



# Spring 2026 District Meetings

## Summary Report

Municipality of Chelsea

### Background

In spring 2026, the Mayor and municipal councillors held six district meetings across Chelsea, bringing together more than 200 residents in total. The meetings were intended to share general information on current municipal files, hear residents' concerns, and gather questions, comments, and suggestions specific to each sector.

This report consolidates the findings of those six meetings for submission to Municipal Council. It first presents the general information shared at the meetings, then a summary by district, followed by the cross-cutting findings observed municipality-wide. The detailed report on the District 6 prioritization survey, completed by 166 respondents, is attached as an appendix.

### General information presented by the Mayor and Councillors

#### Financial position and delivery capacity

It was noted that several projects listed in the Capital Expenditure Program (CEP) may not proceed without grant funding. Despite this, the Municipality expects to pay down part of its debt this year, and an improvement in its financial position is anticipated over roughly a four-year horizon.

#### Taxation and inter-organizational relations

It was mentioned that the National Capital Commission (NCC) does not pay the full municipal taxes owed on properties under its responsibility, representing a shortfall for the Municipality. It was also noted that Chelsea bears a larger share than other MRC des Collines-de-l'Outaouais municipalities for policing costs — about 7% more — due to the calculation method, which is based on property assessment.

#### Municipal organization and internal capacity

Efforts are underway to increase the Municipality's operational capacity, including hiring additional public works staff. A shift toward doing more work in-house was discussed, to reduce reliance on outside contractors; this includes acquiring specialized equipment. An organizational audit is also underway to better identify the organization's needs.



### **Governance and municipal operations**

It was noted that priorities are set by Municipal Council and implemented by the administration, in accordance with the framework set out in the Municipal Code. On matters within the administration's purview, the Mayor works through the Director General.

### **Urban planning, residential development, and the moratorium**

It was noted that a moratorium is currently in effect in the village core sector. An analysis is underway to determine next steps and the conditions for resuming processing of certain projects.

### **Water access**

The water access file was described as complex, owing in part to constraints related to private property and to contamination on certain lots. No structured development is planned in the short term, but options could be explored over the longer term.

### **Mobility and infrastructure**

Discussions are underway with the Ministère des Transports et de la Mobilité durable (MTMD) regarding certain road infrastructure. Some of the projects discussed remain at a preliminary stage and will require further analysis and, where applicable, public consultation.

### **Services to residents**

The clinic project was discussed; it was noted that Chelsea residents should be prioritized in physician assignment, in accordance with applicable rules. Parking issues in the village were also raised; some proposed options were ruled out because of zoning constraints, notably behind the pumping station.

### **School**

The proposed new school remains listed in the provincial government's Québec Infrastructure Plan (PQI). It was noted that the Municipality needs a community school accessible in the evenings and on weekends.

### **Water meters**

It was noted that water meters are functioning at a 99% rate, and that a letter will be sent to residents shortly to inform them of their water consumption.



## Summary by district

The following sections present, for each of the six districts, the main issues, questions, and suggestions raised by the residents present. The level of detail reflects the content of the discussions held at each meeting.

### District 1 — April 13, 2026 (about 10 people)

#### Property upkeep and cleanliness

- Concerns were raised about certain properties with a significant amount of debris on the lot, raising cleanliness issues.
- It was suggested that property owners be reminded of the importance of keeping their lots tidy and of their maintenance obligations.

#### Local services and resident information

- A suggestion was made to publish a list of Chelsea businesses and professional services to encourage local buying, noting it is not always easy for residents to find local contractors.
- A request was also made for a list of companies approved by the Municipality for lawn maintenance.

#### Waste collection and drop-off

- A suggestion was made to set up a drop-off point at the municipal garage where residents could bring bulky items, notably branches.

#### Roads and infrastructure

- Concerns were raised about the paving of certain streets.
- A request was raised regarding cleaning of the Voie Verte Chelsea (VVC) culvert in the south section.
- The question of bollards on Route 105, in the south section, was also raised.

### District 2 — April 21, 2026 (about 50 people)

#### Urban plan and planning vision

- Questions were raised about how long the urban plan remains in effect and about the planning horizon; it was noted that the 2021 plan is still in force.
- Residents are asking that building height be addressed in the next special planning program (PPU).
- It was said that large buildings along Chemin Old Chelsea do not reflect Chelsea's character.
- Concerns were also raised about setbacks, vegetation, and the impact of lighting on neighbouring homes.
- It was mentioned that some site plans have been revised multiple times.
- Questions were asked about certain strategic lots, notably the one beside the pharmacy, which had reportedly once been associated with a library project.



