






## SUMMARY REPORT – PLAN 6

1. Response Rate: 89.6%
2. 4 / 43 Votes
3. Overall Rank: 5
4. Compliance with Guiding Principles

	Strong Agreement –	2.9 %
	Agreement –	40.0 %
	Neutral –	40.0 %
	Disagreement –	8.6 %
	Strong Disagreement –	8.6 %

5. Design Review Comments

- a. **What did you like about Plan 6?**

- Agriculture area; high density should be 160
- Core
- 10 – High density areas. Like centralization of high density
- Commercial where transfer station is and along road
- No heavy duty industrial
- Like recreational area north + west for environmentally sensitive areas as long as it's low impact activities.
- To make infrastructure viable (ie. Sewer/water) high density residential area should be required
- Ag in east
- Growth OK along main corridor
- Stewardship towards the land
- Returning resource extracted plots back to nature
- Lack of higher density – but if 50 – keep in Hub
- High density may as well be high
- Commercial in town
- High density – 240

- Branding WV as a Country place
- Commercial in area that are commercial now 4 way stop
- Higher densities
- Have more low density further west on each quarter
- No 'Smoke stacks'
- No large industrial
- ESA
- Common sense stewardship of land but no more impositions
- Keep high density to one are
- Agricultural land
- Preservation of western feel
- Small commercial
- Reclamation
- Don't sprawl development out
- Like plan for growth
- Most of this plan was good

**b. What did you Dislike About Plan Six?**

- The development is so wide spread
- Med. Density area
- Med. Density at 80; should extend to west
- M-H spread too far
- Distraction of Agriculture; no preservation of rural land uses
- Against all principles
- 10 – medium density area to large @ south end. Suggest reducing this & move close to town center area
- MD goes too far S towards WL
- All the development north of river + west in ES areas
- Why weird development NW of town along river?
- Don't agree with development at far north of map as it is in ESA + high slopes + wildlife corridors!
- Density may be too high
- 'Go big or Go Home'
- North south 'wall' of development
- Way too much development
- No wildlife corridor consideration
- The residential going south of 4 way stop
- Amount of recreation development
- Too high on med density
- Didn't like high density
- Density of housing
- No industrial

- Too much high density
- Growth not in large enough area
- Did not like commercial

**c. What Changes Would you Recommend to Plan Six?**

- Exstend (sic) medium density all the way to rodeo grounds
- Industry – light industries should be prioritized, this does not have to include “Walmart”. But could include cabinet shop, mechanic etc.
- Take development of north + west area AG & ESA.
- Get rid of the “strip” concept of development north/south
- Didn’t seem all that clear to me. Confusing presentation/
- Medium density growth should go further west to river
- Broaden you density

**6. Table Comments**

Agriculture

- Struggle making land use decisions on others property.
- Ag area uses
  - Agreement that there should be guidelines based on unique values of each property
  - Ag
  - Good land stewardship
  - Respectful of what people worked for

Residential

- Why does the growth center boundary include the ONE (1) ¼ section on the left side?
- Any future development **MUST** be contingent on having adequate water and sewer (not everybody agrees with this though)

Commercial and Industrial

- No smoke stakes
- Need local businesses so residents don’t have to commute
- Need to buffer areas between residential and commercial (buffer is also needed between high density residential and other land uses)
- Industrial development should be located **AWAY** from residential
- Not a lot (if any at all) of industrial should be in plan area

Recreational Development

- Don’t agree with the ESA map or how the study was completed
- Recreation should be located near river



Want	Don't Want
Minimum environmental regulations	No quads
On private land OHV trails can be allowed with approval/ significant consultation of neighbours	No Off Highway Vehicles (OHV) on any public property (county owned parks)

Environmentally Significant Lands

- Dissatisfaction over how ESA was established (their land is designated ESA but their neighbours isn't ESA)
- By placing ESA designation on lands the perception is that it is less desirable to purchase – it penalizes people who are good stewards of the land
- The ESA designation adds an unnecessary level of approval to subdivision/ permitting (for example clear cutting trees needs studies to do b/c of ESA policy)

Natural Resource Extraction

- Gravel extraction in ESA is VERY costly because of the conditions the County places on them (it's costly because of the amount and depth of the studies that are required)

Other Comments

- Consideration should be given for low density residential on “poor agricultural” land. There are areas without CCN road access that are suitable for subdivisions

Challenges

- Difficulty making decisions about other's land
- There can be many different land uses in one area (for example lands can be either ag/ recreational/ open space or environmental)
- Don't like the Environmental designation (how the ESA study was conducted and the labeling as certain areas that are environmental)
- Didn't like that the ASP and land uses must conform to higher order plans (MDP – basically don't agree with all of the MDP policies)

Consensus

- High Density – if land's going to have 80 lots / quarter it makes no difference to allow density bonusing to 240 (at least the community is getting something out of it)
- Residential should be permitted to have larger lots (10 acres) with overlays and building envelopes to allow for further subdivision to smaller lots
- Even though lands have been identified as a particular use it should be flexible for other uses (rec uses can remain ag)

