MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Thompson
Manager of Long Range Planning

FROM: Stephen Boogaards
Planner

DATE: March 29, 2010

FILE: PL2010-002
Area ‘H’ OCP

SUBJECT: Bylaw No. 1335.03 to Amend Electoral Area ‘H’ Draft Official Community Plan
Bylaw No. 1335, 2003 to Include Bowser Village Centre Plan

PURPOSE

To receive the Report of the Public Hearing containing the Summary of the Submissions of the Public Hearing held March 16, 2010 on the “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010”, consider additional amendments to the bylaw and grant 3rd reading.

BACKGROUND

The Bowser Village Centre Plan was initiated in early 2008 as the Electoral Area ‘H’ Village Planning Project. Recent actions on this planning project include the following:

1st and 2nd Reading

The Regional Board granted 1st and 2nd reading to “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” at their regular meeting held on February 23, 2010.

Bylaw Referrals

The Bylaw was referred to the Bowser Waterworks District, Deep Bay Waterworks District, the Agricultural Land Commission, the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, Ministry of Community and Rural Development, K’omox First Nation, Qualicum First Nation, Ministry of Agricultural and Lands, Comox Valley Regional District, School District No. 69, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Vancouver Island Health Authority, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Ministry of the Environment, Integrated Land Management Bureau, Ministry of Forest and Range, BC Transit, Bow Horn Bay Fire Department, BC Hydro, Terasen Gas, and Canadian Wildlife Service. A summary of the agency referral comments was available at the Public Hearing and is included as part of the written submissions and comments included in Appendix A.

Public Hearing

A public hearing was held pursuant to the Local Government Act on March 16, 2010 with approximately 130 people in attendance (see Attachment No. 1 for the Report of the Public Hearing and public comments received on the Bylaw).
ALTERNATIVES

1. Receive the Report of the Public Hearing, grant 3rd reading of Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010 with no additional changes and refer the Bylaw to the Ministry of Community and Rural Development for consideration of approval.

2. Receive the Report of the Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010, amend the bylaw as outlined in Schedule No. 1, grant 3rd reading of Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010 and refer the Bylaw to the Ministry of Community and Rural Development for consideration of approval.

3. Receive the Report of the Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010 and not grant 3rd reading and provide staff with further direction.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

The RDN Board has an adopted policy and Public Consultation Framework, which outlines public consultation procedures for major RDN projects. In addition, the Local Government Act sets out public consultation provisions for the amendment of OCPs. The requirements of the RDN Board policy and the Local Government Act have been followed throughout the process.

A Report of the Public Hearing is included as Attachment No. 1. Staff are proposing a number of minor amendments to the Bowser Centre Village Plan in response to comments received through the public hearing and written submissions from the community. The proposed changes are outlined in Schedule No. 1. These amendments are consistent with the overall direction in this Plan and do not affect land use or density.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Should the Regional Board grant 3rd reading to the “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010”, the Bylaw will be referred to the Ministry of Community and Rural Development for consideration of approval. In consideration of its approval, the Ministry will take into account the comments of the agencies to which the Bylaw has been referred. Comments were received from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Ministry of Community and Rural Development, BC Hydro and Vancouver Island Health Authority. These referral response letters were available at the Public Hearing and are included in Appendix ‘A’.

Following 3rd reading and the Minister’s approval, the Board may consider the Bylaw for adoption.

FINANCIAL / LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Pursuant to the Local Government Act, the draft amendments have been considered in relation to the Regional District’s Financial Plan as well as its Liquid and Solid Waste Management Plans.

VOTING

Electoral Area Directors – one vote, except Electoral Area ‘B’.
SUMMARY

The Regional Board gave 1st and 2nd reading to “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” during its regular Board meeting held on February 23, 2010. In accordance with the Local Government Act, the Agricultural Land Commission has been provided a formal opportunity to consider the Bylaw prior to Public Hearing. In addition, formal referrals were sent to applicable provincial and federal agencies with interests in the Plan Area. In response to comments received from the agency referrals and other community and staff input, some minor changes (outlined in Schedule No. 1) to the Bylaw are recommended.

A public hearing was held on March 16, 2010 with approximately 130 residents in attendance. The Summary of comments and written submissions to this public hearing are attached for the Board’s consideration.

“Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” has fulfilled all requirements of the Local Government Act and may now be considered for 3rd reading.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Report of the Public Hearing containing the oral and written submissions to the Public Hearing held Tuesday, March 16, 2010, together with all written submissions received prior to the Public Hearing on “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” be received.

2. That “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” be granted 3rd reading with amendments as outlined in Schedule No. 1 of the staff report.

3. That the “Regional District of Nanaimo Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010” be forwarded to the Ministry of Community and Rural Development for consideration of approval.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
Report Writer                                               General Manager Concurrence

---------------------------------------------------------------------
Manager Concurrence                                         CAO Concurrence
## Schedule No. 1

Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010
Proposed changes to be considered by the Board at 3rd reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Location/Objective/Policy</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Related Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 – Policies and Implementation | Add new policy:  
Policy 1.3.6 | The use of marine retaining walls and other "hard" surfaces such as seawalls, concrete groynes, gabions, and rip rap shall only be supported where a qualified professional has determined that "soft" approaches to shoreline stabilization such as vegetation enhancement, upland drainage control, biotechnical measures, beach enhancement, anchor trees, and gravel placement are not appropriate given site specific conditions. In addition, the construction of shoreline stabilization measures including marine retaining walls should be in compliance with the Regional District of Nanaimo Marine Retaining Wall Policy, as amended from time to time. | Work with property owners, qualified professionals, DFO, ILMB and MoE to develop solutions to beach stabilisation issues that do not result in a further hardening of the shoreline and will not have an impact on the surrounding area including adjacent upland property. |
| 3 – Policies and Implementation | Add new policy:  
Policy 6.2.3 | The use of shoreline stabilization measures on Crown Foreshore, in a manner that obstructs pedestrian access to and along public beaches or foreshore areas, shall not be supported. | Work with property owners, DFO, ILMB and MoE to develop solutions to beach stabilisation issues that do not block public access along Crown Foreshore. |
| 4 – Land Use Concept | Page 8  
Replace the second bullet under Building Arrangement with: | Residential Uses at or above street level when associated with the Seniors Housing, Affordable Housing or Care Facilities land uses. | |
| 4 – Land Use Concept | Page 8  
Replace the third bullet under Building Types with: | Attached or stacked town houses when associated with a retail or office use. | |
Attachment No. 1

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2010 AT 7:00 PM AT LIGHTHOUSE COMMUNITY HALL, 240 LIONS WAY, QUALICUM BAY, BC TO CONSIDER REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO ELECTORAL AREA ‘H’ OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 1335.03, 2010

Note that this REPORT IS not a verbatim recording of the proceedings, but are intended to summarize the comments of those in attendance at the Public Hearing.

Present for the Regional District of Nanaimo:

Dave Bartram  Chair, Director, Electoral Area ‘H’
Paul Thorkelsson  General Manager of Development Services
Paul Thompson  Manager of Long Range Planning
Stephen Boogaards  Planner

There were approximately 130 people in attendance at the Public Hearing.

Written submissions were received during the Public Hearing from:

Mac Snobelen, 6887 West Island Highway
Sally Barton, 130 Bald Eagle Crescent
Robert Hunt, 3310 Welch Rd.
John Lyotier, 4268 Wildwood Rd
Dianne Sampson, 5224 Gainsberg Rd.

The Chair, Director Bartram opened the meeting at 7:00 pm, introduced those attending the meeting from the RDN.

The Chair stated the purpose of the Public Hearing and requested that staff explain the Bowser Village Centre Plan Bylaw that was the subject of the Public Hearing.

Paul Thompson, Manager of Long Range Planning provided a description of the Bylaw.

The Chair outlined the public hearing procedures and invited submissions with respect to the proposed bylaw from the audience.

The Chair read the submission from Mac Snobelen

Roy Nex expressed his concerns with the bylaw. Two readings have already taken place for the bylaw in Nanaimo for which people in the Bowser community did not receive any notice. Meetings affecting the Bowser community should be held in the area. He identified the names in the acknowledgement section and suggested that the involvement of the community in the preparation of the plan has been overstated. Mr. Nex stated that he did not agree with fast tracking applications, as the community will not have any input in the development approval process. Bowser does not have sufficient water to support the development in the plan. He also stated that the plan does not say that the developer will pay for new infrastructure. He is concerned that the people in Area ‘H’ will end up paying for most of the infrastructure through their taxes.

Sally Barton, 130 Bald Eagle Crescent, read her submission.

Bob Hunt, 3310 Welch Road, read his submission.
Dianne Eddy, 5058 Longview Drive, explained that the Mapleguard Ratepayers Association has distributed flyers highlighting important issues for residents in the plan. One of her concerns is interface fires and that once Esary Road is completed it will be gated and only open in emergencies. This is an important second exit for Jamieson Road and could not be unlocked in an emergency. Her other concern is the ability of the water board to service the densities supported in this plan. A hydrological report from 2004 suggested that the water supplies were too poor to support development. She has attended most of the meetings for the village plan and has brought up this issue. The RDN should do a review of the water supplies before it can consider any further development.

Al Grozell, 56 McColl Road, stated that he owns two properties within the Bowser village and future use area. He stated that the plan has had a lot of public input and he supports it as it sits. Any problems that were discussed would be addressed during specific development applications. He stated that it is not an open door for developers.

John Lyotier, explained that he was a member of the committee and was pleased that everyone was invited to be part of the committee. The committee has really progressed and among the members there was adherence to respectfulness and politeness. He explained the planning process and stated that it was a huge leap of faith in participatory democracy. The process is very important as it allows people to have their say for what is important. This is an opportunity to make recommendations in the future for environment and housing issues. Mr. Lyotier referred to a graph for community water consumption and explained that the consumption in the community has decreased significantly since the Bowser Water District adopted a new rate structure. Despite population growth in the village, consumption went down since people stopped wasting water due to the disincentives.

Barry Bevilacqua, Faye Road, stated that if the plan was to be embraced by the community than they should have a vote on it. He also stated that he liked the community as it was and that they are betraying their children by allowing for high density development. This will affect the entire area, not just Bowser.

Ian MacDonell, Seaview Drive, commended the committee for the time spent preparing this plan. He identified objective 1.2.3 and stated that the water provided by Deep Bay Improvement District was unsustainable. He explained the intention of the province to get rid of improvement districts and stated that the RDN will not take over any of the improvement districts until they are brought up to standard, which would be at the expense of the community. The only way to sustain funding is to separate from the regional district and to fund their own water works.

Joyce Bartram, explained that as the chair of the Deep Bay Improvement District she attended in the beginning since land serviced by the improvement district would be included in the village centre. She explained the hydrology groundwater study prepared in 2007. The study concluded that the aquifer in Deep Bay can provide for the present community with more water to spare. She believes that there is an adequate amount of water. If there was a proposed subdivision of land then an engineering firm is consulted to confirm available water through further study. She clarified that the developer is responsible for providing infrastructure to development and rate payers only pay if everyone benefits. She also confirmed that the improvement district is considering the purchase of a new fire truck in 2018. The developer would bear the cost of any equipment needed for higher densities.