### **Residential development, densification, and capacity**

- Concerns were raised about densification and taller buildings, particularly four- to five-storey structures.
- It was noted that such densification could have consequences for infrastructure and for certain fire-safety needs.
- Discussion touched on various projects and areas, including Hendrick Farm, the technology park, the Meredith sector, and other residential developments.
- A concern was raised that some units might not sell and would not generate welcome tax, raising questions about the resulting benefit to the Municipality.
- About ten units to be built near the clinic were also mentioned.

### **Infrastructure and network maintenance**

- It was noted that development must be accompanied by consideration of road and infrastructure maintenance.
- It was mentioned that the Municipality does not necessarily have the infrastructure needed to support visitor traffic, notably in connection with NCC land.
- Questions were raised about the presence of traffic flaggers and the Municipality's capacity to manage certain pressures on its territory.

### **Drinking water, filtration, and boil-water advisories**

- Numerous questions were raised about water quality, treatment, clogging issues, and the technical solutions being considered, including pre-filtration and adding membranes for better filtration performance.
- Residents raised the issue of boil-water advisories and would like better communication on this topic.
- It was noted that a plan is in preparation and will be made public soon.

### **Water meters, billing, and consumption**

- Questions were asked about how water meters work, how readings are taken, and billing.
- It was noted that some meters were not working last year.
- Discussion touched on actual consumption, sector-specific infrastructure costs and how they are allocated, as well as pool filling and its effect on quotas.

### **Parks, community facilities, and quality of life**

- It was noted that there is a significant need for parks, particularly in areas that currently lack one.
- It was suggested that a park does not necessarily need to be costly and could be developed simply.
- The possibility of developing or better funding schoolyards was also mentioned.
- Future needs were also raised regarding the Meredith Centre, the arena, and the clinic.



### **Road safety, speed, and road design**

- Many comments concerned speed, lane markings, bollards, and compliance with stop signs; it was noted that lane markings and bollards were installed late last year.
- Chemin Cecil drew specific comments: the four stop signs there were seen as not very effective, with some drivers no longer respecting them, and other solutions such as speed humps or a roundabout were proposed.
- Concerns were raised about children's safety, particularly in the Meredith neighbourhood area.
- Comments were also made about Chemin Mill, where the 30 km/h limit is reportedly hard to see because of certain obstructions.
- Pedestrian crossings, radar feedback signs, and signage maintenance were also discussed.
- At the roundabout, residents noted that most drivers stop at the crosswalk, but that trucks reportedly do not and drive over the brick section; it was suggested that signage be added explaining how to use a roundabout.
- It was mentioned that the flashing beacon (qualiflash) at Richelieu has not worked for about eight months and that few drivers stop; residents said they do not feel safe crossing there.

### **MTMD and Route 105**

- It was mentioned that discussions are ongoing with the Ministère des Transports et de la Mobilité durable (MTMD) regarding Route 105, and that a speed reduction to 50 km/h was approved in one section.
- Regular meetings reportedly take place to advance files involving the Municipality and the MTMD.
- It was also mentioned that Chemin Old Chelsea could eventually be taken over by the MTMD, but not in its current condition.

### **Parking and local mobility**

- Concerns were raised about parking in the village core.
- On-street parking, parking meters, and a mobile app offering a free first hour were discussed.
- Parking needs were linked to certain facilities and attractions expected in the future.

### **Commercial development and local services**

- Discussion touched on the Richelieu grocery store, vacant commercial spaces, and services available to the local population.
- It was noted that some businesses have adapted their offerings or surveyed customer needs.
- The need to maintain or attract more services for the local population was raised.

### **Environment, problem sites, and studies**

- The lot behind the pharmacy was described as looking like a dump site, with materials scattered by the wind.
- Questions were raised about the water table, certain hydrological studies, land contamination, and the updating of older reports.



- The sensitivity of the Meredith sector and the link between residential development and access to the water network were also discussed.

