| 2 | X | | | |
| 3 | X | | | |
| 4 | X | | | |
| 5 | X | | | |
| 6 | X | | | |
| 7 | X | | | |
| 8 | X | | | |
| 9 | X | | | |
| 10 | X | | | |
| 11 | | | X | |
| 12 | | | | X |
| 13 | X | | | |
| 14 | X | | | |
| 15 | | | X | |
| 16 | X | | | |
| 17 | X | | | |
| 18 | X | | | |
| 19 | | | | X |
| 20 | X | | | |
| 21 | X | | | |
| 22 | | X | | |
| 23 | | X | | |
| 24 | | X | | |
| 25 | X | | | |

| Comment form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | 86 | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| 26 | X | | | |
| 27 | X | | | |
| 28 | X | | | |
| 29 | X | | | |
| 30 | X | | | |
| 31 | X | | | |
| 32 | X | | | |
| 33 | X | | | |
| 34 | X | | | |
| 35 | X | | | |
| 36 | X | | | |
| 37 | X | | | |
| 38 | X | | | |
| 39 | X | | | |
| 40 | | X | | |
| 41 | X | | | |
| 42 | | X | | |
| 43 | X | | | |
| 44 | | | X | |
| 45 | X | | | |
| 46 | X | | | |
| 47 | X | | | |
| 48 | X | | | |
| 49 | X | | | |
| 50 | X | | | |
| 51 | X | | | |
| 52 | X | | | |
| 53 | X | | | |
| 54 | X | | | |

| Comment form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | 86 | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| 55 | X | | | |
| 56 | X | | | |
| 57 | X | | | |
| 58 | X | | | |
| 59 | X | | | |
| 60 | X | | | |
| 61 | X | | | |
| 62 | X | | | |
| 63 | | X | | |
| 64 | X | | | |
| 65 | | X | | |
| 66 | | X | | |
| 67 | X | | | |
| 68 | X | | | |
| 69 | X | | | |
| 70 | X | | | |
| 71 | X | | | |
| 72 | X | | | |
| 73 | X | | | |
| 74 | X | | | |
| 75 | X | | | |
| 76 | | | | X |
| 77 | X | | | |
| 78 | X | | | |
| 79 | | | | X |
| 80 | X | | | |
| 81 | X | | | |
| 82 | X | | | |
| 83 | X | | | |

| Comment form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm Not Sure | Didn't Answer |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | 86 | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| 84 | X | | | |
| 85 | X | | | |
| 86 | | X | | |
| 87 | X | | | |
| 88 | | X | | |
| 89 | X | | | |
| 90 | X | | | |
| 91 | X | | | |
| 92 | X | | | |
| 93 | | | | X |
| 94 | X | | | |
| 95 | X | | | |
| 96 | X | | | |
| 97 | X | | | |
| 98 | X | | | |
| 99 | X | | | |
| 100 | X | | | |
| 101 | X | | | |
| 102 | X | | | |
| 103 | X | | | |
| 104 | X | | | |

(3) Currently, the permitted coach house size is 800 ft². The Committee is considering increasing the permitted size of coach houses to accommodate a 2-3 bedroom suite. The Committee is considering either 1,000 ft² or 1,200 ft². Which size do you prefer?

| Comment Form # | 1000 ft ² | 1,200 ft ² | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------|
| Total | 36 | 51 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 1 | | | | X | |
| 2 | | | | X | |
| 3 | | | | X | |
| 4 | | X | | | |
| 5 | X | | | | |
| 6 | X | | | | |
| 7 | | X | | | |
| 8 | | X | | | |
| 9 | | X | | | |
| 10 | | X | | | |
| 11 | X | | | | |
| 12 | | X | | | |
| 13 | X | | | | |
| 14 | | | X | | |
| 15 | | X | | | |
| 16 | X | | | | |
| 17 | | X | | | |
| 18 | | X | | | |
| 19 | X | | | | |
| 20 | X | | | | |
| 21 | X | | | | |
| 22 | X | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | X |
| 24 | X | | | | |
| 25 | X | | | | |
| 26 | | X | | | |
| 27 | X | | | | |
| 28 | | X | | | |