Mac Snobelen, 6887 West Island Highway, explained that this is not a plan for development but an opportunity for determining what it would look like if it happened. He stated that he had a hard time embracing the plan, but there would be opportunity to address these issues in the future. He emphasized that the document is not a plan for development but a good attempt to provide direction for the future.

Gerry Quinn, 126 Bayridge Place, explained that he had been part of the committee for the majority of meetings and reminded the group that the OCP had left a number of issues incomplete. Everyone was invited to participate in the process and there were many non-committee meetings for people to get involved. Mr. Quinn explained that development should be planned and not just happen by accident.
People who disagree with the plan have not given suggestions for specific changes. There are opportunities for input and this is the time. He stated that he supports the plan and encourages others to do so as well.

Ron Ryvers, 6996 West Island Highway, said he supported the process and explained that it is rare that a community would have the opportunity to develop a core that is largely empty of development. In time this land may be occupied by half acre lots. Mr. Ryvers stated that the business community needs to compete with the car. It is difficult for small business to survive where there is no commercial core. Business needs density around the core, so that there are enough people to support those uses. He also explained the concept of eco-density where it is more sustainable to have higher density to use resources more efficiently. The entire community would benefit.

Margie Healey, 200 Crome Point Road, stated that she went to the committee meetings because she did not want to see strip development. She supports a village centre where there is a doctor and people can come for shopping. Until there is a village centre the community cannot support a doctor. She also stated that the community wants to keep the rural areas. There were lots of opportunities to provide input and she supports the plan.

Mark Rautiainen, 2440 Whistler Road West, stated his concerns that there is no industry in Bowser and that they are running out of water.

Steve Anderosov, 600 Cowland Road, expressed his concerns that the density in the future use area is higher than what the water system can handle.

The Chair read the submission from Diane Sampson.

Roy Nex, stated his concern that the village concept is not what the people of the area wanted. He stated that the scale needs to be smaller and the plan needs to emphasize that the developer pays for infrastructure. He emphasized that the committee was really rushed at the end. The Board should cancel the first two readings and the meetings should be in Bowser.

The Chair asked if there were any other comments or submissions.

The Chair asked for a second time if there were any other comments or submissions.

The Chair asked for a third time if there were any other comments or submissions.

Hearing none, the Chair thanked those in attendance and announced that the Public Hearing was closed. The Chair indicated that the Board of the Regional District would consider Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010 at their Regular Board meeting to be held Tuesday, April 27, 2010 in the Board Chambers located at 6300 Hammond Bay Road in Nanaimo.

The meeting concluded at 8:25 pm.
Written Submissions Received at the Public Hearing

Bowser Builders

Subject: FW: Village Plan

Stephen Snobelen
6887 West Island Highway
Bowser B.C.
250 757 8442

It looks to me like we have made room for Multi-unit residential and Affordable housing, that can be at street level with no connection to commercial development. “As I read it.” I think this opens the door to the commercial land being used for higher density housing.

Residential – High Density land use section ...also allows for this kind of development

If the intention was to include residential with the commercial in the Commercial Mixed Use.

I propose that we change the wording too

In “Land Uses”... Line three

. Multi-unit residential [ in combination with commercial development]
 Line five
. Affordable housing [ in combination with commercial development ]

In the section “Building Arrangement”
Line two
. Residential uses at street level [ When used for seniors housing or Care Facilities ]

And in the section “ Building Types”
Line two
. Clustered multi-unit residential developments [ attached or part of the same development including ] retail or office use
 Line three
. Attached or stacked town houses [ as part of a retail or office development ]

I think this is more the intent of the “Commercial mixed use”
Thanks Mac
Submission from:  
Sally Barton,  
130 Bald Eagle Crescent, Bowser (250) 757-8455  

March 15, 2010

Input re: **Bowser Village Centre Plan.**

There were 24 public meetings and events held between June 2008 and October 2009. I attended all but 2 of those (as I recollect). The majority of people who attended regularly did so in good faith and with an open mind. We were frequently reminded that it was our (the public’s) plan and that our input was important. Minutes of all the meetings were produced, and Lisa, the RDN representative, was available almost every Friday at EyesOnBC to discuss things, answer questions and get input from people who perhaps couldn’t attend the regular meetings. This was a very open and public process.

In my opinion, the final document accurately reflects the outcomes of this extensive consultation process.

The Bowser Village Centre Plan does not only contain the Land Use Concept and Designations (section 4) and the Development Permit Area descriptions (section 5). It also contains the many Sustainability Principles that were expressed by people throughout the process (section 2), and the Policies and Implementation Actions that were developed to address the Goals and Objectives (section 3).

It is a plan that incorporates many good ideas from the residents of Bowser and surrounding areas.

In the Introduction (section 1) it states that:

"This plan is intended to illustrate a preferred pattern of land uses as development and re-development occurs. It is not intended to change the use of the land in the immediate future. Future zoning changes will be initiated by property owners and not imposed by the RDN."

Also:

"The Bowser Village Centre Plan will be applied in the review of all planning and land-use matters within the Bowser Village Centre Plan Area."
Applications for development, re-development and public improvement projects must be consistent with plan policies."

This is our plan – the plan of the concerned citizens who attended all or many of those meetings. As with all plans, it can, and should be re-visited and adjusted in the future. As a community we should embrace the plan and see how we can take an active role in the management of the plan and the development of our village centre.

I am dismayed that some people can only see negatives in this plan. I do not understand why someone would publish an anonymous attack on all of the hard work done to create this plan when there were so many opportunities to provide input during the process. Also, I am a member of the Mapleguard Ratepayers Association, but I was not informed of, or consulted about, the flyer that went out from that association and I do not agree with the concerns written in it.

