AREA 'H' VILLAGE PLANNING PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #8
April 15th, 2009 6:30-9:30 pm, Lighthouse Community Centre

FINALLY SUMMARIZED OF THE MEETING

In attendance:
Amar Bains          Sally Barton          Keith Brown
Theresa Crawford    Jim Crawford          Dianne Eddy
Marilyn Dussault    George Dussault       Dennis Erickson
Margaret Healey     David Heenan          Christo Kuun
Brian Kingzett      Bill King             Els King
John Lytottier      Bob Hunt             Gerry Quinn
Angelika Quint      Michael Recalma       Josianne Séguin
Mac Snobelen        John Stathers         Diane Sampson
Lynette Twigge      Sharon Waugh          Catherine Watson
Wayne Morrison      Roy Nex              Lisa Verbicky
Lyle Harvey         Rodney Luck           Phil Rygg

Lisa Bhopalsingh (RDN Senior Planner), and Elaine Leung (RDN Planner)
Dave Bartram, Area 'H' Director
Guest Observer Dr. Chris Ling, Royal Roads University

1. Review of Agenda
   Dave Bartram reviewed the agenda.

2. Summary Notes from March 25th
   No changes were made to March 25th meeting notes.

3. Introductions
   Dave Bartram introduced Dr. Chris Ling, a professor with Royal Roads University who specializes in sustainability planning for smaller, rural communities. Dr. Ling was present to observe the meeting, learn from our process and also provide some suggestions for improving our process from his experience.

4. Presentation and discussion of scenarios

   **Dave Bartram presented his Scenario**
   Please see attached a summary of Dave’s speaking notes.
   - Dave used a PowerPoint presentation to introduce his scenario of a Bowser/Deep Bay Village. He noted that his idea was not from the RDN, and that Lisa had only just seen it today. Dave noted that the Area H Village Planning Project had never been tried before in the RDN.
   - “As there were no volunteers to present, Dave presented an option that the Group can work with.”
   - The end state of Dave’s presentation was to design a Rural Village for future generations and not a just a Village Core or a Village Centre. Dave believes this is necessary to preserving our water supply our rural quality of life, sense of place and rural character.

Please see attached a summary of the rest of Dave’s speaking notes.

   After his PowerPoint presentation, Dave outlined the challenges he sees. His comments were followed by questions as summarized below:

   1. We have Crown land in the village core zoned rural residential .5 acre.
• Mac asked “Where is your containment? Where is the Village Centre?”
• Dave responded that ‘I have purposefully not drawn a Village Core or Village Centre boundary’ as this boundary would be within a rural village and the subject of a design charette about the entire rural village.
• Mac noted that around Bowser there is not enough land to develop a Village Centre.

2. **Crown land at Jamieson & hwy 19a possibility to zone parkland.**

3. **Our other challenges is that we have land zoned RU1D (not ALR) inside the Village node which could be rezoned if further growth needs to be accommodated inside the rural village.**
   Our other challenge is we have ALR over unconfined aquifer & Deep Bay Water Improvement District wells. Dave stated that we need to determine if there is a way to protect food production and our water supply. We have to figure out how to ensure that we don’t have fertilizer and pesticides affecting our aquifer.

4. **Land zoned RS2M neighbourhoods option to bylaw no subdivision below .5 acre except land zoned public, commercial or CD zone outside village core to preserve rural character and quality of life.**
   Dave stated that as a community we seemed to like larger lots.
• Roy Nex asked “Don’t we already have laws for half acre lots?” and Dave responded that we did, but not inside a rural village containment boundary.

5. **We need a ‘design architect’ to help us with the next phase.** We also need a design architect to help us with transportation linkages between the boundaries of the rural village neighbourhoods and the village core/village centre. After attending the last BCRPA (BC Recreation and Parks Association) seminar, Mark Holland told us that:
   A. In rural villages, design for live and play is more important than work as most work takes place outside the rural village node and that probably won’t change.