| Comment Form # | 1000 ft ² | 1,200 ft ² | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 29 | | X | | | |
| 30 | | X | | | |
| 31 | | X | | | |
| 32 | X | | | | |
| 33 | | X | | | |
| 34 | | X | | | |
| 35 | | X | | | |
| 36 | | X | | | |
| 37 | X | | | | |
| 38 | X | | | | |
| 39 | X | | | | |
| 40 | X | | | | |
| 41 | X | | | | |
| 42 | X | | | | |
| 43 | | | | X | |
| 44 | X | | | | |
| 45 | | X | | | |
| 46 | | | | X | |
| 47 | X | | | | |
| 48 | | X | | | |
| 49 | | X | | | |
| 50 | | X | | | |
| 51 | | | | X | |
| 52 | | X | | | |
| 53 | | X | | | |
| 54 | | X | | | |
| 55 | | X | | | |
| 56 | X | | | | |
| 57 | | X | | | |
| 58 | | X | | | |
| 59 | | X | | | |
| 60 | | X | | | |

| Comment Form # | 1000 ft ² | 1,200 ft ² | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 61 | X | | | | |
| 62 | X | | | | |
| 63 | | X | | | |
| 64 | | X | | | |
| 65 | X | | | | |
| 66 | X | | | | |
| 67 | | | X | | |
| 68 | | X | | | |
| 69 | | X | | | |
| 70 | | | | | X |
| 71 | | | | | X |
| 72 | | | X | | |
| 73 | | | X | | |
| 74 | X | | | | |
| 75 | X | | | | |
| 76 | | X | | | |
| 77 | | X | | | |
| 78 | | X | | | |
| 79 | | | | X | |
| 80 | | X | | | |
| 81 | | X | | | |
| 82 | | X | | | |
| 83 | X | | | | |
| 84 | | X | | | |
| 85 | | X | | | |
| 86 | | | | | X |
| 87 | | X | | | |
| 88 | | | | | X |
| 89 | | X | | | |
| 90 | | X | | | |
| 91 | | X | | | |
| 92 | | X | | | |

| Comment Form # | 1000 ft ² | 1,200 ft ² | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 93 | | X | | | |
| 94 | X | | | | |
| 95 | X | | | | |
| 96 | | X | | | |
| 97 | | X | | | |
| 98 | | X | | | |
| 99 | X | | | | |
| 100 | X | | | | |
| 101 | X | | | | |
| 102 | X | | | | |
| 103 | X | | | | |
| 104 | | | | | X |

(4) The Zoning Advisory Committee is currently considering two options for floor area ratio and maximum home size. The “Current Bylaw” Option permits the same Floor Area Ratio and Maximum Home Size as the current Zoning Bylaw (502) (for example, 5,333 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). The “Average Existing Homes” Option permits Maximum Home Size based on the average size of existing homes in the village (for example, 3,050 ft² on a 0.25 acre lot). Which option do you think best supports the Official Community Plan?

| Comment Form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------|
| Total | 81 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | X | | | | |
| 2 | X | | | | |
| 3 | X | | | | |
| 4 | X | | | | |
| 5 | X | | | | |
| 6 | X | | | | |
| 7 | X | | | | |
| 8 | X | | | | |
| 9 | X | | | | |
| 10 | X | | | | |
| 11 | | | X | | |
| 12 | X | | | | |
| 13 | X | | | | |
| 14 | X | | | | |
| 15 | | | X | | |
| 16 | X | | | | |
| 17 | X | | | | |
| 18 | X | | | | |
| 19 | | | | X | |
| 20 | X | | | | |
| 21 | X | | | | |
| 22 | | X | | | |
| 23 | | X | | | |
| 24 | | X | | | |

| Comment Form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 25 | | | X | | |
| 26 | X | | | | |
| 27 | X | | | | |
| 28 | | | X | | |
| 29 | X | | | | |
| 30 | X | | | | |
| 31 | X | | | | |
| 32 | X | | | | |
| 33 | X | | | | |
| 34 | | | X | | |
| 35 | X | | | | |
| 36 | X | | | | |
| 37 | X | | | | |
| 38 | X | | | | |
| 39 | X | | | | |
| 40 | | X | | | |
| 41 | X | | | | |
| 42 | | X | | | |
| 43 | X | | | | |
| 44 | X | | | | |
| 45 | X | | | | |
| 46 | X | | | | |
| 47 | X | | | | |
| 48 | X | | | | |
| 49 | X | | | | |
| 50 | X | | | | |
| 51 | | | | | X |
| 52 | X | | | | |
| 53 | X | | | | |
| 54 | X | | | | |
| 55 | X | | | | |