I would like to hear the opinions of the landowners within the Bowser Village Centre Plan Area. I live outside of that area (as do many of the participants in the process), and I appreciate that a central premise of this plan is to support the potential for increased density within the village centre so that we, who bought ½ acre or larger rural lots do not have to be concerned about proposals to either increase density in our “rural areas” or to develop commercial properties near our residences. How do the village centre landowners feel about the plan?

Throughout this process I also represented the Bowser Seniors Housing Society, and we are pleased that seniors housing was considered important by many people and is included in land use designations within the plan.

I support this plan. I think that it provides much better direction to the RDN about what we would like to see in Bowser Village Centre in the future than previously existed in the OCP (section 5.5), and expands and enhances the Guidelines previously included in the OCP, Appendix A2.

Thank you.
SUBMITTED TO THE R.D.N. HEARING ON THE BOWSER VILLAGE CENTRE PLAN, MARCH 16, 2010 BY ROBERT HUNT, 3310 WELCH RD. QUALICUM BAY, PH. 250-757-8307, EMAIL STEELEHUNT@SHAW.CA.

I have lived on my property here for 38 years. I was involved with the committee discussing the above plan. I cannot endorse the plan as presented.

Many hours were spent at the beginning of the process discussing definitions of terms like node, rural, sustainability, rural lifestyle, and healthy communities. Motherhood issues like clean air and water, environmental protection, and greenspace were largely agreed upon. I don't recall the subject of high density development ever being discussed. There are many implications to allowing densities far higher than ever allowed in Bowser before, and these were never addressed by the committee.

I was told the planning theory that grouping of population minimized sub-urban sprawl. I do not believe this applies to Bowser, because large amounts of land are already zoned for 1/2 acre lots and there was an early agreement that there would be no downzoning. There was no provision for preserving land outside the village, so higher density inside the village would not affect the small-lot rural lot developments outside its boundary.

A sewage system was discussed only briefly. There was no discussion of where the wastewater would go, since for the first time in Bowser, it would need to be moved from the property generating it. There was no discussion of the merits or drawbacks of using public or crown land for disposal, for the benefit of the high-density developments. No suitable sites were examined for their potential to accept waste water. Financing wasn't discussed.

The desirability of imposing building inspection was not discussed. It seems to me that it would have been a relevant topic for the group to examine. I do not see city-style inspection as necessary for a rural village to evolve and do not agree with the linkage.

There was no concrete preservation of park or open space and no serious effort at obtaining waterfront public space within the village.

Though we've been told that this isn't rezoning, I see it as a near-certainty that rezoning would be approved immediately after this plan is accepted. The supposed approval of the committee would be used as an argument in favour of rezoning.

I think the work of the committee was cut short and rushed to a conclusion when real progress was about to be made.

In summary, I see very little of substance that would benefit the village coming from our many meetings, but an immediate open door for high density development and the huge profits that will be made possible by this unprecedented rezoning.

I believe a majority of Bowser and area citizens must be in favour of this plan before it is allowed to proceed.

Bob Hunt
Submission from John Lyotier – Water Consumption in Bowser
RDN Board of Directors
RDN Planning Department

Re: Bowser Rural Village Plan

In our Draft Planning Goals, as set out by the Advisory Committee at the beginning, the following were listed:

- Ensure that the scale, design and appearance of village nodes and the planning approaches used reflect the unique and natural characteristics of the rural village node area and the community’s desire to protect the small community and rural character of the area.

- Ensure that rural village planning and design assists in protecting and promoting the natural, environmental and geographical features of the area.

- Consider how rural village node planning can assist in preserving and/or enhancing the biodiversity of the area.

- Reflect rural character of the area within the village nodes through appropriate scale, types of uses, building site and street design.

- Ensure that rural village node development does not negatively impact the ability of the community to sustain a continued safe, high quality water supply.

If this plan was, in fact, built on these values, it should have detailed how these were being incorporated into the plan by identifying existing land features, protecting the existing natural area by reducing the percentage of actual building structure on each property.

As this is a “Village Plan”, it must absolutely address the needs of the existing business community and future business needs of the residents. It was agreed by everyone that the Commercial/Residential area would allow for commercial at street level and residential above. If there are areas that need to be just residential, they should be separated from the Commercial/Residential, if agreed by the Advisory Committee.

Although there are many issues and details that could be addressed, the most important is:

- to greatly reduce the proposed density, as it does not adhere to the wishes of the community or what was originally outlined by the Advisory Committee members,

- that the Commercial/Residential area must only allow residential above street level, and

- the retention of the natural environment must be incorporated in new developments and in the plan as a whole. This will retain the rural character, fight against global warming and will continue to clean and retain our water.

With Respect,
Diane Sampson
Appendix ‘A’
Agency Referrals

Thompson, Paul

From: Edgar, David D TRAN.EX [David.Edgar@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: February 27, 2010 9:57 AM
To: Thompson, Paul
Cc: Allwood, Angie TRAN.EX; OBrien, Debbie TRAN.EX
Subject: Bowser OCP Amendment

Paul,

Thanks for the Feb 24/10 referral of the OCP for Bowser Village. A few comments below from MoTI staff.

