

**Area 'H' Village Planning Advisory Group Meeting #9**  
May 13, 2009 6:30-9:30 pm Lighthouse Community Centre  
**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

In attendance:

Patty Biro	Nick Bush	George Dussault
Marilyn Dussault	Bob Hunt	Keith Reid
Theresa Crawford	Jim Crawford	Keith Brown
Sally Barton	Dianne Eddy	Margaret Healey
Els King	John Lyotier	Gerry Quinn
Angelika Quint	Michael Recalma	Josianne Séguin
Mac Snobelen	Diane Sampson	Lynette Twigge
Sharon Waugh	Catherine Watson	Roy Nex
Dick Stubbs	Wayne Morrison	Rod Gentry
Gordon Webb	Christo Kuun	Bill King

Lisa Bhopalsingh (RDN Senior Planner), Elaine Leung (RDN Planner)  
Dave Bartram, Area 'H' Director

Lisa opened the meeting and welcomed the Group. She acknowledged that the Group had gone through a tough time over the past two weeks and asked that those present set a good intention for a positive outcome for the meeting.

### **1. Review of Agenda**

Lisa reviewed the Agenda. The Group agreed to Gerry Quinn's request that item # 6 (April 29<sup>th</sup> Information Meeting) be moved to item #3 on the Agenda.

### **2. Discussion & Decision of Chair Person Role**

- Lisa noted that Dave Bartram had resigned as Chair and asked the Group how they would like to proceed. John Lyotier noted that the Terms of Reference outlines the role of the RDN representative. He stated that Dave Bartram does not have the option to resign.
- John put forward a motion that the Group not accept Dave's resignation. The majority of the majority of group through a show of hands voted in favour of 'not accepting Dave's resignation'.
- Dave stated that he accepts under the condition that he is allowed to speak and voice his opinion. He noted that according to the Terms of Reference, he cannot give his opinion. He said that if the group cannot accept this then they will have to find another Chair.
- Margie noted that Dave is a member of the community, and that he has a right to have an opinion.

By a show of hands, the majority of the group were in favour of Dave's condition that he accepts the role of chair only if he is given the opportunity to state his opinions.

### **3. What did we learn from the April 29<sup>th</sup> Information Event?**

Gerry spoke about Information Event held for the Advisory Group and the community on April 29th. He noted that it was a huge amount of effort for a small showing from the community. He stated that the group has to get more people involved, as we are drawing on many resources. He noted two points: first, participation from community members, and second, we have to do something different to get more attendance.

- Roy Nex commented that he was told by neighbours they did not know about the meeting.
- Dave commented that getting people out is one of the most difficult problems we have and that as an Advisory Group, that is one of our most difficult challenges.
- Dick Stubbs commented that the group should contact the Deep Bay Water Works for pointers to get the public out and participate.
- Roy Nex asked if the event was advertised in the paper.
- Diane Eddy asked what the group got out of it. She commented that the representatives from the Department of Highways were helpful, and very responsive to opening a connection at the back of Bowser, coming down Horne Lake. She commented that she felt that members of RDN Transit didn't care, but that BC Transit was helpful and suggested possible options. She noted that Bowser generates 1 million dollars. With our dollars generated, we should see services back in the community. She suggested an increase in morning, evening or afternoon services, and suggested that the community could volunteer. She noted that Bowser needs to be able to connect to Courtenay.
- Dave noted that a Fanny Bay bus connection was an option to explore. He noted that he has asked the RDN to look at funding to see whether this is possible.
- Lisa asked the group what the end product should be. Once we decide upon a boundary for Bowser Village, then we can fill in the land uses inside that area. She showed examples of plans that could be used as templates.
- Gerry directed a question at Lisa, asked that there must be an area that parallels the exercise we're doing. He asked Lisa if she can begin to draft what the end product will be. He hopes to get the group thinking of what the end result will be. We can fill in the blanks, and if we don't like the end product, we can redirect.
- Lisa asked the group how they felt about her coming up with a template of a Village Plan that they could work with. She showed examples of neighbourhood/Village plan documents to give people an idea of what the end product for a Village Plan could look like.
- Sally responded saying it was a great idea; we need a framework to work with. She also noted that she found an example that might help the group, the Greenwich Village.
- Dick stated he was going to use Mac's words in that we need something firm. He stated that there is a 'yellow fringe triangle' where we can't see development. We need to take off a bit of the triangle here and there. We need something concrete.
- Christo commented that we have to look at OCP figures, population projections and guidelines.
- Lisa noted that the power point slides from April 15 that were sent out by e-mail show population 'build-outs' and projections. Some of this information was taken from Land Inventory and Population studies which she will put in the library.
- Margie stated that we should have a timeline for completion of the project, and then we will know how much time the group has. That way, if getting Crown Land will delay the project, the group will know.
- Dave Bartram suggested holding smaller meetings on Fridays with Lisa to discuss definitions and aquifer protection.

