

# Results of the survey of neighbourhood perspectives on the Molnar Group’s development proposal for 388 Machleary St.

## Introduction

Close to 80 people attended a community meeting on March 27, 2018 hosted by the Nanaimo Old City Association (NOCA) to introduce the Old City neighbourhood to the revised proposal by the Molnar Group for the property at 388 Machleary Street.

The lead architect and development manager from the Molnar Group were invited to present the proposal, and staff from the City of Nanaimo’s planning department attended to respond to questions about processes involved in property development.

Finally, NOCA members facilitated a survey questionnaire to capture the perspectives of Old City residents in response to the Molnar Group’s proposal. Fifty-one (51) surveys were completed. The survey sought opinions in nine areas of the revised proposal development:

1. Preservation of the site’s heritage values
2. Types of development
3. Architectural design
4. Density, massing and height
5. Building height
6. Open space
7. Parking
8. Community amenities
9. General contribution to the future of the neighbourhood and its identity

Respondents rated their viewpoints to the nine areas on a scale of 1 to 5:

1 – Quite Disappointed      2 – Not Impressed      3 – Neutral      4 – Satisfactory      5 – Good

Respondents were also asked to provide written comments in each of the 9 items and any additional comments they wished to make at the end of the survey.

## Summary of ratings, comment highlights, and the written comments from the surveys

### 1. Recognizing or preserving the heritage value of the site

- What is your opinion of how the heritage values of the site have been addressed?

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
6	9	21	13	1

### Highlights from comments:

- Respondents were pleased to see the heritage aspects of the former site being incorporated into the development, especially the original staircase.
- Heritage design of the buildings, e.g. arts and crafts, is preferred.

- *A number of people commented that it was difficult (or they were unable) to assess the preservation of heritage values yet because they needed to see the design detail first. [This item actually referred to the preservation of aspects of the previous buildings or of the property (e.g. foliage) and some confused it with item #3 Architectural Character (of the proposed buildings).]*

**Written comments:**

- Not much left – nothing left.
- I need to see the design detail before I can determine the heritage values.
- Not really impressed – wonder how much value the old maps are?
- It's difficult to assess – I need more visuals to be realistic.
- You levelled the full site. Material that was supposed to be used in the interior/exterior of the building went missing.
- Please keep the development as much as possible with this [heritage] in the design. I live in Pacifica built on the old site of "The Malaspina Hotel" – some of the walls were used from prior development and they have cracks that have had to be fixed. I understand that the hospital was ridden with asbestos. So new is good sometimes!
- I'm not concerned about heritage-inspired design.
- Too bad there wasn't anything more meaningful [re: preservation of parts of bldg.]. Steps are good.
- A little too block like – needs some greater aesthetic value. Include heritage info.
- It's costly, requires forethought & was not high priority.
- It does not address in major ways the hospital foot print detail which is unclear and important to the design.
- I like the building outline plaza idea.
- I like using the foot print and artifacts but I not like the design- it reminds me of the barracks. It does not have a heritage feel.
- I am happy that the stairs were saved, unfortunate about the corner stone. Perhaps one could add heritage photos of the hospital or a mural would help.
- It would be great if you could build/consider green – yes – solar, rain barrels, no pesticides etc. would be very impressive
- Why is there no green space?
- Green space?
- Lost coper archways off site – add cometaph (spelling?) to old hospitals, there were two on this site
- Hard to preserve
- Design should be more arts and crafts style construction. Good to keep the staircase ☐. Driveway off Kennedy not desirable. Retaining wall/uphill drive? Negative impact on neighbouring house. Problem for garbage pickup.
- Preserving a healthy, unique tree -> cornerstone of old hospital.
- Can't comment on this yet because we haven't seen the actual design.
- Nice to see the stairs will be used. Nice idea to have Malaspina Gardens plaza.
- Like the aesthetic on Machleary. Original hospital built in 1950s - younger than surrounding buildings/houses. Agree with a cleaner, modern aesthetic. Love the view opening.
- I have a fear that the architect will try to incorporate faux heritage elements into the design.
- Like idea of keeping entrance step.
- Lay out good. Probably needs some decorative addition to make it blend with neighbourhood.
- I would like as much arts and crafts character as possible.
- I would like to see as much heritage inspired design implemented as possible.
- It's hard to tell, since the design is not finalized. Would like as much heritage look as possible.

- Given the age of the original building, not much could have been saved. I am satisfied with what has been retained.

## 2. Types of development

- What is your opinion of the proposed tenure of for-sale condos and townhouses?

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
6	11	10	8	10

### Highlights from comments:

- Although there was some diversity of opinion on tenure, mixed tenure (rental and strata) was most often preferred.
- Some concern was expressed about affordability of strata units and there was a desire to see some affordable housing for families or seniors.
- There were a few comments in support of the current Official Community Plan (OCP) and single family/duplex zoning of the property.