| Comment Form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 56 | X | | | | |
| 57 | X | | | | |
| 58 | X | | | | |
| 59 | X | | | | |
| 60 | | X | | | |
| 61 | X | | | | |
| 62 | X | | | | |
| 63 | | X | | | |
| 64 | | X | | | |
| 65 | X | | | | |
| 66 | | X | | | |
| 67 | X | | | | |
| 68 | X | | | | |
| 69 | X | | | | |
| 70 | X | | | | |
| 71 | | | X | | |
| 72 | | | X | | |
| 73 | | | X | | |
| 74 | X | | | | |
| 75 | X | | | | |
| 76 | X | | | | |
| 77 | X | | | | |
| 78 | X | | | | |
| 79 | X | | | | |
| 80 | X | | | | |
| 81 | X | | | | |
| 82 | X | | | | |
| 83 | X | | | | |
| 84 | X | | | | |
| 85 | X | | | | |
| 86 | | X | | | |

| Comment Form # | Current Bylaw Option | Average Existing Homes Option | I'm not sure | Didn't Answer | Other |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| 87 | X | | | | |
| 88 | | X | | | |
| 89 | X | | | | |
| 90 | X | | | | |
| 91 | | | | | X |
| 92 | X | | | | |
| 93 | | | | | X |
| 94 | X | | | | |
| 95 | X | | | | |
| 96 | X | | | | |
| 97 | X | | | | |
| 98 | X | | | | |
| 99 | X | | | | |
| 100 | X | | | | |
| 101 | X | | | | |
| 102 | X | | | | |
| 103 | X | | | | |
| 104 | X | | | | |

(5) The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | N/A |
| 2 | N/A |
| 3 | N/A |
| 4 | Unnecessary, Silly |
| 5 | Makes sense to protect view scapes and take into account scope |
| 6 | N/A |
| 7 | Not enough information known, floor area ratio and maximum building size needs to be confirmed |
| 8 | Okay – sounds reasonable |
| 9 | I would like to see no changes. Just keep size as is. |
| 10 | N/A |
| 11 | Worth looking at in conjunction of existing 502 bylaw |
| 12 | N/A |
| 13 | N/A |
| 14 | N/A |
| 15 | Zones make sense – small water front lots and larger non-waterfront are different in character. Road access is also an important variable. |
| 16 | N/A |
| 17 | I think there should be zones |
| 18 | I don't think we need new zones. Keep what we have now. |
| 19 | Depends on size of lot. 4 houses on one lot unless over 1 acre is too much. |
| 20 | Good. Takes in account the differences in lots and geography. |
| 21 | Even within zones, specific properties + topography should allow unique homes. Height should not be limited on waterfront homes. |
| 22 | The concept is sensible but some refining is required. |
| 23 | Good idea |
| 24 | N/A |
| 25 | No. Badly worded |
| 26 | Might be useful to direct developments |
| 27 | Location and access |
| 28 | N/A |
| 29 | I don't support this |
| 30 | Thank you for identifying lot line front (waterfront) currently we are on the water and when we built, the village said the water was not our front but side lines with appropriate set backs |
| 31 | Zones are a good idea |

(5) The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 32 | Zones are fine |
| 33 | Good idea |
| 34 | Not in favour. Property owners should have the freedom to build homes that are sized to meet their needs. |
| 35 | Why – the Geographics will determine the realistic footprint |
| 36 | O.K. |
| 37 | I don't think there should be residential zones. |
| 38 | N/A |
| 39 | N/A |
| 40 | Seems reasonable approach, but so far the committee has not really used the zones to distinguish bylaw differences. |
| 41 | Need more information |
| 42 | We feel we need more clarification at this time. |
| 43 | Sounds like a good idea |
| 48 | N/A |
| 49 | N/A |
| 50 | N/A |
| 51 | N/A |
| 52 | Value retention of Belcarra, lots demand more liberal building far as lot size is restrictive. Lot devalued with alternative existing home option. |
| 53 | Model if after a similar Port Moody, Alderside. They had a special zone for waterfronts. As waterfronts often have smaller lots due to waterfront. |
| 54 | 6 new residential zones are what it takes to ensure every current home owner in Belcarra is not an outlier, go for it. However, if it (6 zones) complicates the bylaw to the extent that it will hold up building permit processing and increase the administration, forget it. |
| 55 | Too many. |
| 56 | |
| 56 | Zones are not required if we maintain the current by-law. If zones are created, I don't want to see any reduction in home sizes for zone R-2. |
| 57 | Playing identity homes, different rules for different net worths, immoral. |
| 58 | I think we are stepping in the right direction. |
| 59 | The zones are really unnecessary in many ways, but if we do go ahead Farrer Cove needs its own zoning. |

