

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

ID	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + Responses 65		Q5 Buffer + Responses 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns Responses 64		Q8 Water/sewer co Responses 51		Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments			
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	Yes	No		comments	comments	
					in favour 27% 17	16% 10	neutral 10% 10	somewhat opposed 56% 35	strongly opposed 47% 29						49% 32	51% 33	43% 23	57% 30	31% 18	17% 10	9% 5	43% 25	78% 50	22% 14							
					16% 10	11% 7	16% 10	10% 6	47% 29	9% 6	15% 10	16% 11	9% 6	51% 34	49% 32	51% 33	43% 23	57% 30	31% 18	17% 10	9% 5	43% 25	78% 50	22% 14	Comments		61% 31	39% 20	Comments		
1.12	1								1				1		1		1						1	1			too much traffic and already diverts to avoid Pembina, McGillivray backup	1		I have no faith in our city to do what is right. Already they gave this land without consultation.	No- City council is not listening. Buses do not even come close to rapid transit. Infill house often turns into crack housing as seen in Lord Roberts. Most of the city has been dishonest with consultation taking place after the fact.
1.13	1							1					1		1		1						1				somewhat		I hope not		
1.14	1					1					1			1		1							1				Too close to railway lines oil tanker spills.	1		Just convinced me present plans are ridiculous.	
1.15	1							1			1			1			1			1			1			Beaumont has considerable traffic as flow through already. Congestion can - is - heavy on Beaumont and Windermere. Addition car services will increase the traffic load due to current bottle necks at Point Rd and	1	1	This has to be properly designed and engineered.	Nice to see you.	
1.16	1						1				1					1			1				1			I do not want more traffic on Beaumont	1		Sewer is already a problem in Winnipeg	Yes, the city has to do something with the road system. I will never support any option that brings more traffic through west Fort Gary. Keep to low & medium density only.	
1.17	1						1					1											1							Is there plan of having a single detached house?	
1.18	1					1					1			1		1			1				1			It looks like there is not enough roads going to new development.	1		yes		
1.19	1					1							1		1		1		1				1			There's already way too much traffic - including large trucks and Beaver buses driving right through residential areas			not sure hope not	Not really - would have liked to see the city here so we can ask more questions.- I just want low (density) - a nice middle class neighborhood to blend with the existing ones	
1.20	1						1						1			1		1		1			1			No proper exit for existing community. Too much additional traffic through existing community.	1		we have had emergency pumps in the area before	How do you get to Red River College on the Rapid Transit? Need 7-11 Store.	
1.21	1							1				1					1		1				1					1	I don't want Parker to be developed. Keep it green space.	Don't develop Parker. Leave the trees! Nice border.	
1.22	1							1				1											1								
1.23	1							1				1				1							1			The traffic is already high. This new development will make it intolerable!			That's a question for an engineer.	Partly. Until traffic concerns are addressed by the city it doesn't make sense to proceed. If the city will allow access to Oak Grove ONLY via Waverley then it's OK by me. How about a roadway paralleling the BRT from McGillivray to John Hurst / Parker	

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Q1 Where do you live?	Responses					Q2 In favour of Zoning change?	Responses					Q3 Support mix of densities?	Responses		Q4 TOD +	Responses		Q5 Buffer +	Responses				Q6 Park site priority.	Responses		Q7 Traffic concerns	Responses		Q8 Water/sewer co	Responses		Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments		
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other		strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed		strongly in favour	somewhat in favour		neutral	somewhat opposed		strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes		No	south edge		centre	western edge		all	Yes		No	Yes
						in favour 27% 17	16% 10	opposed 56% 35			in favour 24% 16	16% 11	opposed 60% 40																					
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%			61%	39%					
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14			31	20					
West of Waverley																																		
3.1			1						1					1		1		1									1							To be determined
3.2			1			1				1					1			1			1							1				Build it. Wetland issue is overblown. Need infill development		
3.3			1			1					1				1			1			1							1				Very well done - thank you. It is good to have the facts presented and appreciate the opportunity to participate. I will miss walking the dog through this area but the city needs TOD to create taxes to pay for BRT. Stop urban sprall. Prefer as high density as possible to make it commercially viable.		
3.4			1			1					1				1			1										1				Yes		
3.5			1						1					1		1		1											insufficient information at this point			The Parker Wetlands should be maintained as public green space		
3.6			1						1					1		1		1																
3.7			1					1				1			1			1			1							1						
East of Pembina																																		
4.1			1						1					1		1							1	1								to me that area is not a priority for transit development. We would be better off with a more direct route to the university.		
4.2			1						1					1		1		1					1	1					do not know			Yes - provided a good description of what is planned. Questionnaire biased toward development does not ask about remaining a natural area. - Q2 how about a natural environment option? Rezone to parkland.		
4.3			1						1					1		1		1					1	1								I am concerned about the wetlands		
4.4			1						1			1			1			1					1	1								sewer system is crumbling and inadequate as is.		