### Written comments:

- It needs to be affordable for families. We don't need more high-priced condos. Consider a condo/rental mix.
- I really would prefer the zoning be changed to join the rest of the neighbourhood zoning – e.g.: single family / duplex. The present condo buildings are far too much density for my liking, but the townhouses are fine.
- It should be part rental and part strata.
- It really should be mixed incl. low income affordable and rentals.
- Probably condos are better.
- Condos generally rent for more money than rental-only units do.
- Would like mixed tenure – some rental, more condos/strata than proposed.
- Like multi-family.
- This site was used to house building that served the community (hospital, college, long-term care home). The proposed development offers no benefit to the existing neighbourhood & the money (the profits) will leave the community entirely. The City is selling us out!
- [Re: Pleased] If rentals keep a low percentage of 10%. I live in a development that started out in a higher market that took a dive (Cape Construction – Vancouver) so not all units sold and developer had to lease – now all are sold but almost half the units are rented (speculation). Not always happy about that!
- For sale condos and townhouses
- It would be great to see an element of social housing added.
- I would prefer single family or duplexes but if change is unavoidable then condos and/or townhouses would be my preference.
- Some senior rentals should be considered. Should be a mix of rental & for-sale if possible. Would be happy if it was just rentals if the selling price is too high.
- I would like to see a mix of strata & rental to encourage development of a new & respectful community.
- Needs to be mixed, rental & purchase. As well needs to have mixed footprints, e.g. 1, 2 & 3 bedroom
- I'm in favour of condos for sale because I feel that owners will take better care of the property than renters.

- There needs to be a mix of both. HOWEVER price of rental/purchase will be major determinant of who can afford.
- Happy with the new direction. Buyer will purchase units and rent them. Believe the bylaws should reflect rental and pet friendly, lifestyle, storage.
- I do not want 100% rental but I think there should be unlimited rental allowed in the buildings which will allow investors to buy and rent units meeting the needs of the people who want to rent.
- Would like a mix of rental and for sale
- I like the townhouse idea-Vancouver has many heritage-looking townhouses which fit smoothly into their heritage neighbourhoods.
- There needs to be rental as well- especially in light of the current housing crisis. Seems too greedy to develop and sell
- Think single family or townhomes only. Seniors deserve a view – care facility preferred
- I think there needs to be far more affordable housing in our neighbours
- Need to have family low cost housing options
- Need to take global warming into consideration as you (?) have added a great deal to the environmental degradation and greenhouse gases from the waste you have created
- All strata or part strata/part rental. Would be acceptable to me
- I think a combo would be great
- Mixed tenure is needed.
- Not for rental please. Parking comes with unit.
- Should be both rental and strata.
- I like mixed townhouse and condo's but would also be OK with some rentals – NOT all rentals. I possible mixed use – still like to see some service areas/coffee shop.
- I like diversity. 100% either rental or 100% ownership is too drastic. Would like to see a greater mix.
- Excellent. 100% agree with strata. Buy into the neighbourhood. Love the townhomes.
- Please no rentals. I'm especially concerned with micro apartments. More townhomes, less apartments.
- Need some rentals!
- Stay with the OCP, single family heritage style homes.
- Like to see rental and strata mix.
- Some rental units should be included.
- If their units are for sale. We will be unable to live in them due to the high cost of strata developments. We will have to deal with high strata fee and condo boards.
- I would like to see some rentals units available – 30-40%.
- Would like a mix of rental and strata
- As an older person, I was interested in the rental option as on the outset. With this type of development, I would be able to sell and remain in the neighbourhood without exhausting my savings on the purchase of a condo. Perhaps a mix of strata and rentals would work.
- I'd have preferred single family/duplex home ownership on separate lots, like the rest of Kennedy and Machleary streets. I don't particularly like the idea of strata, and I definitely don't like 100% rental. I could live with a mix, but don't know how I'd feel about owning one of the units if it was strata. Too many horror stories about dysfunctional stratas and people who don't want to spend money when they get old because they don't think they'll benefit from the improvements.

### 3. Architectural character

- While the design of the buildings will occur at a later stage, the developer has provided images and descriptions of what they will use as inspiration for future design. What is your opinion of the general design direction they are proposing for architectural character?

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
7	10	19	11	3

**Highlights from comments:**

- *The comments indicate that a number of people thought the massing and features shown represented the finished design, despite comments made at the meeting that the buildings’ design happens at a later stage in the development process.*
- *Some people felt they could not comment until the design detail is determined in the drawings.*
- *In general, opinion was mixed about the merits of flat and shed roofs, but both were preferred over pitched roofs if heights would go up (with pitched roofs).*
- *Some openness to a heritage/mix of design was expressed, however heritage-inspired and craftsman styles were the most preferred.*

**Written comments:**

- Have a mix of heritage and modern/urban.
- I need to see more detail before I can comment except to say flat roofs are not really OK for all the condo buildings. Maybe for one of them. Townhouses need lots of heritage look.
- The buildings (other than the townhouses) are much too big and too high. Apartments building should be smaller and set back. This development is too big – it should have fewer units.
- Shed roofs are from outbuildings – like the chicken coop.
- Design presented does not really recognize the character.
- I like the current plan. Again – more rentals.
- Better than previous – not there yet. Like more of a combo of heritage / west coast contemporary.
- Does not match the form/function (...presumably of the neighbourhood).
- There are almost zero heritage elements in the design presented.
- Not bad – like the tree (green areas), low structures (height). Could be a mix as new design to let in light. Do like Craftsman style for sure.
- I like modern/urban.
- Heritage if possible but not making the roof higher. Westcoast contemporary will be okay if heritage look cannot be done.
- More aesthetic value needed.
- Only massing was discussed. Not design. Can’t approve concepts that don’t exist. Needs to fit with character of comments.
- I’d like to see at least 3 options proposed. I prefer heritage design buildings although it looks like the architect did a beautiful job.
- Should be heritage inspired.
- Very disappointed in design. Most people live in the old city quarter because they love and appreciate grand old homes. “New look” is out of place.
- The drawings shown tonight were favouring a very modern look. It should be more heritage inspired.
- Good quality, wood, natural light, neutral colours. Replanting are key so it blends in with the existing homes.