### **District 3 — April 22, 2026 (about 30 people)**

#### **Communication, transparency, and access to information**

- Residents expressed a need for greater transparency and better communication from the Municipality.
- It was noted that the community wants stronger involvement, as well as more accessible and more open Council meetings.
- A question was raised about the municipal website and the disappearance, according to one participant, of certain features previously considered useful.

#### **Water access and docks**

- Questions were raised about private docks, shared docks, and more equitable access to the water.
- The file was described as complex, notably because of property constraints, private land, and contamination in certain areas.
- Residents have questions about dock regulations, the actual scope of provincial requirements, permits required, and the cost of the process.
- A public consultation on docks was requested.
- It was noted that water access for all residents needs to be considered.

#### **Municipal governance and roles**

- Residents asked questions about the distinction between the role of Municipal Council and that of the administration.
- It was asked how priorities are set and how they are implemented.
- It was also noted that Council cannot intervene directly with staff.

#### **Organizational capacity, resources, and services**

- Questions were raised about the Municipality's capacity to carry out several projects at once.
- The number of available resources and staffing needs were discussed.
- It was noted that the Municipality is looking to do more work in-house.

#### **Moratorium, planning, and development**

- Questions were raised about the village-core moratorium and when it might be lifted.
- Residents asked how and when projects will be able to resume being processed.
- Concerns were raised about densification, the review of the urban plan, and certain projects proposed behind the Meredith Centre.
- A concern was expressed about the pace of development.



#### **Regulation, enforcement, and support**

- Residents asked how by-laws are enforced.
- It was asked how by-laws can be amended, whether residents are consulted in that process, and whether public consultations could be better communicated.
- Some participants reported negative experiences or experiences perceived as excessive in by-law enforcement; it was suggested that warnings be given before fines are issued.
- It was also noted that some staff may lack clear direction.

#### **Culture, village programming, and community life**

- Participants expressed interest in more cultural programming in the village.
- The role of certain cultural and community organizations was discussed.
- The need for a more lively, dynamic community life was raised.

#### **Parking and traffic**

- Discussions took place regarding parking, notably in the village sector.
- Certain potential sites and their associated constraints were discussed.
- The need for additional parking options was raised.

#### **MTMD, mobility, and studies**

- Discussion touched on certain highway ramps and Chemin Old Chelsea.
- It was noted that the MTMD would not intervene in the short term at certain locations.
- A MOBIO consultation on Chemin Scott was mentioned, along with a subcommittee tasked with reviewing the report.
- The need for a better understanding of the recommendations and next steps was raised.

#### **Website, PiVOT, and public notices**

- Comments were made about the difficulty of navigating PiVOT and finding relevant notices.
- It was suggested that more descriptions, maps, and clear reference points be added, notably for zoning changes.
- The possibility of better using mailing lists and local groups to inform residents was discussed.

#### **Permits, forms, and documentation**

- Questions were raised about the source and accessibility of certain forms, notably those related to acquired rights.
- High-resolution aerial photography and access to certain municipal documents were also discussed.



#### **Motorized boats, access, and cost sharing**

- Discussion touched on motorized watercraft, access, and keeping gates open.
- It was noted that parking behind the community centre should be avoided.
- The question of cost sharing for users from other municipalities was also raised.

#### **Waste management**

- Comments were made about the collection service, notably about bins or waste left in ditches.
- Residents were encouraged to file complaints through PiVOT to document the situation.
- It was noted that the Municipality is not satisfied with the current service.

#### **Other issues raised**

- Questions were asked about the Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton report, the future of the Meredith Centre, and the role of the Chelsea Foundation.
- Concerns were raised about certain municipal fines, notably that the amounts collected do not return to the Municipality.
- Discussion also touched on MRC judges, service-sharing between municipalities, a possible shift in organizational culture, the protection of ecological corridors, the Dunnderosa lot, ties with Kitigan Zibi, and a potential trail toward the south or toward Gatineau.

### **District 4 — May 6, 2026 (14 residents)**

#### **Deer and road safety**

- A question was raised about ways to control the deer population; it was noted that this issue falls outside the municipal mandate.
- A connection was made to road safety and to reducing speed on Route 105.

#### **River access**

- Residents asked for an update on the river access file.
- It was noted that Council still has briefings to receive and that the file remains complex.
- The presence of municipally acquired land with docks that were not part of the acquisition was mentioned as a complicating factor.
- It was noted that there is not yet a consensus on the approach to take.