(5) The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 60 | New zones is a good idea. Farrel Cove South should be separate from FC North and + Twin Island. Farrel Cove South is unique from the other areas in that we have a church attended weekly by 100+ parishioners and a restaurant open to public 2 days a week. Road access for 35+ years, power, portable, water, hydro, cuble, fire service, internet, designated road access in current OCP. By giving it its separate zone it will remove this process to be done in the future when the public road is put in. Nothing else would change, just the designated area shown as a new and separate zone. |
| 61 | Different ZONES are a good idea. I live in Farrer Cove South and we are uniquely different from Farrer Cove NORTH and Twin Islands. We have uninterrupted road use for 35 plus years and all the service that come with road access. Farrer Cove NORTH and Twin Islands are true WATER access ONLY, and that is UNIQUE to them. They do not enjoy the many services that we do. |
| 62 | The problem with the existing proposed zones is that it creates inequities within the village. Should not all residents be treated the same? |
| 63 | Keep it simple!! The division of zones may lead to additional inequalities. |
| 64 | I think the concept is fine as long as the zones align with the uniqueness and demographics of the areas. I think there could be a rationale to have a separate zone for Road Access Farrer Cove (where I live). There road is specific to the properties it serves and not to the water access – only properties. The zone would contain the same material as RM-1, it would simply be named differently recognizing road access. This is not a major item for me, but it seems to make sense. If not done at this time, it would likely need to be done if public road access to this area happens to the future. |
| 65 | Currently Belcarra Bay and Bedwell Bay are distinct areas – 2 think this could be maintained. 2 think natural trees (i.e. indigenous) and exposed land could be maintained. Zones are an excellent concept. 2 very much like the idea of more duplexes and 4 plexes. |
| 66 | My view is that basically already two districts areas – zones. Generally speaking, the overall Belcarra Bay area has houses that are cheek + jowl extremely close to each other. Belcarra Bay area has in some houses being further spaced that blend in with the forest environment. I feel micro zoning would lead itself to major difficulties with folks trying to manipulate the micro zones to their preconceived needs. |
| 67 | Not sure why creating zones makes the rules different for residents. Creates more confusion about issue of bylaws. |
| 68 | N/A |
| 69 | Not important to me. A lot if just that and should not be differentiated from others with the exception of assessed and market values. |
| 70 | N/A |
| 71 | My initial thoughts on the concept of zones is that it is financially prohibitive to create 6 tax zones within Belcarra at this time. |