- They can do a lot to address heritage and consistency with the neighbourhood.
- I like what I am hearing – wood and interesting keeping some of the integrity (steps, footprint) is a good thing
- Looks too modern, no green space
- Looks too modern
- The number of units being crammed into the site causes concern
- I am open to having an interesting, well-designed modern building that complements the existing 100 yr. old houses, i.e. doesn't have to be exactly the same in design
- Looks pretty good!
- Nice to see front of townhouses facing onto the street.
- Needs more heritage design.
- It should be more arts and craftsman style. Problem for garbage pickup off Kennedy Street.
- Whatever is built needs to be respectful of the existing, not necessarily copies.
- The design again has not been done. The flatter roof line works but would like to see a complete design before commenting.
- Way too early to say. I can live with heritage inspired.
- Love the townhomes. Love the view opening. Like the heritage | buildings white as per the old hospital?
- I would like to see a clean classic design. I do not think the addition of out-riggers, corbels, or other "craftsman" design features are necessary or benefit the design. Stick to clean and urban, not heritage.
- Craftsman style architect to fit with the heritage style of the neighbourhood.
- Want to see samples of diff. designs. Not opposed to west coast style but need individual looking as current pictures showed.
- Heritage inspired elements.
- I want heritage inspired.
- Since the architectural design is still to come, it is hard to comment on this. I would prefer heritage inspired over the other styles, but I'm not opposed to flat roofs.
- As much heritage look as possible. We have not seen their final design yet, so hopefully they will consider this at the next stage.
- Given the developer's wish to maintain some sight lines, I think the flat roof design makes sense. Peaked roof designs, I believe, would defeat sight lines.

#### 4. Density, massing and height

- **What is your opinion of the proposed street edge presence – height, setbacks and massing of the buildings?**

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
4	5	7	23	10

#### **Highlights from comments:**

- *The townhouses on Machleary St. were very positively reviewed, but the condo buildings were seen as too big and density too high.*
- *The use of the slope of the land, the street edge, set-backs and the centre view corridor garnered a number of positive comments.*

#### **Written comments:**

- Would love to see an imaginative building designed for great character.
- I like the work and thought that's gone into the height and use of the slope of the land. The massing looks pretty good for the scope of the project.
- Townhouses on Machleary are OK. But Kennedy will just be a wall of condos/apartments. It should be set back and lower. The centre open corridor is very nice.
- Not happy with massing and height.
- Like it better – though prefer sloped / peaked roof.
- 160 units is significant.
- Seems to be fine as the heights is lower than the old hospital so houses in the neighbourhood will not see any difference as per views.
- Street edge height seems good!
- The townhouse concept on Machleary is good. The 3 masses are too large. These large masses need to be reduced.
- The design height does not maximize the amazing views. They should consider 2 and 3 story and 4-5 from Kennedy to Machleary with the natural gradient. This would increase the number of units with views.
- Better than I expected. Happy with the layout, building concept and setbacks. Happy to see more active residents in the community. More lifestyle and energy.
- I like the setback they are proposing.
- The townhouses will have no yards for kids to play in if they have two outside parking spaces and the 20 foot setbacks. I like the idea of setback of the top floor of the apartments.
- I do not like flat roofs, and thin the building should be around the edge with parking and free space in the middle. Street edge is good, setbacks good.
- Set-backs were discussed earlier
- I really like the proposed townhouses along Machleary as well as the view corridor, as well as the lower buildings
- Nice setbacks, green space
- Build peak roof.
- Too dense - larger buffer zone next to neighbouring house – driveway further away from neighbouring houses. Why not take more advantage of the view? Why not build a building more like the old hospital with green spruce around? Parking lot at rear Machleary.
- Seems good.
- Like use of slope. Two storeys on Machleary is good | four storey or three because of lay of land is ok – want some sight lines through – ok setbacks – stepping back of larger buildings for green space and decks – would be good on 2nd, 3rd, or 4th floor.
- I like the setback from the street for the townhouses. I like the fact that the middle building is no higher (in fact it's lower) than the old hospital building. Good idea to set back the top floor on 4 on the three bigger buildings.
- Like the height of buildings. Love the sighting of townhomes along Machleary.
- I like the street edge along Machleary. Townhouses are well-scaled however the apartments are too big. 160 units is too much | density is too high.
- No peaked roofs. I like the lower heights on Machleary on top of hill and massing on Kennedy and Franklyn.
- Needs more diversity in frontages.
- I like the look of the proposal.
- I would prefer two to three storeys allowed throughout but understand that this project needs to be profitable. I like their proposed street edge presence, especially leaving the old chestnut and the city property trees.
- Would prefer lower townhomes. Like the setback and that you are leaving the perimeter trees in place.
- As presented, the developer seems to have given this much consideration.