#### **4. Presentation of Boundary Scenario by John Lyotier**

John Lyotier gave a PowerPoint presentation of rationale for his scenario which reflected the current Village Centre Boundary for Bowser (please see attached PowerPoint slides and with detailed speaking notes). A summary of John's presentation is captured by his notes below:

"V0R ONE GREEN OLIVE -

- We have had lots of discussion about our aspirations for the future.
- Issues like protection of aquifer and down-zoning are important for us but not part of the village planning process. None the less it is important that our views are known.
- Village nodes must accommodate pedestrian ways, green spaces, and vehicles. We are not yet prepared to leave our cars at home.
- Neighbourhoods reflect our rural style and fit with the half acre lot subdivisions. Our neighbourhood life style does not fit with higher densities but we continue to hope for the benefits brought by higher density centres. Expect continued growth of half acre subdivisions.
- Avoid highway commercialization and sprawl. Therefore we must limit commercial development to within the village core or node. There is opportunity to mix commercial and high density living within the village node.
- Wastewater treatment within areas of higher density can be done with new technology. Developers will need to work this into their cost.
- Other areas within RDN have faster growth for high density than Area "H". Pressure for high density is limited. Stay the course with current Bowser Node boundary.
- We can make behaviour changes that enhance our environmental, economic, and social sustainability."

John concluded by noting that the current plan [original Bowser Village Centre Boundary] has room for change, with some tweaking.

The Group asked questions following John's presentation

- Mac asked John "we have enough room for what?"
- John replied "Is there enough room for businesses to expand?"
- Mac replied "Where is room for parking in the current node?"
- John responded that we can consolidate properties. There are other communities with parking underground, and gardens are on top.
- Patty believes that attitudes are changing. She has noticed more people walking. People will cycle if there are attractions to go to. The highway is not a pleasant and safe connection between Deep Bay and Oceanside.
- John agreed, but wondered how to get people in the village centre.
- Sally noted that she is concerned with moving the boundary away from the coast, as well as concerns with the steep slope. She questioned whether the boundary should include the coast.
- John stated that there will always be competition for the land. He noted that his thoughts are similar to Josianne's. We need to first see what we can do with what we've got.

Dave Bartram called for a 10 minute break.

#### **5. Selection of Village Boundary Scenarios to Evaluate**

Dave Bartram asked the group to discuss what they liked and disliked from each scenario.

Note that prior to the meeting Lisa and Dave had categorized the various boundary scenarios into groups that shared similarities. The idea of the exercise was to select two or three scenarios that could be fully evaluated during the next meeting.

**The first scenarios discussed were # 10 and # 2.**

Mac	Likes	
	Dislikes	#11 Creates a high demand for commercial space Encourages strip development – it's against what we've said. The natural development of the node will create strip development.
	General Comments	
Roy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	#2 It is a big area of waterfront, where is the money coming from?
Wayne	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Crown Land is not yet commercialized: therefore it would be easier to expand to these areas. It would be difficult developing infrastructure other than along the hwy.
Dick	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	There are opportunities for pedestrian paths. Roads are already there, but not built.  The RDN is building trails along the rail right of way
Sally	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	When talked to a representative of RDN Parks, was told there are expansive, steep slopes that might limit trails along the rail right of way.  It fills in with the hwy, and not running in with the centre of village.
Dianne Eddy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	What are the ramifications for residents? Would there be ramifications? Should the residents have a voice?
Gerry	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	The result is a very definite decision to include the waterfront.
Wayne	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Duncan is a good example of congestion along the hwy.
Jim	Likes	Likes the plan on the left better (#2).
	Dislikes	The plan on the right (#11) is too small for the next 50 years.