#### **Culture and support for artists**

- A question was raised about the possibility of further supporting culture and artists in Chelsea.
- It was noted that some support already exists through the Fab and the Meredith Centre.



### **Municipal revenue and debt reduction**

- Residents asked what revenue-generating options could help reduce the debt.
- An industrial zone was raised, with reservations about available space and social acceptability.
- Options such as installing solar panels on municipal roofs were mentioned.

### **Public transit**

- A question was raised about improving Transcollines service.
- It was noted that management of this service now falls under the MRC.

### **Private docks and support**

- A concern was raised about how hard it is for private dock owners to understand the current process.
- The need for better explanation and greater support was expressed.

## **District 5 — April 14, 2026 (60 residents)**

### **Cyclists — safety and shared use**

- Groups of cyclists (four or more) riding side by side on Route 105, without adequate signage or police presence.
- Use of community trails by motor vehicles in the Chemin David area.
- Excessive speed during cycling races descending Chemin St-Clément.
- A safety issue when drivers turn left exiting Chemin Bellevue while cyclists travel through at high speed.
- A bollard that was installed and later torn out was mentioned, as was a past municipal refusal to install speed humps on Chemin St-Clément.
- Lack of signage along the VVC trails indicating the speed limit; signs at trailheads were said to be too small.
- A request that cyclists be encouraged to announce themselves when passing pedestrians.

### **Docks and infraction notices**

- A request to favour warnings before issuing infraction notices.
- An acknowledgement that some improvements can be costly and take time.
- A wish to allow affected residents a period of adjustment.

### **Residential development — Déry quarry sector**

- Strong concern about protecting the Meech corridor before new residences are built.
- A request to know whether the Municipality will have time to put protective regulations in place, notably for ecological corridors.
- A question about access to the quarry via Chemin du Pont Étroit, where only one vehicle can pass at a time; no access plan has been filed to date.



- Concerns about tree cutting, climate change, and the construction of large homes.
- A question about when developers will be put in touch with residents to better understand community needs.
- Questions about mechanisms that could support affordable housing and avoid a “luxury home” style of development.
- Requests about the possibility of declaring a moratorium in Farm Point or slowing development.
- A suggestion to hold a public consultation similar to those held in other municipalities.

#### **Blasting**

- Concerns about blasting in the Crescent sector.
- Fear of well subsidence, referencing a past situation linked to blasting for the IGA.
- A perception that there is no regulation, or insufficient regulation, governing blast intensity.
- A request to ensure blasts are not too powerful and that homes' seals are checked.

#### **Sewer maintenance and financing**

- High cost of sewer maintenance fees.
- Questions about sewer-related debt: a 20-year loan maturing in 2040; a request for information on the remaining balance owed.
- Questions about how funds paid at the time of network connection are allocated.
- A request for transparency on agreements reached with developers at the time of installation.
- A question about the number of remaining units available for wastewater capacity.

#### **Chemin St-Clément and Route 105**

- A request for information on the possible timeline for a pedestrian crossing.

#### **Parking — Farm Point and the boat launch**

- Parking issues during large-scale events.
- Difficulty maneuvering at the boat launch since two posts were installed, as the space has become much narrower; users reportedly need several attempts to back in.

#### **Development vision and planning**

- A request to organize a meeting with the urban planner to prepare the PPU.
- A question about the possibility of speeding up the PPU adoption process and about other tools available to guide or slow development.
- A request to review the studies and analyses carried out in 2014.
- A concern about the balance between development and preserving rural character.
- A question about municipal powers compared with those of other municipalities.
- A proposal for a study of the ecological value of all remaining developable land in Chelsea.



- A suggestion to explore alternative zoning, including recreational zoning, to allow some development while protecting the environment.
- A reference to anticipated development around the Atiscou centre.

#### **Ambulance and clinic**

- It was noted that priority will be given to Chelsea residents under the new clinic, provided they are registered with Santé Québec.
- In response to a question about ambulance wait times, it was noted that the number of ambulances is a CISSSO responsibility.

#### **District 6 — April 23, 2026 (about 40 people)**

*District 6 was also the subject of a separate prioritization survey, completed by 166 respondents; the detailed survey results are presented in Appendix A.*

#### **District priorities and budget**

- A question was raised about the time required to complete municipal projects.
- Residents — from the Hendrick Farm, Hollow Glen, Chemin de la Mine, and Kingsmere sectors — were invited to name what the Municipality could do to improve their quality of life.
- It was noted that the next budget should reflect the priorities expressed.