- Impressed with the set-backs that allow for existing trees and boulevards (especially the townhouses along Machleary). Nice consideration!

## 5. Building height

- What is your opinion of the proposed building heights, sizes, and positioning on the site?

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
6	7	9	20	7

### Highlights from comments:

- A number of comments advocated for maximum heights of 3 storeys on the property, in keeping with the Old City Neighbourhood Concept Plan.
- A number of comments in this section related to #4 Density, heights and massing. Many were positive, but some expressed that the buildings could be smaller, giving more green space.

### Written comments:

- If we have to go with multi-family complexes, I think Molnar has done a good job with this concept.
- It should be kept down to 3 storey max. There needs to be more green space and smaller buildings.
- No higher than 4 floors.
- Max 3 storeys
- Keep it 3 storeys (e.g.: Neighbourhood plan).
- The OC Neighbourhood Plan supports a maximum of 3 storeys. Why does this guideline not apply to this site?
- Looks good to me! Looks like time was put into this.
- 3 storeys are good. I like the sloped idea.
- Would like to see one more “clear view” through to ocean. Currently 2 in the plan. Good notion of flat roofs.
- I’d like to see max of 3 storeys. I’m concerned about the height with elevator shafts on top.
- They could strategically increase the height and reduce others. Basically, they would up the existing topographic gradient and tailor buildings to maximize it.
- Like the sloped design. Really liked the townhouse with grades allowing for feasible single level lifestyle living.
- I like the approach to the building massing they are taking with the top floor setback. I feel it is sensitive to the neighbourhood.
- How will the adjacent homes be impacted in regards to sun and light for garden on the lower side of Kennedy?
- Building in the middle is too big and looks very much like the company is maximizing units disregarding character and comfort.
- Too much land covered with buildings. Green space between development and neighbouring houses would be more desirable. Why not build higher and have a smaller footprint?
- Shouldn’t overpower existing homes. Restraint on height because of size of buildings is good.
- Height should be sloped to break the feel of solid blocks. Have green spaces.
- The three large buildings do not fit in with the character of the neighbourhood. I’d prefer two large buildings and the townhouses.
- Building storeys to three.
- I do not think the buildings should exceed three storeys.
- I like the open corridors due to building positioning. I like effort to keep buildings below max heights.

- Works well.
- I like the height but would like peaked roofs and I like the positioning on the site.
- I would prefer three storeys over four throughout the project.
- Would prefer lower height and low density overall.
- From what I can see, the positioning and sizing of the buildings are designed to take full advantage of maximum density along with some common space.
- I'd like to see the City stay true to the Old City Neighbourhood Concept Plan and deny heights above 3 storeys on this property. It doesn't matter what the hospital height was...it was grandfathered!

## 6. Open space

- **What is your opinion of the proposed open space on the site?**

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
3	11	3	15	7

### Highlights from comments:

- *The view corridor (coordination of stairs through green space to Machleary St.) was widely appreciated.*
- *The opinion that there is very little green space generally (on-site and perimeter) and no play space for children were common criticisms.*

### Written comments:

- I really like the coordination of the original stairs and the site lines (the major one) from Machleary St.
- There are no trees on Kennedy – just a wall of condos. There needs to be more set back, green and trees on Kennedy.
- In our older neighbourhood plants should include lilac, roses, not just mature shrubs – more heather – it's where beds...(can't read the rest of the writing).
- Love the gym and common area outside. Rebuilding the steps is a great idea.
- Like view corridor. Need more green space. More pedestrian friendly walking area, children's play area, grass areas / park.
- Not a lot of open space.
- As many environmental designs that can be incorporated to make this a building of the future – please!
- Open corridor good; no play space!!! not good
- I appreciate the view corridor from Machleary but hope on-site trees won't grow to block it.
- No play areas for children.
- Needs more greenery between buildings to take eyes away from "Russian" style block building.
- Open space/green space insufficient & no real design qual [?] to open/green space.
- I like the green space & centre green area. I like the view corridor through the centre. But, what about good areas geared to the children, teens & pets that will live there?
- Not overly focused on pedestrian movement on the site.
- Traffic-the intersection and Kennedy and Fitzwilliam, Machleary and Fitzwilliam already difficult to turn on to. Fitzwilliam traffic comes over the hill. With 170 + comes more cars and chaos!
- Outdoor entertaining/dining! Residents blending with the existing owners, common area playground, dog area, community lighting- higher end.