	General Comments	
Dave	Likes	The plan on the right is a good nucleus to work from.
	Dislikes	The plan on the left (#2) is stretched too far to Mapleguard, it is too far.
	General Comments	Any future development should go west along Crossley.  The OCP would support higher density if there is water and sewer.
Rod	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	The issue is availability of commercial space.
Dave	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	How much can we grow in the area to sustain commercial development? There are 2 vacant lots right now zoned residential, but could always change.
Margie	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	The property along Crossley is hazardous? Slippage? Good portion of waterfront. No trees should be cut down on bluffs.
Others:		
	General Comments	We have to get access to properties, but we have to look at costs.
		How many properties are actually in the areas? 1. properties? 2. residential buildings?

- Lisa commented that just because we are designating space as a village centre, does not mean that it has to be developed completely, there can be areas left as parks and open space.
- Rod Gentry asked whether the group could get information about the age of existing buildings in the area, to determine whether any would be worth taking down.
- Lisa responded that it would be difficult to find this information, since there is no building permits in this area, and so there would be no records. However she may be able to get them from BC Assessment data.
- Dave stated that we're trying to look at one or two options so we can look at them in greater detail. Sally reminded everyone that the option may not include any of these. Dave stated that we can eliminate things that the group is unhappy with.

**The next two scenarios were # 3 and # 1**

Sally	Likes	Likes the development moving west. (#3 & #1) Offers green space.
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Not sure which is better in terms of size.
Sharon	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Prefers not to see anymore crossings at Thames Creek.

Mac	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	He explained his plan (#1) as a backdrop to the village. His plan is thought to be the minimum size needed, with green space to the west.
Gerry	Likes	Likes the plan on the left, preserving the Thames Creek, with the plan lines following the property lines.
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	It is to enable future growth in the long term.
Dave	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	#3 Includes ALR lands. The uses are restrictive.
Bob	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Also includes Crown Lands.
Lisa	General Comments	In her experience, the ALC has not been keen on including ALR lands inside any containment boundaries where growth is promoted.
Dianne Eddy	General Comments	It would be a plus to have ALR lands. This should not be a big factor in acquiring lands. Protection of the creek is important.
Keith Brown	General Comments	The boundaries are too big (# 3 & #1). A 1km walk should be considered. For a village, what is a decent size? For services? The population will get bigger but other village nodes will service them. 600 acres is very spread out. Isn't it better to have a central space and then expand out?
Lisa	General Comments	It is hard to plan for 50 years, is it easier to break a plan down into 10, 20 30 years? Important to remember that plans should be reviewed every 5-10 years and adjusted accordingly if growth projects change.
Sally	General Comments	We had thought at the beginning of the project we were looking 50 years ahead. That is why some of us are looking at a large scale, large parcels, but doesn't mean development will happen all at once.
Dave	General Comments	Are we designing commercial centres, or villages?
Dick	General Comments	Keith raised a good point, what is the rough square mile of Qualicum Beach? We aren't thinking of the future.
Keith Brown	General Comments	If we look at an area too large: sprawl. Neighbourhood lot density is 25%. Keep it small, keep out of the ALR. If we go into Crown Land, then think in terms of 'non for profit.' Otherwise applications for Crown Land will be rejected.
Els	General Comments	The plans shouldn't include ALR.  Island Scallops is an example of a site that looks like a junk yard. We wouldn't want that in the town centre.
Wayne Osborne	General Comments	If we don't apply and take it now (Crown Lands), it will be too expensive later.
Bob	General Comments	Can we assume these plans will be a municipality?
Dave Bartram	General Comments	Becoming a municipality is a governance issue. What we are discussing is building a village not governance.
Bob	General Comments	It will eventually be incorporated like the Eaglecrest

		subdivision taken into Qualicum.
Catherine	General Comments	There are limiting factors: sewer, water. These are difficult to project. What is the perfect size? In 15 yrs, 20 yrs, it can be expanded.  The ALR seems complicated, let's leave it out.  Concerns like environmentally sensitive features, hazard areas etc, let's leave out, and then see what's left.
Dianne Eddy	General Comments	Hoping someone builds a gourmet restaurant along the bluffs where nothing else can be built.  Light industrial is expanding to the point where there is no more space. Spoke to someone who wants space outside the residential areas. Where would we put that in Bowser? They've outgrown the space.
Mac	General Comments	Village centres include all uses but there is still a commercial core. If this is a pilot project we should ask for what we want, and what is good for our community. We won't develop everything right away.
Dave	General Comments	Agrees. We can regulate development with bylaws.
Sally	General Comments	Most of these plans follow the lines of the existing lot lines. But we don't have to, do we?  We are running out of time, can we build a scenario and then work with it?
Margie	General Comments	Asked to see the other scenarios.

**The next scenarios discussed were # 5 and # 7.**

Catherine	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	We haven't talked about containment? Let's <b>not</b> .
Els	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	1,100 acres is too big of an area (#5).
Catherine	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Wants to modify existing property lines.
Dianne Eddy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	It is much too massive (#5). What are the ramifications on the Regional Growth Strategy?  The RGS allows community growth anywhere in this proposed area. The RDN would support it.  There is nothing for protection for the aquifer over and above what we already have today.
Dave	Likes	

	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Disagree; what is in containment is what people want.
Sally	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Let's concentrate on village centre. This proposal is too large. It does not include residential areas.
Wayne	Likes	
	Dislikes	The line/boundary is too far up (#5 & #7).
	General Comments	We didn't show residential areas at the top.

**The next scenarios discussed were # 6 and # 4.**

Els	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	<p>Asked Dave Bartram to explain his plan (#6) saying that she understood that he started to process to stop sprawl however she is confused because his proposal looks like sprawl.</p> <p>You explained you are not changing anything, but I do not understand your plan.</p>
Dave Bartram	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	<p>Village includes the village centre. I included Deep Bay because we need to talk about it. Is it a neighbourhood or is it a Village Centre? History would tell us that Deep Bay was the industrial and economic centre for the area. With the Shell Fish business and VIU Centre for Shellfish Research it could be again.</p> <p>We need a sense of place, to feel included which is why I would propose including the surrounding neighbourhoods in the Village Plan I proposed.</p> <p>We have sprawl already outside the current Village Centre boundaries. According to the current RGS everything outside the current Village Centre is sprawl. Containing sprawl by including it inside a Village boundary is one way of containing sprawl and ensuring we have a say in how it gets developed in the future to include servicing, rather than being dictated to by outside influences which we may have not control over.</p>
Patty	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	<p>Including existing lots does not mean change, can still be in Village Centre.</p> <p>Like the Departure Bay example, colour blocks, determines where development will be.</p> <p>It doesn't mean things change.</p>

Sally	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Wants to make smaller boundary (#4). Black lines were never included.
Patty	Likes	Likes Sally's idea (#4), taking it further north.
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	
Keith	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Confused, as it seems we're mixing it up. Some people are defining boundary, centres, and village?
Dave	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	What do we want?
Dianne Eddy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	We should be focusing on the village centre only.
John	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Let's focus on Village Centre of Bowser <b>only</b> .
Theresa	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Shouldn't we look at the other neighbourhoods who will support the village centres?
Dick	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	If we don't go southwest of hwy, we can't define.  Dealing with the area as a 'whole' is the next step of the OCP review. The village centre is where our focus should be.
Josianne	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Other areas are connected.  Sally's idea (#4) is moving more away from the hwy, it is important to include the Oceanside.
Sharon	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	What are the benefits of including the ocean in the boundary?
Josianne	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Public access to beach park. The beach should be part of the village centre.
Lisa	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Still large underdeveloped & undeveloped parcels down towards the waterfront. There are possibilities for allowing for more park and beach access by trading off higher density uses on portions of those sites. More diversity of

		commercial, residential and tourist uses could be considered through inclusion in the Village Centre. Connection to the water is also an important feature from a tourism perspective as well.
Gordon	General Comments	#6 Boundaries are way too ambitious. Bowser should be expanded southwest. It is good enough for the foreseeable future.  Move development off main road.
Theresa	General Comments	Development should go from one end to another (like #6).
Jim	General Comments	170 people in Bowser. If we expand the boundary, 1300 people in Deep Bay left out in the cold. Village should include everything. We should expand the vision of what a village is.  I want Deep Bay Spit included in the Village boundary (like #6).