Dave

- I was happy to see the reference to discouraging direct access to properties from Hwy.19A.
- Mobility map (road network plan) looks fine.
- We can work with RDN on allowing gateways; just need to ensure they don’t create any safety issues.
- Any pathways along Hwy.19A would be done under permit to RDN.
- We can certainly review speed limits. We would just need to gather more information and assessing this location to see if the change is appropriate.
- Same for requested crosswalks. We would need to look at Ministry warrants and undertake a site visit to determine what is (or isn’t) appropriate at each location.
- Document speaks of promoting on-street parking for both residential and business. This may create safety (sight lines) & maintenance (snow clearing) concerns. I think we want to be careful on the message.
- Policy and implementation Objective 1.2.6 “to increase the ‘green’ function and appearance of streetscapes with one ‘Green Street’ established in Bowser Village Centre within the next 5-10 years.” I’m all for this, but we need to ensure that plantings don’t impede sight lines and maintenance. I think we would want to work together with ideas.
- Cycling and pedestrian paths along 19A. The usual questions will need to be dealt with. Is the plan to fit these in the shoulder or separate from the travelled portion of the highway? Who builds, maintains and is liable?
- Not our issue but curious how you will enforce their building ideas (styles, materials, etc) when this isn’t within your building inspection area?

Dave Edgar
Transportation Planning Engineer
Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
3rd Floor - 2100 Labieux Road
Nanaimo, B.C. V9T 6E9
(250) 751-3276
Fax (250) 751-3288
David.Edgar@gov.bc.ca

01/03/2010
Response to Bylaw Referral - Electoral Area "H" OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, ...

Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 5, 2010 9:47 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: Response to Bylaw Referral - Electoral Area "H" OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010

From: Walton, Stephanie CD:EX [mailto:Stephanie.Walton@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: March 5, 2010 9:24 AM
To: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Response to Bylaw Referral - Electoral Area "H" OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, 2010

Hello Paul,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on your proposed bylaw amendment (No. 1335.03, 2010). Laura Tate asked me to provide you with comments because I am the designated staff member in our group who works with your regional district. Please consider this email MCD’s response to your referral.

The Bowser Village Centre Plan is an impressive document that identifies many goals to increase sustainability in Electoral Area H. As you may already be aware of, in the summer of 2008, the Ministry of Community and Rural Development passed legislation requiring GHG reduction targets, policies and actions in Official Community Plans and Regional Growth Strategies by May 31, 2010 and May 31, 2011, respectively. Although the Bowser Village Plan contains several sector specific targets, I did not see an overarching numerical target which would meet the legislative requirement. You may already be working to meet this requirement through another process, but I thought I would take this opportunity to remind you of these requirements and also provide you with some examples.

Here are three examples of electoral areas who have included GHG targets, policies and actions into their OCPs.


Columbia Shuswap Regional District Electoral Area “D” – Reduce GHG emissions by 30 percent below 2007 levels by 2020, and 80% by 2050 for the entire community - http://csrd.civicweb.net/FileStorage/0188B5C6C7B4D26B180F7DB297BC8CF-Draft%20Bylaw%2075%20October%20reformatted%20reg%20text.pdf

Kootenay Boundary Regional District Electoral Area “A” – Support the Province’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 33% below current levels by 2020 -

05/03/2010
Response to Bylaw Referral - Electoral Area "H" OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1335.03, ...

http://rdkb.fileprosite.com/FileStorage/4F1B1FFA04CE4D68A75AEC35CEC4D01E-
DraftRevisedAreaAOCPText.pdf

In addition, may I also remind you to ensure that you have referred this bylaw to the appropriate ministries and agencies and that you provide a record of the results of your referral efforts with your bylaw submission. Also, the information you provide with your bylaw approval request will be reviewed for First Nations consultation. The Ministry recently sent the Interim Guide to First Nations Engagement on Local Government Statutory Approvals (Guide) to all local governments, which I have attached for your reference.

<<First Nations Engagement Guide_Final.pdf>>

Hope this information is helpful.

Feel free to contact me if you think I can be of any assistance.

Thanks,

Stephanie

Stephanie Walton, MPA

Planning Systems Analyst

Intergovernmental Relations and Planning Division

Ministry of Community and Rural Development

250-356-0283

05/03/2010
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Bouman, Paul [Paul.Bouman@bchydro.com]
Sent: March 8, 2010 1:41 PM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Cc: Calderon, Roger
Subject: Feedback on your Bowser Village Plan

Hi Stephen,

After reading through the BVP I see that you have not missed much (if anything) in the plan. I can see the tell tale signs of some of the excellent attendees you had participating.

Below are a few thoughts that I had as they were partly covered or could be I missed them in the plan:

- I was interested to read your application of DPA guidelines. I understand that they are limited to dictating building and design on the outside of buildings only. However, I have heard discussion of using them to enforce energy use intensity requirements for an area. If this is possible then you could add in some energy use intensity targets for certain areas – perhaps focussing in on the village centre or mixed use zones. Another form that this might take is setting Energuide ratings for any single family dwellings (perhaps 85) to ensure energy efficient buildings are constructed.
- You have energy efficiency well represented throughout the plan. You could consider having “Energy” as a section unto itself just raise the profile and importance of energy as it relates to GHG/climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- In section 2.2.1 you mention independent heat sources to contribute to resiliency. BC Hydro is doing work in the district energy area and one of the most important learning to date is that in order to accommodate district heating opportunities and allow for fuel flexibility in the future you need to have buildings that are heated with a hydronic system. This allows for ease of connection to DE systems and does not commit the building to one fuel source. Perhaps there is a way to support hydronics installation in the plan. Maybe you could grant density bonusing (sic) or expedited permitting for hydronic systems.
- Alternately, you might address this topic by mentioning the need to make the best match possible between the energy source used and the application (exergy). For BC Hydro this means discouraging electric base board heating as electricity is considered “high grade” energy and should not be used for “low grade” purposes such as heat.
- Section 2.2.3 speaks to undergrounding electrical infrastructure and calls to consider a by law enforcing the undergrounding of electrical cables. BC Hydro’s distribution planning department supports the practice of undergrounding cables as the benefits extend beyond aesthetics including improved reliability and ease of maintenance. Undergrounding of cables would happen more often but it does required more money to do this.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the plan. Good luck with the public session.