- No children’s play space. Lots of roadway and too much parking\*\* Need good lighting.
- The view for the building in the middle is toward other buildings. I would like to see more street access of smaller parking areas and less “streets” in the middle.
- Very poor landscape less than 5%
- It appears to be minimal
- I like open plaza in the middle
- Please keep the landscape as native, green and without pesticide use
- What landscape? I have more in my single lot - you have less than 5%
- I like the provision for view through development.
- Needs more views of ocean. No play area.
- It has space within the development, but not so much around it... a bigger buffer zone is required.
- Good to give a good view through to passers-by. Setback is also good.
- Would like to see more green on buildings. Open space on buildings – trees – or decks.
- Could be a bit more open space, however, I like the idea of various pedestrian access points to the site from the street. Would be nice to have more space between the two buildings oriented towards Kennedy. More green space for kids/townhouses.
- Love the view through from Machleary to Kennedy. Love the flat roofs to preserve views.
- Inside play area for kids. Need more green/open space. Keep the copper beech tree. Also, the Cedars.
- What about play area for children? Need more green.
- I like the opening allowing a corridor view to the water. Play area for children.
- It would be great if the community had some access to the green space. I like the view corridor. No play area for children.
- Seems adequate; lowering by 1 floor would improve more light and the feeling of more space.
- Would like more specific details along general landscape plan – I understand this will come at a later stage – hope there will be rooftop gardens.
- I wonder if the open space might be available to others in the neighbourhood to stroll and sit.
- It would be great to have less density: so smaller condo building footprints, more green space added to that already proposed. I really like the concept of the view corridor from original Kennedy stairway to Machleary.

## 7. Parking

- **What is your opinion of the proposed approach to parking on the site?**

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
9	5	9	15	8

### Highlights from comments:

- *Many commented that the City should not relax existing parking space requirements.*
- *Some feel that 15 spaces for visitor parking is not enough.*
- *There was much concern that overflow, visitor parking, and even residents’ use of street parking rather than the underground parking will spill onto bordering streets and that residential-only designations might be required.*
- *The underground parking is appreciated.*

### Written comments:

- I am satisfied that the developer has not asked for parking relaxations. I accept that there will be more traffic and parking on the street but hope that people use their garages.
- 15 visitor's parking stalls is way too few. We need permit parking for residents on the street to control excess parking.
- At seasonal gatherings parking will be a nightmare as the plan is presented.
- Many questions about the impact on street parking.
- But takes away pedestrian friendly aspects – makes it all about vehicles.
- Too many units = too many cars. Current space & bylaw requirements will not alleviate potential parking problems.
- Great to have parking underground. I live in a space 1 condo 1 parking space - \$30,000 for a second with very few extra spaces for visitors.
- On street parking will impact the neighbourhood – not good. Walking through neighbourhood would need cross-walks, lights, etc.
- The more the better (parking). No parking relaxations should be allowed! Having co-op car spots.
- I don't want the City to allow any relaxation.
- Get all the parking spaces you can & let us hope they don't come back with a variance request like all the developers do.
- Vehicular access will need to be revisited to ensure pedestrians/cyclists/disability vehicles are not at risk. Think crosswalks, pedestrian controlled x-lights. \* co-op car sites \* electric car charging stns.
- Would like modo car share to be considered in parking space.
- We have a parking issue above what occurs in other neighbourhoods. I think this needs to be addressed.
- The layout is road intensive and not overly pedestrian friendly. Can the space be laid out in favour of more pedestrian friendly movements?
- It will all balance itself out. Some owners will rent their spots maybe residents will have to get permits to park on the street. Units should share storage lockers. Townhouses must park one car inside if they have two.
- I see parking problems of the existing residents. Residential parking permits may be needed by the city.
- No parking relaxations asked for- good.
- Not enough visitor parking.
- On site visitor parking be available to the neighbourhood in the same way that the streets are available to the property owners/renters.
- People have love affairs with their cars
- How can you be sure how many spaces or vehicles might be connected with each unit?
- Expect problems
- You are making it worse by allowing people access to street parking
- Do not like the access point off of Kennedy St. Access should come in and out of current access points off the property and new access points off of Kennedy
- Concerned about probably on-street parking overflow.
- You may need to ask for resident only parking along Kennedy and Machleary to encourage visitors to the project to park inside the development.
- I think people should be encouraged to walk. Second parking spots could be {?} and used for more community amenities.
- Concern regarding street parking.
- Very concerned about street parking. 15 visitor spots for 160 units doesn't seem appropriate.
- Most houses on Kennedy and Machleary do not have driveways and must park on the street.
- I am happy to hear that no parking relaxations are asked for, however, I feel that the city requirements are inadequate. Our neighbourhood is already congested. Provide more onsite parking.

- Excellent parking has been contained to site.
- Underground parking is great. Nice idea to have driveways for the townhouses. I am glad Molnar plans to meet the city’s requirements for parking.
- Good. Most of parking underground – make sure there is enough to minimize street parking.
- Need to have adequate parking off street for all residents + their car(s).
- There is a driveway right next to the neighbouring property. It is not neighbour and neighbourhood friendly. Too much parking will also end up on the streets.
- More underground parking is needed.
- As expressed in the meeting, we are all concerned about the effect of the development on on-street parking. This is going to be a problem irrespective of the number of allocated parking spots for the development. I don’t know if there is an answer to this.
- Let’s face it, there will be more vehicles parked on the surrounding streets, and I’m not overly worried about that. On Machleary St., Malaspina Gardens staff and visitors parked on the street, so Machleary residents are pretty used to vehicles being parked in front of and across from their homes. Kennedy St. (toward Franklyn) has long been sheltered from excess street parking because for years there’s been no entrance to the property from Kennedy. Residents close to the property are not happy that this will likely change. I don’t see increased street parking on Kennedy as such a huge issue...I think most of the residents in the Kennedy and Franklyn buildings will use their underground parking. The biggest impact is likely to be Franklyn St. because the block is so short. There may need to be “caution re: playground” signs on Franklyn. Hopefully people buying/renting on this property will experience this as a walkable neighbourhood and downsize their # of vehicles (we did: from 1 truck & 2 cars to 1 car, 1 utility trailer & 2 commuter bicycles). Long term bicycle parking should be included in the development.

## 8. Community amenities

- **What is your opinion of the proposed community amenities on the site?**

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
14	6	10	7	2

### Highlights from comments:

- *Many comments that there appear to be few amenities (for development residents) and none for the community as a whole.*
- *A number of comments showed an expectation of (or desire for) “public access” to “private property” amenities.*
- *Funds should be given to support Pawson Park (across the street) as a community benefit. Other ideas were a community public meeting space, subsidized housing, upgrading crosswalks, benches in the neighbourhood, and replacing lost trees (firs, Cedars, Copper Beech, Chestnuts).*

### Written comments:

- There doesn’t seem to be many amenities – just some green space.
- I don’t think its realistic to think that the rest of the community will get to use the amenities. If I lived there, I wouldn’t need a gym but I like the idea of a BBQ social area for site residents.
- No community amenities have been provided, if we are considering the whole community, not just people living in the development.

- As far as I could see, there are no amenities for the neighbourhood. We are going to be left with nothing, not even a place of public art.
- Don't seem to be any.
- There needs to be a way for community to benefit and integrate: common space/room – could be used by anyone (even with small rental fee) – rooftop or elevated view area, fitness gym facility, yoga.
- I think the city should implement multi-family on this site and include lower income rental housing for seniors / single moms.
- If this development is to be units for sale they should include housing that is available for seniors, students & the disabled. Also should address the park across the street, bike lanes...and more!
- General space for play area for children
- Presently no community amenities offered
- I don't see the need for amenities.
- Perhaps the developer could contribute to the City for improvements at the park across the street. Available meeting room for the public to rent at a reasonable cost.
- Children's play area &/or contribution to Gyro Park to enhance for more ages/stages. Community public meeting room access?
- It's a commercial project not a project of social conscience. That said green space/open space would be great to share with the neighbourhood.
- I'd like to see the community get something back such as contribution to low income/low barrier housing. Also, you could buy an empty lot as parkland.
- Funds from the project should be directed to rejuvenating the derelict buildings and densifying the Old City Quarter.
- I would like to see a community bbq area to help new residents and locals become more involved or a community garden.
- They didn't offer any-very disappointed. Why don't they refurbish the park across the street to create a community gather place.
- I would not want this property to provide or give me anything but I would like to see fewer units and more beautiful buildings which would be higher priced but would add to my property value because it is a more desirable place to live. I believe higher prices draws more respectful and better owners and renters.
- There is nothing for the community in these plans for us to support the project
- Would the community be able to use fitness centre?
- Like the idea of gym, great to look at gardens-sustainability
- It's be good to have a mixed (rental/purchase) housing complex
- Obvious-is none
- I see none – want more for larger community use
- Nothing for community in these plans i.e. green space
- Not discussed.
- This was not addressed by the developer and needs further discussion. We expect something to come out of this to benefit the neighbourhood – possibly some subsidized housing units needed.
- We don't want a gated community. The idea of 1/3 sold, 1/3 market rental, and 1/3 affordable. The amenities should benefit neighbourhood. Housing.
- All power lines underground for houses along Kennedy & Machleary. Designated parking on street for houses on Kennedy & Machleary.
- Some park. Add to green space somehow. Replace lost trees – firs, Cedars, copper beech, chestnuts.
- Would like to see some small commercial spaces – coffee shop, professional offices.

- Money spent on upgrading parks – crosswalks – sidewalks – landscaping | benches in the neighbourhood – access to the gym + plaza.
- Rooftop garden is wonderful. Gym is a very good idea for the residents of the site.
- Onsite indoor – community center – use of building for community functions – multipurpose – possible inside/outside – use.
- Fitness facility? Walking up and down the hills is already a good workout.
- No benefits for the community neighbourhood, funds should be to support park.
- So far, not much has been offered other than the \$1000 per door. Perhaps this (and more) could go to improving Pawson Park.
- It’s hard to decide on amenities (other than benches, lights, art) on behalf of future residents for whom we don’t know the demographics. In lieu of amenities that I, as a non-resident of the development, wouldn’t have access to, I would support funds to upgrade Pawson Park (I believe the city has plans for further stages of improvements).