**The next scenarios discussed were # 9 and # 10.**

Gordon Webb explained his scenario:

- “Plan is to Crossley road. If government buys into it, future expansion. Let’s use land we have, let’s not get ambitious.”
- We have to plan for roads, especially along the waterfront.
- Deep Bay: small lots, Block A is vacant and not in the ALR, best used for residential.
- “Mini treatment plans to service Deep Bay Marina, Ship & Shore store. If we want to change community, we need coffee shops etc to encourage walking. Deep Bay could use further services. Bowser needs to develop *better*, not necessarily *more*.”

Margie	Likes	Likes Gordon’s scenario #10. In Deep Bay, everyone walks, bikes. Likes keeping it small.
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	
Dave	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	In the future should Deep Bay be something that needs to be discussed? Can we put a ‘marker’ down?
Sally	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Not every village centre is the same.
Dianne Eddy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	What about competition?
Patty	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Don’t be worried about competition. We want to encourage competition, development, walking. Parks, trails along waterfront.

		Supports future development in Deep Bay.
Dianne Eddy	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	What is the point of putting a 'marker' down for a future plan of Deep Bay? Are we putting a 'marker' down for Dunsmuir?
Dave	Likes	
	Dislikes	
	General Comments	Let's put something together.

- Dave asked the Group if they could agree to putting a 'marker' down in the Bowser Village Plan to identify that a future village plan should be done for Deep Bay given that three out of the 10 scenarios had aspects of Deep Bay included and that there has been a question since the public open house last September, "Why has Deep Bay not been included as a Village Centre and the history of Deep Bay from First Nations shell fishing to commercial fin fishing and processing through timber and now back to shell fish aquaculture and a research centre . The majority of the Group agreed.
- Dave said that he felt that Lisa had enough information to go away and come up with three scenarios for the Group to Evaluate at the next meeting.
- Gerry asked if Lisa felt she had enough information and asked what she wanted to do.
- Lisa replied, that it would be difficult to come up with three based purely on the discussions and said it would help if everyone picked their top three. These three will be used to do a more detailed evaluation.
- She noted that once a Village Boundary is picked (for Bowser) it may be adjusted again because once we look at what space is needed for different land uses within the Village Centre we may find that we need to make changes again.
- Mac likes the idea of the Dot exercise. Asked if we "can have a grid showing all the scenarios, lay them over top of one another?"
- Dave said that the Dot exercise could be done at the end of the meeting.

## 6. Discussion of Charette & use of Randall Arendt

- Lisa discussed with the group an idea of having a charette, or design workshop.
- Keith Brown stated that if the group has two options, it could result in a third.
- Lisa agreed, stated that a design charette could produce more options. The group could present them to the wider community for feedback before deciding on one.
- Bill King asked what the best way to protect Thames Creek is. He stated that "95% of the scenarios include the creek. It is better to leave larger lots as 5 acres."
- Lisa responded that there is typically a 30m buffer of development either side from a creek/river. She noted that while large lots typically would have less development through less hard surfaces to generate run off, it does also depend on what other activities are taking place on the lot that might impact water quality.
- Dave Bartram also agreed that it depends on the land use.
- Bill stated that "you would have 20 people if subdivided. The big thing is to protect the creek."
- Lisa explained what a charette is and read out the following definition of a charette "**A creative process akin to visual brainstorming that is used by design professionals to develop solutions to a design problem within a limited timeframe.**"