6. **Dave suggested that given what we know about the carrying capacity of our aquifer we may want to consider limiting population in the Bowser/Deep Bay Village Rural Village to 3000 until we have better scientific knowledge at what level of withdrawals are sustainable.** This study is going to happen with the RDN drinking water and watershed protection project but it will take time. We may want to consider no development over the unconfined aquifer boundary other than woodlot, community forest, parkland, or greenbelt. This allows for control of land use and protection of the unconfined portion of the aquifer serving our community water supply. [Dave noted that it may be possible for the community to get a Community Forest which could mean no development over our aquifer].

We have to consider Deep Bay part of the community – The VIU (Vancouver Island University) Shellfish Aquaculture Centre project starting at the beginning of May will be a huge economic driver in the area. The Project will bring in sixty construction jobs to start, 15 full time employees plus students and the VIU culinary school.

**Dave outlined how his scenario met the Goals developed by the Advisory Group (please see the attached summary).**

• Sally Barton noted that the group should be careful with words, and definitions. (She held up Dave’s Area ‘H’ newsletter put out by the RDN). She stated that the word ‘node’ has been used (in Dave’s newsletter) in the broader sense (as a village), and ‘we have to be careful how the community is communicated to’.
• Dave responded that was the term used in the Regional Growth Strategy and the article was written a month ago and trails the work done by the Advisory Group.
• Diane Sampson questioned Dave’s boundary for a node as the location for higher density development from Nile Creek to Deep Bay.
• Dave replied that land outside the village core/village centre could be left as .5 acre lots. Dave stated that some people are afraid that if the community gets sewer services, it will
lead to subdividing. Dave stated that didn’t need to be the case and that bylaws could be put in place to keep .5 acre lots as the minimum size inside the rural village boundary.

- Diane Sampson wondered what was the point of having the whole area included as a node (Bowser to Deep Bay). She noted that we can have half acre minimum lots anyway.
- Dave replied that in his opinion in the design of a rural village you need the neighbourhoods surrounding the village core/village centre linked to preserve that sense of place and rural character.
- Wayne Morrison commented that Bowser will most likely stay as the main focus, but the population of Deep Bay will increase, and more services will be needed. He said that ‘I feel that we will need a mall. That will happen’.
- Sally asked to discuss the other options.

Dave called for a short ten minute break, and said that after the break his option could be used as a jumping off point to discuss other options that may be presented to the Group.

**BREAK**

- Keith Brown noted a previous comment about the different types of ‘Type 1’ and ‘Type 2’ septic systems, and asked if he could get more information. He also requested a copy of the RDN Electoral Area Update Newsletter that Sally Barton spoke of.
- A question was raised about the definition of a ‘rural village containment’ area. Dave stated that his proposal would include everything. Things in the village containment area can be considered the same as the RGS definition of a node.
- Dianne Eddy noted that the current review of the Regional Growth Strategy is underway, and everyone should be informed. She questioned the term ‘urban area’ [used by the RGS review] and its relevance to our project. She noted that this idea is sprawl. She wondered whether the group as a whole is in agreement with vocabulary and the basics. “How can we apply the terms since the RGS uses different terms?”
- Dave stated that the Village Planning Project would undoubtedly produce better definitions to describe rural villages, rural containment, village centres, etc that could be used in the RGS review. For the Advisory Group this is an opportunity.
- Margie Healey stated that her understanding of Dave’s definition as a node is lots that are smaller, but his proposal proposes half acre lots. She felt that communities should be united with the Village node, and within the Village Containment boundary.
- Lisa asked the group whether they wanted to see information relating to how much land is needed for Bowser Village (such as projected Regional populations and demand for housing) before or after seeing the other options. Sally Barton responded that she wanted to discuss the options they had worked on, the previous meeting and the majority of the group agreed.