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

ID	Q1 Where do you live? Responses					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses					Q4 TOD + Responses		Q5 Buffer + Responses		Q6 Park site priority. Responses				Q7 Traffic concerns Responses		Q8 Water/sewer co Responses		Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments			
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	Yes	No	Comments	Comments		
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%						
	29	5	7	14	14	17	10	16	10	35	16	11	16	9	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	61%	39%			
4.5				1			1					1			1		1			1					1		Comments		1	Comments	
4.6				1		1					1				1				1					1		Comments: traffic from the development trying to get onto pembina hwy. The Point Rd / Windermere / Pembina intersection is already poor and has quite a bit of traffic. More traffic will overload the intersection.			Comments: not sure but possibly		
4.7				1			1					1			1								1		1	Comments: I believe the developer is usually responsible for providing adequate water and sewer within the development.		1	Comments: Not really. Thank you. This entire project from the Transit / Land swap has left me with a bad taste in my mouth. No fault found with the developer. The city seems determined to force this through. - Q5 Why?		
4.8				1					1					1		1		1					1	1		Comments: Pembina Hwy!!!		1	Comments: It's a wetland, leave it alone.		
4.9				1										1		1	1		1				1		Comments: As a resident living south of the proposed development it will be an inconvenience to leave our home and get to Waverly.		1	Comments: This is a natural wetland which does what nature intended.	Comments: I'm sorry to see the green space being mutilated. Why does the city have to sell off all our greenspace?		
4.10				1					1					1		1							1			Comments: this project is assinine		1	Comments: Yes. It illustrated how silly City Hall is with planning of our city. The aspen forest and wetlands need to be preserved and the area designated a park!		
4.11				1					1					1		1		1					1	1		Comments: We can't keep up with current maintenance of infrastructure why do we want more pressure on it?		1	Comments: Informative. Yes. A larger room for storyboard space would be more conducive. (too close together)		
4.12				1					1					1		1		1					1	1		Comments: Traffic has already gotten heavy. This will make it worse. We're already having difficulty keeping up with current infrastructure, how can we maintain this development.		1	Comments: Yes. But the room is a little small. The street layout for the proposed division was not very clear. The proposed housing does not match with what is already there.		
4.13				1					1					1		1													Comments: Wetlands are rare and valuable - (unreadable) in urban areas. No excuse to convert then to another subdivision. We need undeveloped land - pristine or not - within the city. Wetland in open area and the forest are valuable. I support transit but this location does not serve a large population here! Transit is poor location (+ unreadable) for the subdivision.		
4.14				1					1					1		1		1					1	1		Comments: Why isn't it on Pembina? That is where I need it!!!!		1	Comments: Very concerned. You are planning to destroy Type A Land !!!	Comments: Not at all.	
Other																															
5.1					1									1		1	1							1	1						
5.2					1										1			1							1		Comments: BRT should be along Pembina where the people are. Didn't do a proper study in the first place.		1	Comments: Would like to see RCMP investigation of land swap.	Comments: The city doesn't have a greenspace plan only a development plan. What do city naturalists have to say? Could we see that.

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

ID	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + Responses 65		Q5 Buffer + Responses 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns Responses 64		Q8 Water/sewer co Responses 51		Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments		
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	Yes	No		comments	comments
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%					
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	61%	39%	Comments	Comments
5.3					1										1		1													Q3: do not favour residential development
5.4					1										1		1							1	1		Don't pave paradise!			It served to further enrage someone who values that forest.
5.5					1				1		1							1						1	1			1	This forest was the site of a very special & magical encounter with a spirit deer who lives there. It is a truly special & powerful place and I had always fervently hoped that it would not be developed. It is very sad to hear that development plans are underway. I see this forest as a brogd to the great mystery of the eternal natural world. The spirit deer disappeared when it ran towards the houses at the edge of the forest. If there's nowhere for it to materialize -- if the forest's integrity is compromised -- it will be a great tragedy.	
5.6					1		1					1			1		1								1			1		
5.7					1	1				1					1		1					1			1			1	Yes	
5.8					1	1				1					1			1		1				1		The train tracks would make me less likely to move here. A pedestrian crossing to Taylor near Sobey's would be beneficial to new and existing neighborhood.		1	Overly conceptual and seemed designed to appease NIMBYs. Important questions left unanswered. - is ground level commercial feasible - rentals or condos - buildout timeline (Fort Rouge TOD has been delayed excessively) I used to live nearby. Can no longer afford to as a university student. Affordable rentals would be a huge game changer, especially near transit station.	
5.9					1																		1			Active transportation corridor with aesthetic route by forest / wetland / retention pond must be charted. Waverly to Jubilee must be a well planned beautiful functional please.				
5.10					1				1			1			1		1			1				1		I've seen earlier plans. The collector roads isn't located well (with respect to the collector roads in other developments)		1		
5.11					1				1					1	1		1		1	1				1		Active transportation links next to natural area must be a priority. Link Jubilee to Waverly and underpasses AT		1	Much Higher Density please. 3-5000 people ESNL Natural inventory must be done like presinct plan. Value sample ephemeral wetland and grassland and forest. Don't call it Oak Grove or Aspen Grove on Parker Parkland or something less insulting. Take down the trees and call it Oak Grove. NO! Prioritize AT routes that work and that connect next to Nature!!	
5.12					1	1					1				1		1			1				1				1	Yes thank you	
5.13					1		1				1					1	1						1			BRT is not required here. Relocate to where ridership is.	1		No - this is already a done deal. PARKER WETLANDS GONE	
5.14					1	1				1					1		1							1				1	Yes thank you	

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments