CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 pm by the Chair. There were approximately 6 people in attendance.

MINUTES

The Chair asked the Committee for a motion to adopt the summary of the July 19, 2010 meeting.

MOVED Garry Laird, SECONDED Donna Sweeny, that the summary of the Area ‘A’ Citizen’s Committee meeting held on July 19, 2010 be adopted.

CARRIED

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Greg Keller gave a presentation reviewing the current subdivision potential outside the Growth Containment Boundaries (GCB) and outlining 9 potential options for reducing development potential in rural areas.

The group discussed how and if the policies adopted in the OCP would be implemented and that community support and initiation by the local Area director would be required. Mr. Keller explained that including policies regarding minimum parcel sizes in the OCP provides an arena for implementation of those policies to be considered in the future. The chair confirmed that if the plan makes recommendations for immediate implementation then this could be brought forward following adoption of the OCP. Mr. Keller explained that the list of options is not an exhaustive list and that the OCP could include a number of options. Mr. Keller also clarified that implementation of any of the options would require an amendment to the zoning bylaw and some of the options would require more research prior to implementation.
The group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each of some of the 9 options. One of the committee members noted that Option 1 is the only option that allows for community servicing grants and asked what the benefits of the grants would be. Mr. Keller indicated that grants could be important in supporting village centres.

Mr. Keller explained that in order for the RDN to be eligible for community service grant all lands outside the UCB in all Electoral Areas must have a minimum parcel size of 1 ha or larger. Committee members also agreed that Option 1 would help to preserve agricultural land. One of the committee members indicated that the concern with Option 2 as it could prevent elderly people from being able to remain on their property i.e. limiting the number of dwelling units to one per parcel wouldn’t allow family members to move to the property to help out older parents. One of the committee members noted that with Option 3 the density might not end up in the same Electoral Area or even within the Growth Containment Boundaries and Mr. Keller agreed that this option would require more study into the feasibility of this option. Another committee member gave an example of density transfer from the CVRD and Mr. Keller explained that unlike the CVRD, the challenge at the RDN is that the RGS controls how density could be transferred from one property to another.

The group discussed Option 4 and how it encourages green development and helps to reach the objectives of the OCP. One of the committee members asked for clarification of what would be considered a community amenity and Mr. Keller stated that the bylaw would specify what the amenities could include and that any amenity needs to provide a benefit to the community. The committee noted that Option 7 would allow people time to decide whether they want to subdivide or not however it could result in a rush of applications. Mr. Keller clarified that a phased approach to changing minimum parcel sizes would be date specific and not dependent on ownership.

The committee members discussed the possibility of including more than one option in the OCP, in particular Options 4, 5, and 7 or the possibility of combining these options into one hybrid option. One of the committee members suggested that Option 9 be included and noted that the RGS and OCP contain statement that support cluster housing. The group also suggested that different options could be applied depending on land use designation, for example the committee noted that Option 7 could be applied to farm land and Option 4 might be better suited to Rural Resource and Rural Residential lands.

One of the committee members made a motion to explore a hybrid option including a combination of options 4, 5, 7, and 9 as they relate to different land use designations and Mr. Keller to report back at the next committee meeting. All members voted in favour.

ROUNDTABLE

Laurie Gourlay noted that he had material to bring forward to the committee members and expressed concern concerning the RDN’s ability to regulate the Nanaimo Airport Lands had not been clarified following his request. Mr. Gourlay stated that members of the community and the OCP committee are operating under false and misleading information and that section 8.8 of the Draft OCP should be amended. The attendee handed out copies of a letter he received from the RDN’s. The Committee Chair explained that the letter had not been received by the RDN Board yet and suggested that the attendee
direct his comments to the RDN’s Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). One of the committee members clarified that the Draft OCP is just a draft and has not been adopted yet so the contents could change still.

Mr. Keller noted the upcoming open houses and stated that he would send out an e-mail with an alternate date for the next meeting due to a conflict with the next meeting and the Thanksgiving holiday.

The Chair brought forward a letter from ABC Precast requesting an opportunity to give a presentation to the committee proposing to include a small number of properties on Kipp Road within the South Wellington Industrial / Commercial Area. The committee members agreed to listen to the presentation by ABC Precast at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55pm.
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