4. Presentations of individual/group proposals of the ‘Bowser village’

**Sally Barton presented first, on behalf of her group’s proposal for the Bowser village.**

- She explained that their idea was to move the commercial centre, away from the highway, giving it sufficient space. This stems from the idea of safety in the community. They felt that the community needed more space than the current boundary.
- Thames Creek would provide parkland within village centre with park space either side of the river.
- The black boundaries represented ‘neighbourhoods’ designated within current regulations i.e. half acre lots. These neighbourhood areas would be different than the commercial regulations [applied to the Commercial Village Centre].
• She noted that she liked Dave’s idea of restricting development over aquifers, and that
eighbourhoods should go ‘with the centre’.
• Some comments from the group were that these ideas were drifting from initial plans to
define Village Nodes and that everything is going into ‘village containment boundaries’.
• A comment was made cautioning the Advisory Group about the words of politicians and
bureaucrats and reminding them about what happened with a prior RDN process
‘remember Building Inspections?’
• Diane Sampson questioned whether the black lines defining the neighbourhoods shown
by Sally’s group were arbitrary?
• Sally noted that the lines were not drawn precisely. Her group wanted to show they [the
neighbourhoods] were linked in some way (to the Village Centre), and their intent was not
to change the area.

Further ideas mentioned were:
• Possible future access from highway, concern about light industrial designated areas
within commercial designated areas close to commercial (uses).
• A member of the group wondered whether the proposed boundary (by Sally’s group) was
large enough for future growth.
• Wayne Morrison asked ‘What are you classing as light industrial?’ He also added ‘Will
that node be sufficient for the next 50-60 years? We need to get Crown Lands.’
• Bill King stated that nobody wants to change zoning outside Bowser. He noted that Sally’s
group and Mac’s maps were similar, and that the group should focus on Bowser. He
questioned ‘Why don’t we stay in the Village Node of Bowser? Why change it? Keep
Deep Bay out of it.’
• Lisa Verbicky noted that with the original idea of Bowser node we need to acknowledge
existing areas, and we can still draw from them, as we still need containment areas.
• Dianne Eddy stated that Bowser is already able to accommodate growth, and that the
group should spend more time confirming definitions.

David Heenan presented on behalf of his group.
• He noted how his group attempted to address two questions: 1. ‘Village Boundaries’ and
2. ‘A Containment boundary’.
• Their proposal was similar to Sally’s, but extended further to Jameison Road.
• Their ideas included Crown Land and excluding industrial in the area, but instead
encouraging industrial to locate to other areas such as the existing gravel pit on Horne
Lake road.
• Referring to Crown land, he said it was ‘up to the RDN to go to the Provincial Government
and grab that land’.

Josianne Séquin presented her proposal
• Josianne noted that the current village node is not completely developed and very low
density. We should be focusing our efforts on density, first not more land. Her proposal
shows one scenario for Bowser as it is and then an expansion if needed.
• She noted that she was careful not to include ALR lands or unconfined aquifer.
• She expressed the need to focus on transportation, increasing density, and said that
perhaps a local train station to service the community could be located in the Bowser
Village Centre.
Gerry Quinn Presented on behalf of his group ‘The GREN Group’

- Gerry Quinn presented on behalf of his group. He believed the node should solely be the village centre including Thames Creek. He noted there should be setbacks from the Creek.
- John Lyotier asked whether these setbacks would be greater or less than 30m?
- Gerry responded that the setbacks could vary, and that his group had not focused on that level of detail.
- He noted that he was surprised to see Dave Bartram’s proposal. He thinks that the node is a very small Village Centre ‘perhaps we should stay with that definition’.
- He also noted that any proposal of planning a village centre should be able to endure 30-50 years. There are decisions that we should be prepared to make.

Catherine Watson Presented on behalf of her Group

- Catherine noted that her group focused on being able to influence on a larger scale, rather than a smaller area.
- She noted their proposal included a ‘core’ public or recreational use.
- She would like clarification on the definition of ‘industrial’ and the different levels of industry.
- She noted her group’s buffer for waterways and desire to stay away from agricultural lands. She noted that aquifer was under the ALR lands so these two aspects could be considered together.

Mystery Group

- Lisa B. stated that this scenario had no names on it, and wondered whether the different coloured lines were meant to represent different phases of development of a Village Centre.
- Dianne Eddy spoke to the scenario that was displayed and said that the green lines were similar to the lines shown in the MapleGuard newsletter.
- She said the lines separated Water Boards. She felt that there may be resistance to the two Boards to joining together.
- The red line represents the higher density and for seniors living, and is close to the current core. The blue line represents the future growth area.
- She also highlighted possible future roads going into the community noting that Horne Lake is not a good entrance to the community. There is a need for roads which can come into a better entrance. She noted that she would support something along these lines (of the Scenario she discussed).

