The Chair - Meeting called to order at 6:30 pm. There were approximately 25 people in attendance including guests.

Agenda Item No. 1 – Minutes of the April 20, 2009 Meeting

The minutes May 4, 2009 were moved by Ray Digby and seconded by Hendrick Kreiberg and were carried without amendments.

Agenda Item No. 2 – Adoption of Official Community Plan Citizen’s Committee Speaker Series Meeting Minutes

The Official Community Plan Speaker Series Minutes were moved by Ray Digby and seconded by Bert Vermaskari and were carried without amendments.

Agenda Item No. 3 - Community Development Forum

Mr. Keller - provided handouts and explained that the group would be going over each handout one at a time.

Boat Harbour

Attendee - I would like to comment that I don’t want us to ignore the developments on the Electoral Area ‘A’ boundaries. Greg forwarded out an e-mail regarding Airport which stated that the RDN has no ability to comment on airport. RDN has no say in aviation activities as we are exempt from Local Government Bylaws. Would we have a say on other types of uses.

Mr. Keller – Jurisdiction on airport lands lies with the airport. Perhaps we should think about how the Official Community Plan could identify the community's concerns with respect to the airport?

The Chair - The Regional District of Nanaimo has no jurisdiction on airport lands. However, we can work with the airport to try and make sure we satisfy the communities’ visions but we have no ability make final decisions on their development.

Mr. Hooper – The Nanaimo Airport is always looking to work with public and willing to reach out and work with community.

Gary Laird - If we don’t have any say on the airport how can we work with the Island timberlands and Cassidy?
Mr. Keller - We will talk about the airport at a future meeting as it is an important issue, but off topic at the moment.

Mr. Anderson – I want to bring up the topic of a sustainability checklist. For example, a checklist for individual developments which entails giving points and creating incentives for green development.

Mr. Keller - We have discussed this before and noted that the Regional District of Nanaimo has a checklist which is being used for a slightly different purpose. In addition, the draft Official Community Plan will support the use of incentives for green development including a checklist.

Mr. Anderson – I am concerned we don’t have a matrix to evaluate environmental and fiscal effects on the land. RDN should have a philosophy behind it, for example DCC and scores correlate. It will cost the developer more money or less money based on scores.

Mr. Keller - The committee was not supportive of charging more for non-desirable developments which is reflected in the minutes.

Gary Laird - Why should developer get penalized?

Mr. Anderson – Because they are not green. Even if they’re not being sustainable? We should be setting the bar in the Official Community Plan, should we not?

The Chair- let’s keep on the topic at hand.

Ray Digby – Talked about lot averaging – resort component looks outside the Official Community Plan although the RGS supports resorts across the region.

Mr. Keller - Provincial bare land strata regulations allow an owner to create the equivalent number of smaller lots provided the developer can meet the conditions of the Approving Officer.

Anne Fiddick- Does RDN have jurisdiction over water lot?

Mr. Keller - The RDN cannot prohibit certain uses but can have some regulations that must be followed. Anything related to navigation is essentially off limits for RDN to regulate thorough zoning bylaws.

Anne Fiddick– Can they do what they want?

Burt Vermaskari – Federally and provincially, this water lot has slipped through the cracks.

Ray Digby – Couldn’t we include green development for building?

Mr. Keller - If there is support we could do this.

Henrick Kreiberg – Could this be a cluster development with strata?
**Mr. Keller** - Yes, it could be strata or it could be fee simple, both result in efficient use of land and both require different approval processes.

**Attendee** – This could create a different community node if it becomes a strata development as opposed to fee simple subdivision. The strata counsel may pursue things (use of common area land) more than individual owners would.

**Trevor Scott** – The property has twozonings and compatibility. Is the zoning required compatible with the rural zoning in the area?

**Mr. Keller** - Depends on the management of the property. Good question and should be looked at more closely in the re-zoning process

**Trevor Scott** – Is there any way to set guidelines for compatibility with the surrounding uses?

**Mr. Keller** - There is no one prescribed formula to determine compatibility. It comes down to number of factors and how are they managed. For example, historical land use resulted in separated uses, now we look at mixed uses and more connectivity within the community.

**The Chair**– In dealing with sustainability, do they fit in the two documents?

**Brain Col len** – This is difficult thing to answer, I have a hard time seeing the positives.

**Mr. Burnett** – 60 lots verses - 5 acre lots?

**Ray Digby** – The difficulty of densification is that there is no guarantee. I can’t find a level of comfort that the development would turn out to meet the parameters of the Official Community Plan. I worry about open space being locked away from it being Open Park. Also that it would meet green environmental standards. We should put different conditions on it to be refined in the future to make sure these items are not avoided.

**Jill Maibach**– I agree with Ray Digby this does meet concept. I would like to see it as part of the Official Community Plan for future discussion to meet criteria discussed.

**Anne Fiddick** – looking at principles 1-15 maybe we could do this but thinking about transportation, this is not the space for this type of development. Services are not cost efficient. Checking against checklist and does not come out greater than 50%.

**Gary Laird** – Densification should not be outside the UCB boundary. Future developments will look to this as an example if this goes through.

**Mr. Keller** - Density is not an issue, they can still have the same density with the current zoning. They can build the same number of units without re-zoning. The big issue is should a resort component be supported?

**Anne Fiddick** – This is not the same though as strata could keep green space from public.
Ray Digby - What about fire protection?

Burt Vermaskari – Densification has already started; Holden Corso has large lots.

Ray Digby – They can do this now?

Mr. Keller – Yes they can create an equivalent number of 2000m² lots under the Provincial Bare Land Strata Regulations.

Jill Maibach – Can we put a covenant on the land to protect green space?

Mr. Keller – We could make this a condition of re-zoning or the developer may be willing to do so.

Attendee – Is it realistic to worry about strata. I don’t understand the objections. There are a lot of strata lots in Cedar already. Kirkstone has one, concept is already there.

Jill Maibach – Thinking about active transportation, can we put an inclusion for pubic to use marina that we want to see, are we included in this decision?

Mr. Keller - Conditions of re-zoning such as active transport can be included as conditions of rezoning in the Official Community Plan.

Mr. Keller - Every application goes through this process of meeting the guidelines and other recommendations of the Official Community Plan.

Brain Collen – Sustainability principles seems to be up to board interpretation, we need qualifiers to evaluate development. How can we evaluate any without this?

Mr. Keller - When we release the draft there will be qualifiers briefly explaining the sustainability principles, we have had extensive discussion on this subject in previous meetings. They are our guiding principles.

Brain Collen – Looking to implement boat harbour into the Official Community Plan based on other details we don’t have yet, what are our assurances?

Mr. Keller – There is a whole draft process and in addition even if it is supported in the Official Community Plan a re-zoning process involving public input would be required.

The Chair- Recap: concept of strata to allow ½ acre lot to save green space would be supported in strata?

Mr. Keller – This can be a suggested preference, not a requirement there is no guarantee unless re-zoning was to occur.

The Chair– Can we move discussion to debate the resort itself, we’ve covered off the housing, is this the best use?
Jill Maibach - Resort portion to move forward provided Official Community Plan supports it with the visions of the committee.

Mr. Keller - We can only take what is put forward.

Anne Fiddick - What about historical and archaeological issues?

Mr. Keller - Many sites have this as something to consider and we work with the Archaeological Branch to protect them.

Attendee - Does the community have criteria? Looking at the community and the history of youth in the area I see it as providing employment for young in summer. Consider Yellow Point area, it has many resorts and works well for the area. We need to think as a committee, saves on transportation to other areas for the locals and gives employment.

The Chair - Regional Growth Strategy supports resorts, although it still needs to meet criteria, do we want to support this potential development for future consideration?

Henrik Kreiberg - Do we gain anything by making a conditions, isn’t it like any other development

Mr. Keller - There won’t be specific conditions although if there are key things you want to see then we need to put them into the Official Community Plan.

Henrik Kreiberg - I don’t think I’ve heard anything yet?

Anne Fiddick - I think Modern trail must connect through the subject property to tide line.

Mr. Anderson - Speaking on Henrik’s question, maybe one principle should be public access to prime open space on the subject property but under control of strata. The feel of the plan does not seem to provide access to water for public.

Mr. Keller - Yes, these are the types of things that the Official Community Plan can identity if the community wants it to.

The Chair - Staff will provide a draft of the condition as discussed and come back to committee.

Cedar Estates - Page 68 and 87

The Chair - they would still be required to apply for a DP and re-zoning

Henrik Kreiberg - if OCP was not changed then they would need to amend the OCP as well.

Jill Maibach - Is there minimum square footage for single seniors and couple?

Mr. Keller - This a VIHA question.
Gary Laird – Is there fire safety considerations?

Mr. Keller – As part of a rezoning, the fire department would receive a referral.

The Chair– Looks like they are looking at raising storeys, this would be something that the North Cedar Improvement District would need to be referred to for comments.

Ray Digby – This looks like it will take longer than Official Community Plan will take, is this not applicable?

Joe Burnett - Will not accept any new applications which are not consistent with the OCP until the OCP is complete.

Anne Fiddick– I hope it does not set a precedent for higher stories in the rest of Area ‘A’

Mr. Keller - Official Community Plan looks at this individual sites separately as well as the residents specific to the area in question would have an opportunity to comment at the time of re-zoning.

Kipp Road

Ray Digby– We need to consider Sandstone, that is where is should go not in an existing residential area.

Brain Collen – I don’t want t to use precedence, this is not supported in the area by residents.

Mr. Anderson – That industrial park does not serve only Electoral Area ‘A’ it’s for the whole region. If it was more community based it would have more validity. The highway gives it high visibility, anything further inland it’s not enhancing South Wellington.

Mr. Keller - Any ideas on target development vs. regional development?

Mr. Anderson – Let’s say for example a recycled materials business, this is a local community based community public facility as opposed to regional industrial use.

Henrik Kreiberg - Should industrial uses grow? If so, EMCON should be able to grow.

The Chair– A land review could show the ‘build out’ of certain area, this is something we could look at doing.

The Chair- RDN should do a land review to see if we need to encourage the build out of these areas to include industrial uses.

Michael Hooper – I would need more data to make informed decision.

The Chair– We still need to do a land review to make an informed decision.

Mr. Keller – We still need to consider this with more information.
The Chair- Developer had it removed from ALR

Mr. Keller - We would have to consider a change to the Urban Containment Boundary.

Mr. Anderson – Why was the Urban Containment Boundary proposed to be moved to its proposed location?

The Chair- They are not in the Urban Containment Boundary right now. We can look at two things; Official Community Plan would support this and second or take whole area out.

Mr. Keller – In the earlier meeting we talked about Urban Containment Boundary and sewer lines, if this is something that the committee would like to support then the Official Community Plan would consider it.

Henrik Kreiberg - Is it the proximity to the sewer lines there?

The Chair- Must be within the Urban Containment Boundary then could be expanded but right now it is not

Mr. Keller – We are waiting for a sewer study.

Henrik Kreiberg – No one else can hook up until the sewer capacity is increased.

Mr. Keller – Urban Containment Boundary and land use designation would have to support it. That would set the stage for the developer to apply to re-zone.

Mike Hooper - Seems like a logical property.

Brian Collen – Do you have a model?

Mr. Anderson – According to my analysis this development scores much higher than others. Triple bottom line, this is a model green development. We don’t do enough of these fast enough. If ALC took it out.

Jill Maibach – I hear no negative comments on this proposal.

The Chair- The Agricultural Land Commission talked about buffering and development does provide for buffering and a connection to Morden Colliery Trail.

The Chair- We want to see this as a condition.

Cassidy; Page 72 and 87

Mr. Keller – Gave an overview of the project.
**Brian Collen** – This is a huge addition to a small area. It is a large area and with diverse uses. We don’t know what the airport is planning on doing? This would be the absolute last area. We haven’t even given cedar any consideration for industrial uses. Also, transit is long from coming out there.

**The Chair**– A transit study being done right now.

**Ray Digby** - To me, this looks like one great industrial strip mall.

**The Chair**– The Urban Containment Boundary was looking at this location to make Cassidy a more complete community with community amenities and a broader range of housing, services, and employment. There is more than just industrial, there is commercial and residential component as well.

**Mr. Keller** – Within the Cassidy area there is no other logical area to locate something like this. That is why these area where identified.

**Mr. Keller** - Past discussion identified that a more complete community was desirable and this is the area that makes the most sense. The land is not in the Agricultural Land Reserve.

**The Chair**- Transportation will be based on ridership. Many riders are from Ladysmith to VIU, which provides potential to this being feasible.

**Jill Maibach** – Would the transit expansion include South Wellington.

**Attendee** – Island Timberlands took all trees from this area and now they want to develop it?

**Jill Maibach** – Agree that timber companies would develop overkill for a small community such as Cassidy.

**Mike Hooper** – The airport is looking at looking at 1600 jobs in the near future. From a sustainability viewpoint we would like to have housing for these jobs, and affordable housing as well. We need this kind of increased housing or better transportation. We need better infrastructure for the folk that live in Timberlands area. They are all on septic and well, this would help expand community water and sewer into these areas.

**Mr. Keller** - Services should be supported but cost is so high that it’s impractical. If help is received from developers and the airport then the costs would be offset.

**Ray Digby** – I originally supported the expansion of the UBC. This is no place for the young people to keep living there, there is nothing to offer. I support affordable housing and business but the industrial lands, I am not keen on. We need to know better what kind of industrial development could happen. Current Mobile Home Park could not afford hook up to community services, many people are retired or low income or young families.