#### **Response times and service quality**

- It was noted that residents do not want to wait two to three weeks for a response.
- A clear expectation was expressed for faster municipal follow-up.

#### **Council meetings and accessibility**

- Difficulties were raised regarding the audibility of Council meetings, notably difficulty hearing deliberations and following the reading of resolutions.
- Consideration is underway of different technologies to improve the situation.
- The need for English captioning was also mentioned.

#### **Community programming and local services**

- A question was raised as to whether people enjoy the programming at Old Chelsea Square.
- The possibility of offering more products at the general store was also discussed.

#### **Community life and by-law enforcement**

- It was mentioned that there appear to be two distinct groups within the sector's population, one of which is more inclined to file complaints.
- It was noted that the peace and order by-law will be reworked to be clearer.

#### **Roads, development, and developer responsibility**

- It was mentioned that developers could be asked to repair roads they damage.



- Chemin Old Chelsea was identified as in need of repair.
- It was noted that the Municipality is working with MOBIO to develop a plan; specific corridors were mentioned, notably Chemin Scott and Chemin Kingsmere.

## **Cross-cutting findings**

The following themes recur across several districts and warrant particular attention at the municipal level.

### **Development and protecting Chelsea's character**

In several districts, residents express strong concerns about densification, building height, project integration, and the protection of Chelsea's rural and natural character. Expectations are high for planning, regulatory oversight, and communication around planning tools.

### **Infrastructure capacity**

Questions about infrastructure capacity — drinking water, wastewater, roads, parking, community facilities — come up frequently. Residents want to understand how far current or anticipated growth can be absorbed sustainably.

### **Mobility, safety, and shared use**

Speed, signage, crossings, bollards, road access, trails, and the shared use of roads by drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians are among the recurring concerns. Residents are asking for concrete measures and a clearer understanding of the respective responsibilities of the Municipality and other bodies.

### **Water access and dock regulation**

Public access to the water, dock regulations, and understanding of compliance obligations are sensitive issues. Residents want more clarity, more explanation, and in some cases a more gradual approach to enforcement.

### **Communication, transparency, and understanding of files**

Many residents are asking for better distribution of information, greater transparency, and improved accessibility of municipal tools. The need to understand decisions, processes, and the limits of the Municipality's authority came through strongly across all the meetings.

### **Service quality and response times**

The Municipality's response times and follow-up capacity are a recurring concern. Residents want a municipality that is more accessible, more responsive, and clearer in its communications.



## Conclusion

The six district meetings held in spring 2026 confirm a high level of engaged, informed, and constructive citizen participation across Chelsea. The concerns raised — road safety, infrastructure capacity, development oversight, water access, and municipal service quality — echo those documented by the District 6 prioritization survey attached as an appendix. These findings provide a solid foundation for guiding municipal decisions in the short and medium term, taking into account the specific realities of each sector while maintaining a coherent, municipality-wide vision.



## Appendix A — District 6 Prioritization Survey Report (May 2026)

Prepared by: Donald Déry, M.Sc. (Community Health), Municipal Councillor — District 6

### 1. Context and scope of the report

This summary report presents the results of the District 6 prioritization survey, based on the 166 responses received as of May 12, 2026. Its goal is to clearly identify citizen priorities, highlight issues specific to each sector, and support municipal decision-making.

The analysis is based on quantitative rankings (highest priority, high, medium, low, not a priority), on more than 150 detailed qualitative comments, and on a comparative review across the Hollow Glen, Hendrick Farm, Kingsmere, and Chemin de la Mine sectors.

#### 1.1 Methodology — nominal group technique

The prioritization process is based on the principles of the nominal group technique, recognized for structuring civic participation and fostering the emergence of shared priorities.

First, 39 participants at the District 6 biannual meeting were invited to collectively reflect on ways to improve their environment and quality of life. This stage made it possible to gather a wide range of ideas based on residents' lived experience, ensure representation of local concerns, and develop a consolidated list of potential actions and interventions.

Second, these ideas were incorporated into the prioritization survey, allowing a larger number of residents to evaluate each proposed action, rank them by perceived importance, and provide qualitative comments to clarify or nuance their choices.