5. Comparing and Evaluating Scenarios

- Lisa B. presented a chart showing the original area of land in the Bowser Village Centre and the amount of land each group/individual included in their scenarios.
- John Lyotier said that he did not understand the link between the chart and the previous exercise.
- Sally stated that these areas were created with different ideas, intentions (i.e. the area of land included in a Village Centre does not matter). She did not believe that the chart inferred anything. She requested a further discussion on definitions. She wondered what the purpose of the mapping activity was about, as it seems the ideas of a village ‘centre’ is similar to everyone.
- Lisa B. said that we did not have to discuss the chart now but that she felt it was important to evaluate how much land was needed for a compact Village Centre. She also said that
the group needed to use the table of goals to evaluate the how well each scenario met them.

- Mac stated his confusion between a node and an urban containment boundary. If the principles apply everywhere, development can occur everywhere. He believes that these are two different issues.
- David Heenan stated that the group needs to understand the terminology so that there is no confusion down the road. He reminded the group about the message given by Ken Kirkby at an earlier meeting.
- Lisa Verbicky noted that the group needs to not only focus on commercial areas but what is in and out of ‘Rural Village Containment boundaries.’
- Dianne Eddy stated that Dave’s new term “Sounds like a village node to me.”
- Margie Healey stated that she likes the term ‘Village node’ and wanted it further defined. As well as ‘Rural Village Containment Boundary’ defined. She questioned if the population increases and is included in the aquifers, “can we get control of trees?” If so, then nobody would be able to develop. She stated she wanted to get away from the term ‘urban containment’
- Keith Brown stated that the group should deal with boundaries first, and parcels later.
- Gerry Quinn questioned whether there was already an existing definition for a Village Centre.
- Lisa B. thought that the group had been provided with definitions early in the process. She noted that there was an existing definition in the Regional Growth Strategy (that Ginny had provided the group with). She also stated that her manager is open to changing the definition for Rural Villages as part of the RGS review.
- A question arose from the group whether in Lisa’s review, it looked like there was a consensus from the group and whether she had noticed a trend? Did she notice small services areas, with large outside centres?
- John Lyotier wanted to change the definition ensuring sustainability. He asked what options the community has to protect aquifers without putting them in UCB’s. He questioned whether the tools are with the province, or the RDN.
- Dave stated that they can zone land to restrict uses i.e. Resource Management or restrict for size for example 20 hectares minimum parcel size. He noted that there are more restrictions on private land. Dave commented that the province has designated lands as old growth management areas, and that Area ‘H’ could approach the province to have it designated as a ‘community forest’.
- Sally Barton questioned what Dave meant by a ‘community forest.’ She asked whether he meant the RDN? She asked if you have to put ‘village boundary’ around it before you can declare it as a ‘community forest.’ Her concern is that Crown land gets ‘nibbled’ away at the edges.

6. Discussion on Definitions

Instead of evaluating the different scenarios against the goals, it was decided that the group wanted to discuss definitions as a large group.

Lisa asked the group what their ideas were with respect to the activities that define a sustainable ‘Village Centre’

- Wayne Morrison said a centre of commercial/activity area
- Margie Healey said high density
- John Lyotier said cultural activity
- Bob Hunt asked are you referring to urban areas as half acre lots?
Sharon Waugh asked Dave Bartram ‘What would be different between the Electoral Area ‘H’ Boundary and the Rural Village Containment Boundary? Why are we isolating Qualicum Bay?’

Dianne Sampson said that Bowser (the existing boundary) is the idea of a village, everything else should be outside. We don’t need a boundary outside of that, it’s already set as half acre lots.

Lisa asked about the role of a Village Centre as a Commercial Core? - Bowser

It’s where you get services.

Sally Barton said ‘Bowser is our Commercial Core’

She asked can we colour code for different types of land use within villages?

Lisa B. responded that this would be the idea once the boundary was decided by the group.

David Heenan questioned if we use the wording Commercial Core, what about residential uses above, second story?

More diversified uses. “mixed uses”

Wayne Morrison questioned mixing commercial and residential uses saying they should be kept separate.