Paul

Paul Bouman
BC Hydro Key Account Manager, Sustainable Communities
office 604-453-8544
fax 604-453-6280
cell 778-828-7987
Suite 900-4555 Kingsway, Burnaby, B.C. V5H 4T8
paul.bouman@bchydro.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail or its attachment.

08/03/2010
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 10, 2010 1:59 PM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: Bylaw 1335.03 - Electoral Area 'H' Draft OCP - Bowser Village Centre

Comments from VIHA

From: Glenn, Doug [mailto:Doug.Glenn@viha.ca]
Sent: March 10, 2010 1:29 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Bylaw 1335.03 - Electoral Area 'H' Draft OCP - Bowser Village Centre

Hi Paul,

I have had a chance to review the proposed bylaw amendment and am advising you that the Vancouver Island Health Authority has no objections.

The RDN and people of Bowser are to be commended on a document that is quite comprehensive and well thought out. VIHA will continue working with the various local groups on infrastructure issues that we have jurisdiction over such as waterworks and wastewater systems. Recognizing the importance of groundwater protection, surface water protection and coastal water protection as well as conservation programs are key priorities.

VIHA is also committed to being available as a resource where appropriate and not merely an enforcement agency.

Doug

Douglas G. Glenn, B.Sc., M.B.A., R.E.H.O.
Senior Environmental Health Officer
Public Health Protection
Tel: 250-755-6284
Fax: 250-755-3372
email: Doug.Glenn@viha.ca

10/03/2010
Appendix ‘B’
Written Comments Received Prior to the Public Hearing

Bowser Village Plan Comments

On face value, the Draft Bowser Village Plan appears to be a worthwhile document and when one considers the limited budget, no one can state that there was not good value for the money spent. Although we had our ups and downs, staff and community members are to be commended. We may have become a little rushed in recent months as the funds dried up and I fear that we could have spent a bit more time confirming that the draft reflects the group intention.

As a property owner in the Village, I found the exercise worthwhile but I also found that my entrepreneurial western philosophy, based on 60 years of bad habits, is facing a bit of a test. Like a number of us, I believe that I am going through a personal realization as to what our future must look like. We are facing the need to change, to adapt, and to ensure the very survival of our place on this planet. We have recognized that the earth and its ability to provide is finite but very few of us want to admit that the party is over. I wonder what the last days of the Roman Empire might have looked like.

We need to make some hard choices. Even big business is asking government to be more firm. Plans from all levels of government need to be much more clear and aggressive as pursue the path to sustainability.

Section 1- Introduction

In 1.6, I find myself confused when it states that there are not to be zoning changes except when initiated by property owners. Does that mean that I can develop a property under the present zoning and not address what the community has garnered from a 2 year exercise? Surely an OCP amendment translates into an amended Zoning Bylaw?

Section 2- Sustainability Principles

Mr. Brundtland’s definition which is essentially the definition we used for the Village Plan is great as far as it goes but many are missing out on the essential details and as a result we are often trying to address the symptoms rather than the root causes. There are some fundamentals that we must recognize and begin to address if we are to get on the proper road to sustainability. The sooner we move beyond “recognizing”, “considering”, “respecting”, “ensuring”, “enhancing”, “encouraging”, “exploring”, etc, etc and realize that the corrections are not going to be a few minor tweaks but a major change, the better off we will be in the long run.

We have become too many who are using too much.

Section 3- Policies and Implementation

1.1 Density is still a bitter pill for many to swallow but if we are to have affordable housing, housing for seniors, transit and like services which will allow many of our residents to age within the community, we must have density, to create the
numbers that will make infrastructure possible. There could have been a clearer reference to a low % of lot coverage which would help maintain the intended rural vision of the village. This would also tend to encourage smaller unit sizes and open up wildlife corridors.

1.2 The idea that hydro geological studies might be required as part of an application should be clarified. The village is within a relatively small area and if we are wondering whether the location is cause for serious environmental concern why have we gone through this planning exercise. I wonder if things like this and storm water management should be addressed by establishing a service area rather than using a lot by lot approach.

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment. I apologize for the lateness of my notes but time is what it is.

Regards,

Dick Stubbs
6920 West Island Highway,
Bowser, BC
250-757-9364
February 8, 2010

The Board of Directors
Regional District of Nanaimo
6300 Hammond Bay Road
Nanaimo, B.C. V9T 6N2

Re: Bowser Rural Village Community Plan

For your attention:

When we worked on the OCP, one of the foremost concerns of the residents of Area H was that we maintain “slow” growth and keep our rural character. At the beginning of the Bowser Rural Village Community Plan, it was made very clear that we again wished to retain the rural character of the area and that we DID NOT WANT to become a Parksville or Qualicum Beach. Why then are “Density Targets” being incorporated into this plan..... using examples from Port Coquitlam and New Westminster. It does not support the wishes of the residents of Area H.

About four years ago, several members of the community approached our Area Representative to begin this process. We wanted to establish the Village Plans, in accordance with the OCP, prior to developers coming into the community so that, with the plan, “we could work with” developers to the benefit of both. Our representative said he “would not support it.”

Last year, with the arrival of developers wanting to put in a large development in Deep Bay, the Village Plan began with the developers being allowed to participate although they are “not part of the community”.

Although I support smaller increases in density in the Bowser Village, the densities to which the plan indicates will not sustain our rural character, are natural environment and ecosystems nor, ultimately, our clean water.