(5) The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 72 | Belcarra is too small to warrant 6 zones, districts that have different regulations stating what kind of development is allowed. We are a "housing" zone as opposed to industrial or manufacturing. This is far too complicated, expensive and bureaucratic. |
| 73 | Don't agree with the zoning definitions and they are too complicated. RS-3 is trying to define itself as waterfront and it's not. Simplify the definitions. Waterfront public road access/no public road access not waterfront public road access/ not waterfront public road access. |
| 74 | We do not need designated zones. We are too small for zones. |
| 75 | Not in favor at all. |
| 76 | I do not support the zone concept. The only exception would be Farrer Cove. |
| 77 | I agree with this concept and believe that Farrer Cove South should be a distinct zone from Twin Islands and Cosey Cove as noted in Article 6 of current OCP re future road access to this area. Notes that house size was decided after much debate and compromise last year and should not be an option now. The Zoning Committee was to provide more definition for F.A.R. calculations, as well as height, building envelope, landscaping, architect guides over and above 502. The Step Code should be phased in over 5-10 years before 2032 and should provide bonus density. |
| 78 | I agree with the concept of multiple zones. I think that the properties located in Farrer Cove South should be in a separate zone from Twin Island and Cosey Cove because Farrer Cove South residents have had a private road access to their properties for over 45 years along with "water access". The Twin Island and Cosey Cove properties have wter access only and any road access is very unlikely. The OCP discusses and supports road access in Farrer Cove South. Properties where tow homes exist on one lot should now be able to subdivide into properties of ¼ acre minimum under the proposed RM-zoning. |
| 79 | Absolutely necessary. |
| 80 | I agree. |
| 81 | N/A |
| 82 | N/A |
| 83 | Good idea! |
| 84 | I need more information. |
| 85 | I would need more information on the suggested zones before making a decision. |
| 86 | Zones are a good idea. I do think that FARs might be different in different zones – at least to the extent of East and West Belcarra. |
| 87 | I think the 6 zones make sense. I support it. |
| 88 | This seems useful, as it appears residents can choose from a range of options and still live in Belcarra. Those of us who prefer the original character should be able to stay in our HOMES. If financial investment is the goal, the option is there. |
| 89 | Not sure it is necessary. |
| 90 | I agree there are areas totally different in our Village. |
| 91 | N/A |

(5) The Committee is currently considering the creation of 6 new residential zones based on unique areas and geographies within the village. What are your thoughts on the concept of zones based on area?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 92 | The concept of zones based on lot area is unacceptable. concept of a house area based on lot area is acceptable. Current property line set line setbacks and building height restrictions and set the maximum floor area and house volume possible. |
| 93 | Simply state: no residents want to see their houses devalued. Nor should we divide the village with these residential zone. Both options are not comparable to other municipalities. The OCP should have comparable bylaws to other surrounding municipalities – Anmore, Port Moody, Coquitlam. The OCP takes into consideration fairness – these options are grossly unfair to the Village of Belcarra’s residents. UNANIMOUS VOTE AT METTING AGREES WITH THIS! NO \$ DECREASE! |
| 94 | This is an issue for OCP and is not what we are talking about in regards to changing the bylaw. I also feel that we are already feeling a great divide in our community and I think creating zones will further fuel dissent among residents. I do not want that. |
| 95 | Deal with that issue at another time. OCP issue. |
| 96 | Just jeep zones as they are now RS/RS2 is an option for other development |
| 97 | Zones ok. All premium area lots to allow LARGE (12,000 or more) houses |
| 98 | N/A |
| 99 | N/A |
| 100 | N/A |
| 101 | N/A |
| 102 | N/A |
| 103 | N/A |
| 104 | <p>I want existing height restrictions but more importantly, viewsapes to be maintained. We have lots in front of our property that slope down to the water.</p> <p>I do not want coach houses on the top of the water. I do not want coach on the top of the slope taking away my view and my lot value with it.</p> |