## 9. General contribution to the future of the neighbourhood and its identity

- **What is your opinion of the proposed development and how it contributes, changes or impacts the neighbourhood?**

1 – Quite Disappointed	2 – Not Impressed	3 – Neutral	4 – Satisfactory	5 – Pleased
9	14	9	7	2

### Highlights from comments:

- *Some feel the development does not contribute in a positive way to the neighbourhood identity.*
- *Some see positives in the possibility of new neighbours and greater density for neighbourhood businesses.*
- *Units need to be geared to diverse populations (incl. income levels, families, seniors, people with disabilities)*
- *Concern was expressed that the Old City Neighbourhood Concept Plan is being disregarded by allowing the proposed high density and 4 storeys into this long-established maximum 3 storey single-family/duplex zoned neighbourhood.*
- *Many residents expect the density of the development to bring parking and traffic issues.*
- *Some of the phrases used in the surveys regarding the anticipated contribution of this project: “doesn’t contribute”; “not a community building project”; “drastic change to most iconic blocks of Kennedy, Machleary etc.”; “massive change”.*

### Written comments:

- It really depends on how affordable the units are. If they’re too expensive, it will not be good for the neighbourhood. You need a mix of various socio-economic groups and ages, families and seniors.
- It turns Kennedy and Machleary into “corridors” – this is a single family / duplex neighbourhood.
- I do not see any positives for the community. What are they offering us? Why is there no social housing included?
- We would like access to the site and roof top gathering space along with the residents (*can’t read the rest of the writing*).
- Doesn’t contribute.
- Completely changes feel of neighbourhood – will no longer be a city/community marker. I can see my self avoiding the area.

- The neighbourhood is 100 yrs old. The design should meet the form/function of the neighbourhood.
- Other than possibly friendly people, the proposed development offers our neighbourhood nothing.
- OK – this is a great site and known only to our older generations. Asked a young 21 yr. old and she didn't know the site. Needs to happen! It just creates a new neighbourhood. That is community!
- It won't be iconic perhaps.
- It will change the neighbourhood for sure, good & bad. New neighbour & friendships are wonderful but also more traffic & perhaps noise.
- Really too early to comment based on info available. More – give back to community.
- All historical services on the site are “lost” to a developer who makes [?] profit on property. Developers need to be accountable to the neighbourhood.
- I'd like to see something of character, green space and beauty.
- Positive: densification. Negative: potential negative if the design/aesthetics are not right. Parking might be issue but could be alleviated by transit.
- Co-op out car spots. Outdoor yoga space, ownership vision by developers for the future of the complex, improvement to the park across the street i.e. bbq area, garden lighting.
- Increased density will help the shops and other businesses. There will need to be crosswalks added to Fitzwilliam, Machleary, and Kennedy.
- In my opinion is that it will bring too many people to a small condensed area.
- There has been no mention of transit service. This could be enhanced to the property and as community amenity.
- It seems that all the above questions would be ameliorated by just building for fewer people. Less density would be better in a general sense.
- Parking permit for existing residents two per house. Garbage and truck hours 8-8 for one day but not the same space. Love they kept the stairs. Happy to see them re-done. Loved again outdoor yoga space. Looking forward to see more finishing details of the development. Good quality, reasonable value. Better walking –cross walks at Fitzwilliam and Machleary. A way to connect existing owners with new residents. Outdoor community area. Better transit plan. Co-op cars spots.
- I would like to see fewer units but more costly units.
- I am concerned that a change of use might be granted based on one proposal that then gets abandoned and replaced by another that is not acceptable to the residents.
- Rental- I believe strata laws allow for a percentage to be rentals. Owners will rent anyway, and it's virtually not enforceable.
- Not a community building project
- No heritage considerations-tokenism with your presentation-most unfortunate
- Unfortunately, Nanaimo is growing up and things won't stay the same
- I look forward to future changes
- Personally, I would like to see all townhouses rather than apartment style buildings.
- Don't feel it is a positive contribution.
- We need more people living in the downtown area, but I would like more acknowledgement of the iconic nature of the site.
- Parking and traffic is a concern. Density. This should be as green as possible – trees and gardens. It cannot be the landmark that the old hospital was – St. Peter's will take their role so should be as appealing and green as possible.
- Currently it appears to be a high-density complex that could and possibly will increase traffic and parking concerns. Would like to see young families, single mother families, and seniors.
- MASSIVE change to the neighbourhood, character and culture.

- Grieve the loss of Nanaimo history to some degree. Higher density is inevitable. We appreciate the openness of the owner and willingness to be open to suggestions.
- The apartment blocks look just like blocks anywhere.
- Like the overall direction, but at a reduction to massing – more access to green space/views.
- Three big buildings are not suitable for the neighbourhood. Too many people and too small a parcel of land. Would like to see less than 100 people on such a small area in the oldest area of the city.
- Need to work on what the development actually will contribute.
- Setback, height make up for increased density.
- Negative impact. Retirement not family? Not taking advantage of views? Drastic change to most iconic blocks of Kennedy, Machleary, etc.
- Incorporate low income housing. Build in co-op car spots.
- It's hard to tell at this stage since our community has never been directly affected in this manner before. I have been here for 36 years so a change of this nature is monumental.
- I am very concerned that the high density of this development (1) on this site, (2) in this long-established single-family/duplex area, (3) on streets which are NOT designated as "corridor" in the Old City Neighbourhood Concept Plan (nor should they ever be), will detract from the neighbourhood. Here I'm not talking about the merits of the buildings and layout of the proposal per se, but rather the type of environment that is often created by the proposed type of condo buildings which I perceive to be a lack of getting to know your neighbours.