The design and retention of a small, unique, rural village will help us promote our area for tourism. Although our beach accesses need improvement, we have fishing (both flyfishing and guiding), kayaking, sailing, world recognized diving nearby, famous caves, two beautiful lakes, a wonderful marina and unbelievable hiking through beautiful forests. This is what we should be promoting for our economy, NOT growth.

In addition, when it was discussed to look at Deep Bay as a village, most felt we did not need another village, as Bowser had already been established. In addition, having two villages within five minutes of each other would be economically detrimental and would not encourage the promotion of “community” that one main village will. We agreed that a “small” commercial area might be supported.

I request that you do not support the plan as it currently stands. Sustainability needs to be defined in detail and how those points will be “specifically” addressed within the design. “Density targets” must be removed.

Respectfully,

Diane L. Sampson
5224 Gainsberg Road
Bowser, B.C. V0R 1G0
Thompson, Paul

From: Bowser Seniors Housing Society [bshs@shaw.ca]
Sent: February 11, 2010 10:52 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Cc: David Bartram; Thorkelsson, Paul; Amar Bains; Angelika Quiet; quint4ad@telus.net; Bob Hunt; brian.kingzett@viu.ca; Catherine Watson; Diane Sampson; Dianne Eddy; dick.stubbs@gmail.com; Gerard Quinn; Jim & Theresa Crawford; Josianne Sequin; Lisa Verbicky; Lynette Twigge; Mac Snobelen; dartagnan@sprynet.com; Margaret Healey; Michele Recalma; Patty Biro; Sharon Waugh; Wayne Osborne

Subject: Re: Bowser Village Plan

Paul,

I attended the RDN's Electoral Area Planning Committee meeting last Tuesday evening and noted that the plan and 6 recommendations were approved to go forward to the RDN Board, with the inclusion of some input provided by Diane Sampson and Dick Stubbs. I thought that you presented it very clearly, and I was also very pleased to hear Dave Bartram's comments and his thanks to all of the people involved in the process including Lisa and the Advisory Group members.

I would like to continue to follow the Bowser Village Plan through the next stages as outlined by you in your email, and intend to be there when it goes to the RDN Board on Feb. 23rd. Would it be possible for you to send me a copy of the recommendations that the committee approved, and also a copy of the additional input that was included?

Also, I have gone through the Final Draft document (Dec. 30th 2009) and noted that there are several changes from the draft #2 of October 26th 2009. Most of those changes appear to be simple editing to clean up the document, and I am comfortable with most of them, but I have one major suggestion that I would like you to consider:

a) Introduction: Section 1.4: Plan Area.
I believe that the changes made to this short paragraph have made the wording ambiguous. I preferred the wording in the October version. Although the area outlined in red in the map (and on the maps in Section 4) do include the full plan area, the first sentence appears to declare that the plan area is approximately 50.7 hectares instead of stating that the plan area is the total 92.5 hectares. This document needs to clearly identify the Plan Area because all of the Goals, Policies and Development Permit Area details are applicable to all of the Bowser Village Centre Plan Area.

I suggest wording as follows:
"The Plan Area consists of an area of 92.5 hectares outlined in red on Map 2 (below) which is the combination of two areas: the triangular shape of the "Original Boundary Area" of the Bowser Village Centre as it was identified in the OCP (approximately 50.7 hectares), plus an additional rectangular area called the "Future Use Area" to the west along Crosley Road (approximately 41.8 hectares)."

The following three suggestions are formatting/spelling corrections:

b) Policies & Implementation: Goal 1: Section 1.2 Policies / Related Actions.
The lettering of the Related Actions does not continue as the table goes from one page to the next. on Page 6 the first related action should be identified with letter 'h.' (not 'u.'). This will mean that the final Related Action, in Policy 1.2.11 will be letter 'u.'.

12/02/2010
c) Land Use Concepts & Designations: Section 4.1.5: Density Estimates.
A section of this page has a blue background. This will not photocopy or fax very well, as the writing in that part will not be readable. I suggest that the blue background is removed. If the paragraphs need to be highlighted, perhaps a box could be placed around them instead.

d) Land Use Concepts & Designations: Section 4.2.6: Parks & Open Spaces
Simple typing error in the first bulleted item under Land Uses: should be Parks, not Parksa.

Those are my comments. If any of the other Advisory Group members wish to discuss this they are welcome to contact me and we could get together before the 23rd.

Paul, please would you forward this to anyone on the 'b.c.c.' list who received your original email, for their information.

Thanks,
Sally Burton
(250) 757-8455

On 11-Jan-10, at 4:24 PM, Thompson, Paul wrote:

Electoral Area ‘H’ Village Planning Project Update

Further revisions have been made to the Bowser Village Centre Plan and Draft 3 will be available soon on the Village Planning Project web page. Comments received at the October 28th Open House have been compiled with the result that a few more changes have been made to the Draft Bowser Village Centre Plan. The next step is to begin the bylaw amendment process so that the Bowser Village Centre Plan can be incorporated into the Electoral Area ‘H’ Official Community Plan. The first step of that process is to have the Draft Plan received by the RDN’s Electoral Area Planning Committee at its February 9th meeting. At that meeting the EAPC will make a recommendation to the Board on how to proceed with the bylaw that will amend the Electoral Area ‘H’ OCP. The EAPC’s recommendation will then go to the RDN Board meeting on February 23rd. Both of these meetings are open to the public and anyone wishing to speak to the bylaw amendment must notify the RDN that they wish to be a delegation.