(6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

| Comment Form # | Response |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | N/A |
| 2 | N/A |
| 3 | N/A |
| 4 | Allow for subdividable lots of 0.25 acres |
| 5 | Maintain regulations that protect green space, trees etc. Allow subdividable lots to 0.25 acres |
| 6 | Due to the individual nature of each lot I believe we need flexibility that can be built. I hope that will be considered. |
| 7 | If the Official Community Plan in any way makes existing homes non-conforming it needs to be changed. Perhaps the Official Community Plan needs to be revised and improved to include our whole community as it is now. |
| 8 | Current drive to reduce home size especially by a vocal group who wants to maintain the status quo = living in the past. The OCP needs to be revised and updated to reflect today and the future. Belcarra is fantastic as it is! With a diversity of homes and population – along Belcarra Bay Road, houses are single storey when viewed from the street one to the topography. The setback between homes comply to existing zoning, otherwise would not have been given a building permit – No HOME SHOULD BE NON CONFORMING!! |
| 9 | N/A |
| 10 | N/A |
| 11 | The use of “not withstanding clause” will only work if it is not challenged legally. What is the legality of this from a BC Provincial point of view? The use of the current bylaw will limit the use this “not withstanding clause” VS “average existing homes” FSR formula. |
| 12 | I want everything to be the way things were before 502! I would like to know what started this whole issue of house sizes! |
| 13 | N/A |
| 14 | I think the kind of money the village is spending on this is ridiculous. This is the second time, when will it stop. When the minority gets its way? |
| 15 | Several residents have raised concerns that their unique property might be unduly impacted when restrictions are applied by a new bylaw. They would like to have an opportunity to make a case (board of variance?) that for their plans there would be no victim of variance. Worth consideration and possible expansion of criteria. |
| 16 | N/A |
| 17 | I think that duplexes or even 2 single family homes that don't exceed the max of current by law could be allowed on lots somewhat smaller than 1-acre lots. I support increasing density in an environmentally conscious way. |
| 18 | You would be devaluing my property by limiting the size of houses + can rebuild. I should at least be able to build as large a house as the largest house on a smaller size property, currently! My attached garage crawl space should not be included in square footage of my house!!! |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 19 | Are unattached houses counted in house size? What about an open carport? You assume everyone will get extra room because of sloping grade, If built on rock below grade space with no windows is not quality space. |
| 20 | Do not want monster homes but feel village has to take lot size ore into account instead of averaging. For example, my home is on a ½ acre lot and was built by a retired person in 1959. I am now the sole occupant and fully expect a new home (larger) to be rebuilt when I sell. Should have side set back so [writing unreadable] are not built right to last [writing unreadable]. |
| 21 | The “smaller home” advocates are attempting to go backwards to a time that has passed. Within general limits and setbacks (heights) let people build what they want. |
| 22 | N/A |
| 23 | No short term rentals |
| 24 | N/A |
| 25 | N/A |
| 26 | N/A |
| 27 | Good job by Zac members – please convey |
| 28 | N/A |
| 29 | I feel very frustrated that despite the majority of residents opposing changes to smaller home sizes, council continues to push this issue. Multigenerational homes will become more prevalent in the future and proposed changes would mean our current family would not be accommodated in a new Belcarra home. Reduce size would result in lawsuits, decrease in value of homes and insurance issues for people who cannot insure their homes. |
| 30 | Keep up the good work. The open house and the presentation helped inform the village of the community process. |
| 31 | Reducing the size we could rebuild our home would be a terrible financial blow to our family. Please leave the size as they are. |
| 32 | N/A |
| 33 | I have a 0.74 acre lot on Bedwell Bay Road. It’s large enough to put a large house and not affect views of the surrounding trees. I am not in favor of reducing the allowable size to the extent of average existing homes option. It is too restrictive and I think will reduce property value by reducing # of potential buyers. |
| 34 | Limiting house size to less than today’s standards is wrong. I don’t see any issues with home size in this community where I have lived or nearly 45 years. |
| 35 | N/A |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 36 | N/A |
| 37 | I would rather there was no change to bylaw 502 |
| 38 | I wish my house to conform. It conforms when I built. |
| 39 | There shouldn't be any change to bylaw 502 |
| 40 | It is imperative that the bylaw is compatible with the OCP, especially the rural character of the village and greenhouse gas commitments. |
| 41 | If the OCP in any way makes any existing homes non-conforming, it needs to be changed. |
| 42 | We want to see the small village feel of Belcarra stay the way it is. No monster homes with designs that don't fit with the feel of the natural surroundings. |
| 43 | I agree the current bylaw needs to be changed but the new proposal is too restrictive. |