This combined approach ensures that the priorities identified in this report come directly from District 6 residents, have been validated and ranked in a structured manner, and reflect both initial collective input and broader prioritization.

### 2. Overall priority profile (all sectors)

#### 2.1 Road safety and traffic calming — priority no. 1

Road safety emerges as the dominant, cross-cutting priority in District 6.

Recurring issues reported:

- Excessive speed on residential and collector roads
- Failure to respect stop signs and school buses
- Safety concerns for children, pedestrians, cyclists, and people with reduced mobility

Most requested measures:

- Speed humps (temporary or permanent)
- Seasonal bollards, curb extensions, and visual narrowing
- Radar feedback signs and “children” signage
- Increased police presence and targeted enforcement



*Key finding: any road improvement or paving is widely seen as acceptable only if accompanied by strong, lasting traffic-calming measures.*

## **2.2 Road rehabilitation, paving, and maintenance — structural priority**

Road conditions are a major quality-of-life and safety issue.

Main concerns:

- Recurring potholes and high cost of temporary repairs
- Gravel roads turning to clay (dust, mud)
- Impacts on health (fine dust), vehicles, and daily travel

Two perspectives coexist: a majority is calling for paving or lasting road improvements, while a consistent minority wants to preserve the rural character, provided maintenance is more rigorous and safer.

*Shared conclusion: regardless of the option chosen — paving or maintaining gravel — the current situation is seen as unsatisfactory and unsustainable in the long term.*

## **2.3 Water management, ditches, and drainage — growing priority**

Surface water and ditch management is identified as a critical issue.

Main concerns:

- Flooding of properties and basements
- Obstructed, undersized, or poorly maintained ditches
- Increased runoff during heavy rainfall

Residents are calling for a preventive, neighbourhood-scale approach, along with explicit integration of climate change into infrastructure design and maintenance.

## **3. Sector analysis**

### **3.1 Hollow Glen — most engaged sector**

Main priorities:

- Road safety (speed, speed humps, stop signs)
- Paving or lasting road improvements (Kelly, Hollow Glen, Duguay)
- Redevelopment of Hollow Glen Park
- Public lake access and ecosystem protection
- Dust and noise management

Specific findings: strong concern for the safety of young children; significant support for paving, conditional on effective traffic-calming measures; high expectations for modern, inclusive park facilities.



### **3.2 Hendrick Farm — pedestrian safety and family-oriented living**

Key priorities:

- Safety of pedestrian crossings and intersections
- Adequate winter sidewalk maintenance
- Stop signs and visibility (notably in the Ladyfield area)
- Active transportation and multi-use connections

Additional issues: need for recreational spaces for children and teens; secure bicycle parking; completion of promised infrastructure (sidewalks, lighting, urban continuity).

### **3.3 Kingsmere — regional traffic and inter-organizational coordination**

Recurring priorities:

- Safety and speed on Kingsmere, Notch, and connecting roads
- Road rehabilitation and improved markings
- Traffic management during major events (e.g., Rhapsody of Colours)

Key concerns: greater, more structured collaboration with the NCC; clarification of certain issues (existing stops, development projects); fire safety, evacuation plans, and emergency access.

### **3.4 Chemin de la Mine — active transportation, safety, and water access**

Identified priorities:

- Speed mitigation measures
- Ditch maintenance and drainage
- Completion of the Sentier des Hautes-Plaines
- Public access to the river and natural areas

The safety of children, pedestrians, and cyclists is a central and recurring concern.

## **4. Environment and quality of life**

Respondents show strong support for protecting lakes and water quality, removing invasive species beyond water bodies alone, and reducing noise and light pollution.

A tension remains between environmental protection and certain developments, but a majority of residents favours balanced, sustainable, and environmentally respectful solutions.

## **5. Key takeaways**

- Road safety is the top priority in District 6.
- Road and water infrastructure require durable, planned interventions.
- Residents are open to change when it clearly improves safety and quality of life.
- Citizen engagement is high, informed, and constructive.



## 6. Conclusion

The District 6 prioritization survey highlights a highly engaged population concerned with safety, infrastructure sustainability, and quality of life. The results provide a solid foundation to guide municipal decisions in the short and medium term, taking into account the specific realities of each sector while maintaining a coherent district-wide vision.