## 10. Further comments

- **Please add your comments on other things you like or concerns you want addressed.**

### *Highlights from comments:*

- *Clean up garbage that has accumulated on the property [Note: As of April 3, this has been done]*
- *Need a range of housing (senior, students, handicapped)*
- *Concerns for increased traffic, safety of the intersection at Machleary and Fitzwilliam streets*

### **Written comments:**

- Old City houses were built one at a time in whatever era - that's what makes the area interesting. I'd love to see something imaginative and unique from this century.
- No fences – cut down all the bushes and hedges. I don't want to look at fences for 2 years.
- I'd like to see a mix of small townhouse units and single family / duplex, heritage-style homes.
- This will add more than 400 people to the neighbourhood. How will this benefit those of us living here? Are there enough libraries, community centres, schools, parking, parks, community gardens, etc...?
- Community gardens would work.
- The ideal use would be a public park – possibly a playing field. It would have to be levelled but the view is fantastic. The rezoning will be many fractions above the surrounding – single family/duplex. Out of character with the neighbourhood planning. Still got problems with massing.
- Please put up construction fencing! Thanks for involving RCMP with the homeless. Please clean the garbage from lack of fencing. Nice building plan. Please have some rentals.
- Building materials – will this be cement-block – wood. I don't live in the neighbourhood however I was born in the hospital and my dad was a doctor there so many good memories. This sounds high end, concerns about local people affording? I live in Pacifica – too many rentals – love location – Hopefully this development will go well. No guest parking – only 1 parking space - \$30,000 extra.

- Thank you all for your time and efforts on behalf of the neighbourhood.
- The City should be mandating social housing in every project of this type/scale. Adding crosswalks to this area would be beneficial.
- How far is the nearest bus stop?
- How accessible for disabled folk to live/visit?
- No playgrounds for children in complex. Community amenities; City to dictate 2000.00/door to be used to give back to neighbourhood. Community gardens. \* Must have low barrier units!
- I think you need to take better care of the property right away. I don't mind the homeless sleeping there but the garbage & the mud doesn't look good. On the model, the roofs don't look good. Are there similar models we could drive by & observe? But, I'd rather have the shed style roof than have the bldgs. higher due to roof height.
- I think the property out to be used for ate type facility and park space- no density in this part of old city, townhomes maybe, no apartments
- Please think about the needs of low income working class families - who need affordable housing and not the wealthy who will be the only ones who can afford the units
- You are putting in a large number of people into the area
- How will you give back to the community given what you have taken away?
- Huge concern re: cars, parking and use of roads and lanes
- Dangerous exit from Machleary to Fitzwilliam cannot see if cars are coming over the hill from the lights
- That leaves these exits- Kennedy and Fitzwilliam, and Kennedy and Albert and the alley between Franklyn and Albert which not safe in any way for the increase in the number of cars that would use it
- Garbage plan would be required to limit the noise levels for commercial pick – up
- I appreciate the consultation process so far, and the willingness to listen and consider feedback from the community
- If you are going to do anything, consider the future and our children. Green is one way to make a positive difference and change – thank you
- Thank you for your consideration of this community and your openness to be very much part of this community process
- What impact does this have on: house and land values? what trend with development of 170 units
- Trend for resale and property value, tax implications/assessments?
- I hope that the project will be of mixed usage, with appeal to mixed age groups. Seniors/students/single and families.
- Despite anything that is said, personally, it is clear that you have the power to disregard anything that the community desires. Let's be honest, profits drive everything.
- Create a crosswalk at Machleary and Fitzwilliam.
- Would like this to be 100% strata with rentals allowed. Like the mixed use and parking plan.
- Please include a percentage of rental units. A mix of options is a good idea.
- Increased traffic onto Fitzwilliam, Machleary, and Kennedy. It's busy as it is.
- Crosswalks – Kennedy, Machleary – Across Fitzwilliam – lighting.
- I look forward to welcoming the new neighbours to our community.
- I see nothing that addresses the issue of traffic.
- I would like to see families living in this project. In the units, I would like to see as much heritage space as possible. Two people living in a two bedroom apartment need parking space more than a big bathroom.
- I'm still concerned about the amount of traffic and look forward to the traffic study. It may be that since it is so close to downtown, residents may walk. It may also be that with a mix of working and retired residents, the

traffic flow may be evened out. It would be a great place to have one or more MODO (car share) cars on site to reduce single user cars.

- While the developer has said it will not structure access from the lane, it is imperative this not be changed.
- The proposed development, being such a big parcel of land, is NOT conducive to mixing and mingling of its residents with the neighbourhood. NOCA has found it almost impossible to include residents of the other “apartment-type” multi-family units in the neighbourhood in its drop-off notices, so they tend not to be engaged in community-building with the association. However, if the various approvals are given and zoning changed to permit this, I am reasonably happy with the changes Molnar has made to their original proposal.
- We are used to lane-ways in our neighbourhood and many of us walk along them frequently. The view corridor from Machleary to Kennedy might be viewed as a “lane-way” to current residents and it would be nice if this was encouraged.