| 44 | N/A |
| 45 | If the OCP in any way makes any existing homes non-conforming, it needs to be changed. |
| 46 | N/A |
| 47 | N/A |
| 48 | N/A |
| 49 | N/A |
| 50 | N/A |
| 60 | New zones is a good idea. Farrel Cove South should be separate from FC North and + Twin Island. Farrel Cove South is unique from the other areas in that we have a church attended weekly by 100+ parishioners and a restaurant open to public 2 days a week. Road access for 35+ years, power, portable, water, hydro, cube, fire service, internet, designated road access in current OCP. By giving it its separate zone it will remove this process to be done in the future when the public road is put in. Nothing else would change, just the designated area shown as a new and separate zone. |
| 61 | Different ZONES are a good idea. I live in Farrer Cove South and we are uniquely different from Farrer Cove NORTH and Twin Islands. We have uninterrupted road use for 35 plus years and all the service that come with road access. Farrer Cove NORTH and Twin Islands are true WATER access ONLY, and that is UNIQUE to them. They do not enjoy the many services that we do. |
| 62 | The problem with the existing proposed zones is that it creates inequities within the village. Should not all residents be treated the same? |
| 63 | Keep it simple!! The division of zones may lead to additional inequalities. |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 64 | I think the concept is fine as long as the zones align with the uniqueness and demographics of the areas. I think there could be a rationale to have a separate zone for Road Access Farrer Cove (where I live). There road is specific to the properties it serves and not to the water access – only properties. The zone would contain the same material as RM-1, it would simply be named differently recognizing road access. This is not a major item for me, but it seems to make sense. If not done at this time, it would likely need to be done if public road access to this area happens to the future. |
| 65 | Currently Belcarra Bay and Bedwell Bay are distinct areas – 2 think this could be maintained. 2 think natural trees (i.e. indigenous) and exposed land could be maintained. Zones are an excellent concept. 2 very much like the idea of more duplexes and 4 plexes. |
| 66 | My view is that basically already two districts areas – zones. Generally speaking, the overall Belcarra Bay area has houses that are cheek + jowl extremely close to each other. Belcarra Bay area has in some houses being further spaced that blend in with the forest environment. I feel micro zoning would lead itself to major difficulties with folks trying to manipulate the micro zones to their preconceived needs. |
| 67 | Not sure why creating zones makes the rules different for residents. Creates more confusion about issue of bylaws. |
| 68 | N/A |
| 69 | Not important to me. A lot if just that and should not be differentiated from others with the exception of assessed and market values. |
| 70 | N/A |
| 71 | My initial thoughts on the concept of zones is that it is financially prohibitive to create 6 tax zones within Belcarra at this time. |
| 72 | Belcarra is too small to warrant 6 zones, districts that have different regulations stating what kind of development is allowed. We are a “housing” zone as opposed to industrial or manufacturing. This is far too complicated, expensive and bureaucratic. |
| 73 | Don’t agree with the zoning definitions and they are too complicated. RS-3 is trying to define itself as waterfront and it’s not. Simplify the definitions. Waterfront public road access/no public road access not waterfront public road access/ not waterfront public road access. |
| 74 | We do not need designated zones. We are too small for zones. |
| 75 | Not in favor at all. |
| 76 | I do not support the zone concept. The only exception would be Farrer Cove. |
| 77 | I agree with this concept and believe that Farrer Cove South should be a distinct zone from Twin Islands and Cosa Cove as noted in Article 6 of current OCP re future road access to this area. Notes that house size was decided after much debate and compromise last year and should not be an option now. The Zoning Committee was to provide more definition for F.A.R. calculations, as well as height, building envelope, landscaping, architect guides over and above 502. The Step Code should be phased in over 5-10 years before 2032 and should provide bonus density. |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 78 | I agree with the concept of multiple zones. I think that the properties located in Farrer Cove South should be in a separate zone from Twin Island and Cosey Cove because Farrer Cove South residents have had a private road access to their properties for over 45 years along with “water access”. The Twin Island and Cosey Cove properties have wter access only and any road acess is very unlikely. The OCP discusses and supports road access in Farrer Cove South. Properties where tow homes exist on one lot should now be able to subdivide into properties of ¼ acre minimum under the proposed RM-zoning. |
| 79 | Absolutely necessary. |
| 80 | I agree. |
| 81 | N/A |
| 82 | N/A |
| 83 | Good idea! |
| 84 | I need more information. |
| 85 | I would need more information on the suggested zones before making a decision. |
| 86 | Zones are a good idea. I do think that FARs might be different in different zones – at least to the extent of East and West Belcarra. |
| 87 | I think the 6 zones make sense. I support it. |