- Typically they are 3 days to a week long, but we don't have the resources to hold a week long charette. Two things to look at and consider are: 1. what land uses do we want and how should these different land uses fit together and 2. what do we want things to look like when they're built. We can have a map with the different land uses and showing how they connect to each other including trails, paths, roads, parks and sensitive areas. We can then frame policies around that. It would show how and where the community wants development to take place in the future. The charette could also identify some preliminary design preferences around building materials and styles.
- Dianne Eddy asked if Randall Arendt is the only person available.
- Lisa indicated that others could be invited.
- Wayne asked "if the mandate of the group is to determine and regulate what materials to use, and what things will look like? Thought we were looking at the shape of node, not the details?"
- Lisa said that if the group did not want to look at design details then they did not have to.
- Dick observed that there would not be time to address this in a one day charette.
- Margie stated that the group is lucky to have an offer of help.
- Lisa explained to the group that it was important for the group to be ready for the charette, and have a consensus on a Boundary to use for the charette. She asked the group if they felt they could agree on a boundary to be used for the charette by the end of the next meeting on May 27th – noting that the boundary could be adjusted again during the charette process. The majority of the group felt that this could be done.
- Sally wondered if Randall is too 'high powered' for what the group is looking at. We are just looking at land use.
- Jim explained that Randall works very fast, he has excellent artistic skills. He reminded the group that it is the group's decision. Randall may offer his opinion, but nothing is engraved in stone.
- Dick stated to the group that he was involved in a design charette on Salt Spring Island, and it was a rewarding experience. He stated that the group has to be concise for the exercise to work in one day.
- Gerry stood up and explained to the group his concerns with having Randall Arendt hosting the design charette because of his connections to the Deep Bay Lands. He asked Jim Crawford if he has contacted Randall for his own development.
- Jim stated that he in fact did, but that the Area 'H' project would be a separate project. He explained that Randall would work with the group on this project, and that it would have nothing to do with his (in Deep Bay).

Dave Bartram asked the group how many people were in favour of having Randall Arendt. Nineteen people raised their hands in support of having Randall. Six people raised their hands that were not in support.

- Sally asked who is available if Randall wasn't available.
- Lisa responded that she was originally planning to ask favours from a variety of professionals on the island and look at involving local expertise as well.
- Dick reminded the group that this is a mechanical exercise, and that it is not something Jim's group is doing as part of their project. During a charette, the group would articulate what they want, and then they would draw it out.
- Gerry asked if it was possible to get a contour map. He contacted the RDN and there are only maps showing 20 metre intervals.
- Lisa responded that currently the RDN only has 20 metre interval contour maps and she was looking for other sources that might have something better.
- Margie asked if we can have a map of just the area we are looking at.

- Sally stated that the group was not ready to have an Open house to show the public. She asked what day of the week the charette would be.
- Jim noted that Randall is available on Monday June 8<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday June 9<sup>th</sup>.
- Jim stated that Randall *is* designing his site, and he that he realizes that it's hard for people *not* to suspicious.
- The group was asked what day of the week worked better, and the response was that Mondays seemed to work, and they were better than Tuesdays. The group was asked who would be able to attend, and the show of hands indicated that the majority would be able to.
- Dick suggested that Lisa contact Ray Cole at UBC, there may be some students who can volunteer. [Contacted May 21<sup>st</sup> & awaiting response]
- Gordon suggested that Lisa contact Peter Mason for contour maps. [Contacted May 20<sup>th</sup> and looking into maps]
- Sharon asked if Fred Ryvers would be invited to the design charette.
- A member of the Group asked if all those affected by the Village Planning would be informed about the charette so they would have a chance to participate. It was asked if all those living within the Village Boundary could be sent information. The majority of the group agreed with this.
- Lisa stated that efforts have already been made to involve business owners in the April 29<sup>th</sup> Information Event and for the charette they would be invited to participate.

#### **7. Selection of top 3 Scenarios**

Group members selected their top 3 scenarios using sticky dots (see attached photos of the results).

#### **8. Announcements**

#### **9. Next Meetings**

- The next Meeting Date is Wednesday May 27<sup>th</sup> 6:30-9:30 p.m. at Lighthouse Community Hall.
- Charette June 8<sup>th</sup> & Morning of June 9<sup>th</sup>

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