**Mr. Keller** - Potential for expansion is there, maybe this is good.

**Ray Digby** - then why didn’t we consider support for industrial lands in cedar area?
Henrik Kreiberg – I’m also having a problem it too. Knowledge of demographic would help me to see whether this would serve existing community, I don’t feel comfortable making a comment if it’s just anticipatory.

Ray Digby – How can we find these statistics?

Mr. Keller – Age demographics are not specifically available for Cassidy.

Ray Digby – This is a regional project, it can’t be specific to Cassidy.

Gary Laird – All land can grow food, next door is a gravel pit, use it for things that make sense not develop it on things that can be done elsewhere like greenhouses. This area is not at all like CVRD, Saanich. We are not good at growing vegetables; some land is not useable as it used to be for food production. This proposed use fits with the Official Community Plan. Live work and job opportunities. We can’t speak out the both sides of our mouth.

Jill Maibach – You are right, I question the location.

Brian Col len – Maybe growing forest may be a better use of land other info must be considered.

Gary Laird – This is our only opportunity to have some of the services paid for; sewer and water.

Joanne McLeod – I’m concerned with industrial sprawl, I grew up in Duncan and it’s ugly along that highway.

The Chair – Looked at UCB and Cassidy and should have some areas to consider areas for development boundary, what I’m hearing is we are not supporting the industrial lands portion of the proposal?

Mr. Keller – Workbook is correct. Timberland changed the plan to work with community.

Mike Hooper – We should also note that there is opportunity here for commercial development.

Ray Digby – I remember with the Cassidy people, there was not much feedback except for having a park and kids to have a home. Considering the lowest income groups in the area, taxes will go up, what are the impacts of this.

Chris Pagan – I don’t know if residents have made up their minds but it looks like a great opportunity here. Lots of young families live here all the way up to retirees. They have to drive everywhere with very little opportunity for work in the area. Maybe the light industrial may provide some job opportunities.

Mr. Keller – Light industrial is open to interpretation, it could be low impact uses, there is lots of flexibility. No standard uses.

Ray Digby – We could make this become a model green community, make it a DPA that could go with this concept.
Chris Pagan – Probably wouldn’t be developed all at once, these development are long term plans.

The Chair – It would be developed over time, for example Sandstones development timeline about 20-25 years.

Wayne Proctors proposals

1. Cedar Store:

Mr. Keller – This would contribute toward the cedar main street concept. Any comments?

Ray Digby – This is one of the few proposals that fits with what we are talking about

Brian Collen – Looks like it fits with the others stores that we’ve looked at.

The Chair – If we do a charrette then we need to look at this.

2. Millay Market

Greg Keller - Consistent with the Official Community Plan and would like addition recognition;

Brian Collen - Is it on the sewer line?

Mr. Keller – It is on the boundary.

3. Ruckleidge Store

Henrik Kreiberg –My understanding is that piece of Morden road is only a 33 foot side road allowance and expansion of this nature sounds like it would be a recipe for problems. Before going down that road it’s an issue that needs to looks at before anything.

Mr. Keller - MOTI would get a referral and they would have to consider approving the bylaw. Any time a property changes use they also need a access permit approved my MOTI. These are both opportunities to ensure adequate road standards.

Brain Collen – There has been no discussion about the adjacent school. Industrial traffic will be travelling down that road. I don’t support this until further discussion.

Jill Maibach – From an observational point of view, the volume of traffic is very high entering into the store. Maybe this would relieve that by pulling back the traffic off the highway.

Attendee - I agree with Jill Maibach, it would help a lot if it could be adjusted further back off the highway.

Mr. Keller - It would require a re-zoning so all of these issues would be looked at.
Joanne McLeod – This is a hotspot, getting a lot of negative feedback. This one is unpopular compared to the other two.

The Chair- What I’m hearing is some concerns and maybe this proposal is not the one that would fit this site. Maybe the developer can re-think this plan and the committee can reconsider this later?

Western Maritime Institute

The Chair- I’m not totally familiar with this site and if not liable for the activities maybe we can support something.

Mike Hooper – Following the suggestion of another committee member to develop a playground on the site. Mike Hooper – noted that it might not be the best location since there is fire suppression training on the property

Anne Fiddick – I’m concerned with the impact on the water.

The Chair- Can the septic system support it?

Ray Digby – Do we know exactly what are they exactly doing.

The Chair– They will be working with the fire department on these activities.

Ray Digby – I’m concerned with the waste water, how are they doing this? Are they using any oils?

Mike Hooper – He is using clean close system, no oils.

The Chair- On surface seems acceptable but need a bit more research.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 pm.
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