He added that we really need to get Crown land, it is our land and belongs to us. He said that we should apply for government land so we can set boundaries.

Lisa B. stated that she had e-mailed the group the outcome of her meeting with government representatives regarding getting crown land which included information about the process and various challenges. She said that she would re-send the email to the group. (See March 25th Meeting Notes and March 16th e-mail re-sent April 16th). She indicated that Crown land representatives have been asked to speak to the Group and come to the April 29th meeting however due to a travel freeze for Provincial employees they were unable to come. She said that she would approach Crown lands again after the elections.

Wayne Morrison stated that the government is willing to give land so we need to apply for it. He questioned “If we don’t plan for growth then what are we doing?”

Lisa B. said that the area inside an UCB should be where we want to see growth directed. Regardless of what we call it, we are trying to define where there is a line that separates where we want growth from where we don’t want growth. That’s what we’re doing here regardless of the terms. Can we define a line? “Where is the line? And what are we going to call it?”

Lisa B. questioned how much land is needed in a Village Centre to accommodate future growth? She provided a projected population of roughly 8,000 for Area H by 2050 (roughly 400 for Bowser by 2050) and noted that there was adequate zoned land to accommodate this in area H without making any changes to the Village Boundary.

Wayne Morrison questioned where the population numbers came from.

Lisa B. responded that the number was a simple estimate calculated by using 2006 population estimates and a growth rate of 1.77% (the average 1.77% growth rate between 1996 and 2006). PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE ESTIMATES ARE ON THE HIGH SIDE A MORE CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE OF 5000 MAY BE MORE REALISTIC GIVEN A SLOWER GROWTH SCENARIO – Lisa B. April 27th 2009.

Margie Healey noted that we don’t need to determine the size. She stated that it seemed like everyone liked the definition for ‘village centre.’ People outside; then they can use the Rural Village Containment Boundary? Can it extend from Nile Creek to Deep Bay? She stated that they “all belong to Bowser.”

Further points mentioned were:
• encourage growth in centre
• “What are we containing?”
• we should promote infill
• Is the idea of ‘suburban’ applicable?
• “shouldn’t we be thinking of commercial areas”
• Senior’s services nearby to access services?
• Sally asked for a definition of light industrial
• Dave B asked if the Esso station could be considered industrial? or Mac’s building supply?
• Lisa B. noted that much of what the group were talking about for a Village Centre was contained in the Regional Growth Strategy’s definition of a Village Centre which she read out to the group.
• The group asked if the definition from the Regional Growth Strategy without the term ‘node’. The group voted unanimously to drop the term ‘node’ from the definition of village centre. Lisa B. noted that she would ensure that this feedback was received as part of the Regional Growth Strategy Review.
• The group voted unanimously to use the edited definition of village centre from the Regional Growth Strategy below:
  "Village Centres are intended to provide for limited development of services centres outside of existing urbanized areas. Lands within the Village Centre designation are intended to be developed into mixed use communities that include places to live, work, learn, play, shop and access services."
• Lisa B. noted that she would provide the group with a variety of definitions of light industrial to consider.
• Jim Crawford thanked Lisa for helping the group start drawing lines. He then added that whether the community liked it or not they were going to develop (lands at Deep Bay).
• Lisa B. showed a slide of a simple cardboard box solar stove used to help prevent deforestation in developing countries. She reminded the group that sometimes the best ideas are not complicated and that is good to think both inside and outside the box.

7. Announcements

• John Lyotier – reminded the group of the upcoming Deep Bay Harbour Festival on Saturday April 25th.
• Dave B. congratulated the Lion’s society on receiving funding for 10 more seniors housing units.
• Dave B. noted the upcoming 2010 Torch Relay Meeting at the Lighthouse Community Hall on May 4th.
• Lisa reminded the group to sign up to volunteer for the April 29th Information Event and noted that the event was coming together well.

8. Next meeting

• Information Event Wednesday April 29th, 3:00-8:00 p.m. at the Lighthouse Community Centre.
• Next Advisory Group Meeting is May 13th, 6:30-9:30 p.m. at the Lighthouse Community Centre.

The meeting ended shortly after at 9:30 p.m.