CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by the Chair. There were approximately 10 people in attendance.

MINUTES

The Chair asked the Committee for a motion to adopt the summary of the May 10, 2010 meeting.

Henrik Krieberg requested that the motion in the previous meeting that “the Official Community Plan not go to the public until we have a response back for the issue raised today” be amended to include “the airport” in brackets.

Henrik Krieberg requested that the last sentence of the second paragraph under OCP Implementation be changed to “it also offer protection to property owners (Section 943) offering them a 12 month grace period to satisfy the conditions of the subdivision to the satisfaction of the provincial subdivision approving officer.”

MOVED Henrik Krieberg, SECONDED Brian Collen, that the summary of the Area ‘A’ Citizen’s Committee meeting held on May 10, 2010 be adopted as amended. CARRIED

NANAIMO AIRPORT UPDATE

Greg Keller explained the motion from the previous meeting to not move forward with more consultation on the draft until the airport issue was resolved. The committee had concerns about the transparency of the process since the RDN was not sharing the legal opinion on the airport. In response Mr. Keller came up with two options for consideration. The first option that was identified is to remove the airport section as proposed and insert a notation in the draft that there are unresolved issues that are of regional significance and that the OCP supports a separate
process. The OCP could be amended at later date depending on the outcome of the process. The airport would also be removed from the Urban Containment Boundary in this option. This option would be open to any number of possible actions and outcomes.

The second option is to leave the draft as proposed and proceed. This option does not necessary address the concerns expressed by the committee. Both options will include a new legal opinion, and depending on the outcome of the opinion there are a number of different approaches that can be taken. The first option is preferable so as not to bog down the OCP review process. The OCP can be amended at a later date depending on the outcome.

The committee members expressed concern with recognising the airport lands as having ‘regional significance’ in the first option. The non-aviation aspect of the airport lands is not an issue of regional significance. Mr. Keller explained that they would consult with the residents of Area ‘A’ specifically as the group most affected.

Mr. Keller explained that the first option would establish a process for the issues on the airport lands, while allowing the OCP process to proceed. The committee discussed the options and without a second legal opinion they can only go with the first option which is open to all possibilities. The committee members emphasized the need for a second legal opinion from a different source than the first.

The group discussed the list of stakeholders to be consulted with for the airport lands and whether they would be appropriate for non-aeronautical land uses. One of the committee members recommended adding stakeholders for aquifer and watershed protection. The committee members suggested that a community charrette would be appropriate on the airport lands. They also discussed revisiting the third option from the proceeding Committee of the Whole report, which was to permit the Citizens Committee to provide a recommendation for the airport section in the OCP. Mr. Keller explained that a charrette may fit into the proposed process.

Some of the committee members expressed their concerns that an airport section may be included in the OCP later without the committee’s feedback. The committee suggested that they should reconvene if there was an amendment to the OCP for the airport section at a later date. The Chair suggested that wording should be added to the first option to reflect that the committee will reconvene.

The Chair asked for a show of hands from the Committee to see if it supports option 1. Support for option 1 was unanimous.

MOVED Devon Wyatt, SECONDED Henrik Krieberg that the Committee support option 1 with an amendment which adds the following: “should the Area ‘A’ OCP be amended that the Citizen’s Committee be consulted and have an opportunity to provide input.

CARRIED

Some of the committee members suggested that an independent process would be valuable to the airport lands. Jack Anderson requested to go on record that the Mid Island Sustainable Stewardship Initiative (MISSI) has no intention of suing the RDN, only that they would go to the next step if the community wanted the RDN to clarify its position.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Greg Keller explained the build out potential of Area ‘A’ based on if the Urban Containment Boundary was amended and the minimum parcel sizes outside the boundary was decreased to
reflect the OCP. The intention of the changes is create more compact forms of development and less sprawl, consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and the community vision. Mr. Keller explained that the committee would consider this information and they can discuss it next meeting. Some of the committee members expressed the need for more information on the water availability prior to making any decisions for changing the minimum parcel size in the area.

SUSTAINABILITY CHECKLIST

Greg Keller explained that the feedback received from MISSI and the Citizen’s Committee had been submitted to the Sustainability Select Committee (SSC) along with an update on the sustainability checklist. The recommendation in the report to the SSC is that a checklist with incentives be developed. A presentation will be made in July to the SSC on how to proceed with the checklist.

Jack Anderson explained that MISSI had been working with some area residents to prepare a checklist as input into the RDN process. He stated his concerns that the report to the SSC does not sufficiently distinguish between land use and buildings. Currently there is too much focus on buildings and not enough on land. He did express his appreciation to the openness to input for the sustainability checklist.

The group discussed the sustainability checklist submitted with the report. Members of the Farmers Institute were not in favour of the provisions for cluster developments on farmland. Mr. Anderson explained that the checklist was only an example; it was the scoring method that was important. Some of the committee members made suggestions that the ‘tick box’ format was an appropriate style to use for the checklist.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN PROCESS

Greg Keller suggested that they release the draft OCP during the summer for the public to review on their own. He indicated that there would be three Open Houses scheduled.

ROUNDTABLE

The committee discussed if the Board was committed to implementing the OCP, possible approaches to affordable housing in the document, and if more information would be available on drinking water in the area. A participant stated that she was concerned about the sewage treatment plant for the airport lands. She has not received any response from the airport for where it will be located.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.
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