| 88 | This seems useful, as it appears residents can choose from a range of options and still live in Belcarra. Those of us who prefer the original character should be able to stay in our HOMES. If financial investment is the goal, the option is there. |
| 89 | Not sure it is necessary. |
| 90 | I agree there are areas totally different in our Village. |
| 91 | N/A |
| 92 | The concept of zones based on lot area is unacceptable. concept of a house area based on lot area is acceptable. Current property line set line setbacks and building height restrictions and set the maximum floor area and house volume possible. Create Bylaws which reduce Maximum floor space based on the new house blocking existing and future houses views capes. In theory a new house could have 2 underground floors which have no negative impact on neighbour views but triple the new home floor area. |
| 93 | Simply state: no residents want to see their houses devalued. Nor should we divide the village with these residential zone. Both options are not comparable to other municipalities. The OCP should have comparable bylaws to other surrounding municipalities – Anmore, Port Moody, Coquitlam. The OCP takes into consideration fairness – these options are grossly unfair to the Village of Belcarra’s residents. UNANIMOUS VOTE AT METTING AGREES WITH THIS! NO \$ DECREASE! |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 94 | <p>“Cap size” should be NO LESS than the largest house that has been allowed. If the “village” wants to put a CAP on size of houses that can be built from now on, the ONLY fair option is to do this. The Village would be making a huge mistake by implementing the zone change to REDUCE house size allowed. I don’t want my tax payers dollars spent on consultant fees to “validate” the smaller house size and I also don’t want my tax dollars used up on the inevitable legal fees once the lawsuits start! I wish the councilors and the Mayor would really listen and be honest and fair. There is great opposition to the suggest bylaw change! The change does not make any sense! I am open minded and have not heard any evidence on how this change would be of benefit to the MAJORITY OF RESIDENTS!</p> |
| 95 | N/A |
| 96 | Is ther a conflict of interest if council makes the bylaw? Keep 502 with refinement. |
| 97 | <p>Yes there are many things I would like to share. The following are not all that I would like to share but I am concentrating on the what is not being discussed enough. The true description of what has been happening is overlooked in most discussions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Belcarra was relatively peaceful and houses were being built that tremendously enhanced the community prior to 502. 2. Without warning or good reason I found myself under severe attack by Others who had decided that they were going to pursue having my property rights to build severely diminished. 3. The reason for the attack is unclear and simply described by the Others as an attempt to keep the character of Belcarra. 4. I, who am under attack, attempt to guess what is REALLY going on in the brains of the attackers. <p>Is it JEALOUSY?? Is it CONTEMPT OF WEALTHY PEOPLE?? Is it SOCIOPATHIC MENTALITY?? Is it PSYCHOPATHIC MENTALITY?? Is it DEMENTIA (EARLY STAGE)?? Is it ALZHEIMERS DISEASE?? Is it UNHEALTHY SELF CENTEREDNESS?? Is it NARCISSISM?? Is it SELF DELUSION OF HIGH IQ?? Is RADICALIZED AGITATOR MENTALITY part of the problem?? I don't know but probably all the above. 5. I, the attacked, am on the DEFENCE ONLY of my Property Rights. In conclusion, I find the actions by Government of Belcarra and this entire process to be FAKE and TOTALLY FLAWED. It is not FAIR TO All. I am not interested in controlling and manipulating the FREEDOM of OTHERS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. A very cute trick by the attackers. Hire some MERCENARIES (The Consultants) and have them aid the attackers. Then send the bill the all including those being attacked. The Consultants are doing a very good job of PRETENDING to being educated and unbiased even as they are so obviously hired in the exercise of exterminating many of the property rights of the property owners of Belcarra. 7. The destruction of the decades long friendships and "class war" (defined as " conflict between social or economic classes (especially between the capitalist and proletariat classes)" is ever present. 8. The "I have mine and you can't have yours" mentality has usurped fairness to all. 9. I was not given enough choices on the questionnaire. I prefer PRE 502 house size and concede that there are some matters to be fine tuned to create an even better regulations. As an example Coach houses need to me much larger on the larger lots. |

| (6) The Committee welcomes your feedback. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment Form # | Response |
| 98 | N/A |
| 99 | N/A |
| 100 | N/A |
| 101 | N/A |
| 102 | N/A |
| 103 | N/A |
| 104 | <p>During the October 4th meeting, Dave Warren asked for a show of hands of people who want to keep 502. An overwhelming majority put up their hands. It showed the council has this process backwards. It is wasting 207000 dollars to then find out it is not serving the community. An egregious waste of money. No one wants to see 20,000 sq ft homes and no one wants to see the value of their likely biggest investment reduced. A simple tweak of the existinf OCP investment would have sufficed to bring down the max house size. Coach housing, duplexes, etc will change the character of this just as much or more than a bigger sq ft house.</p> |