Generally, the process to adopt the OCP amendment bylaw is:

1. EAP  C – recommendation to introduce the bylaw by giving it 1st and 2nd reading
2. R   DN Board – grant 1st and 2nd reading
3. P   Public Hearing
4. EAP  C – receive summary report of Public Hearing and make recommendation on third reading
5. R   DN Board – grant third reading
6. M   Ministry of Community and Rural Development – approval of OCP amendment bylaw
7. R   DN Board – grant fourth and final reading

When the dates are set for the Public Hearing and then consideration of 3rd reading and final reading you will be notified by email and they will be posted on the Area ‘H’ Village Planning Project web site.

12/02/2010
Thompson, Paul

From: Sharon Waugh [waugh@eyesonbc.com]
Sent: February 27, 2010 12:25 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Cc: 'Dave Bartram'; 'Bowser Builders'
Subject: RE: Bowser Village Centre Plan

Hello Paul:

As a result of recent seawall restoration activity on the beach near our property in Bowser, within the Village boundary, I would like the following two points taken into consideration for the Bowser Village Plan.

Policies & Implementation (p. 8) 1.3.5

Is there a way to strengthen this policy to specifically address the damaging erosion by the existing placement of seawalls and those under consideration for future placement, specifically working with DFO/the property owner and the RDN.

Under Parks & Open Space 4.2.6 (page 14)

The bullet points under land uses to include one for: recognizing that the beach is to remain unobstructed as a transportation corridor.

I am hoping that you could help me with the wordsmithing of these two points of concern.

We have waterfront property in Bowser and have been dismayed by the encroachment of the ‘Bowser Bill’s’ seawall development below the high high water level. At high tides you cannot walk past their property. This is only one of a several properties in Area H that poses this problem.

With the last storm damage was done to this particular seawall and a large excavator traveled down the beach to ‘repair’ it. The beach was ‘ploughed’ extensively below the high water mark as the rip rap was being moved around. I am aware that you have been sent photos of large boulders placed on the beach that now impede all traffic at high tide levels.

As an ‘up-coast’ waterfront dweller I am extremely concerned about the ripple-effect of seawalls, as the adjacent property owners to Bowser Bill’s may be put in the situation of reclaiming their property as a result of the neighbouring seawall…and on it goes down the line drastically changing the shoreline.

Thanks Paul for your consideration of these points. I will not be back in my office until March 15th.

Cheers,
Sharon Waugh
4365 Kelsey Rd.
Bowser
Member of the Bowser Village Planning Committee
March 05, 2010

At: Maureen Pearse

This is in reference to the proposed plan for the "Bowser Village Plan."

I am in total opposition to the following plan. The people of Bowser have chosen to live here for the quiet, less populated and rural setting.

To put a plan of such magnitude through without a vote by all citizens (yes or no) in the Bowser Area is unfair.

I agree there will be progress and change to such a beautiful place as Bowser but not to such a degree.

Please stop this massive and uncalled-for change to Bowser. We don't need it. It will definitely gobble up our life styles and make it a much more costly place to live.
The following letter you put in everyone's postboxes is definitely not of professional status. I have outlined a few things that are unbelievable that they would even consider a sewage pipeline out to the Strait of Georgia with a scallop farm nearby. Absolute insanity!

So please count my vote as "No" to the following "Bowser Village Plan."

Vikki Caradonna
4620 Barbers Drive
Bowser, B.C.
V0R 1G0
250-757-9244
Town Land For Sale By Owners!

Attention: Speculators and Land Developers

A rural community is just completing a massive land use plan called the "Bowser Village Plan". High densities (14-18 units/acre) will encompass the entire village area of 125.5 acres. Zoning changes will be much easier for high density development after implementation of this plan. The RDN will support high density, three story development contrary to the current situation. Areas likely to have similar plans in the near future are Qualicum Bay, Duns muir, Deep Bay and possibly Horne Lake.

This is a "done deal" after the Public Hearing scheduled for March 16, 2010 (Tuesday) at the Lighthouse Community Centre meeting at 7:00 pm. This is the last day that residents will be able to oppose this plan. Few residents are aware they must submit written opposition to the RDN prior to this meeting and fewer still make comments! It has already gone through two readings by the RDN Board. So now is a great time to peg those choice properties with options to buy!

Details:

Bowser Village Centre is located in Electoral Area "H" of the Regional District of Nanaimo. Overlooking the Strait of Georgia and the coastal mountains of the B.C. Lower Mainland, this seaside village is part of the area known as 'Lighthouse Country'. Situated on Highway 19A, Bowser is approximately 35km southeast of the City of Courtenay and 21 km north west of the Town of Qualicum Beach. This is amongst the last of undeveloped land in this area.

Current Population: about 370 residents

Projected Population: 3645

These zoning changes will support 3645 new residents. Density packing for residential high density: 18 units/acre. Residential Medium Density: 14 units/acre. Commercial Mixed Use: pretty well anything you want! Also, 3 stories high is approved for most areas.

Water provided by the Bowser Water District from an aquifer. According to District trustees they have plenty of water. Bargain prices with capital expenditure charges of only $4,300/connection. Compare this to other areas you have developed land in and you know this is a bonus! In addition, tapping into the Deep Bay Improvement District (DBID) water supply is only a pipeline away with a new development in the Bowser Village Centre area already approved by the DBID. Easy approval system!

Sewage Treatment: Currently none. However discussions are underway, even before the final approval of the Plan, for various options, including a pipe out to the Strait of Georgia. Remember, "the solution to pollution is dilution!" However, some treatment will be necessary because there is a scallop farm just off the beach. Other options will be considered but will probably be more expensive!

Neighbourhood Parkland requirement: The best option is not to give up 5% of your land, but rather put a few token coins into the "park space" coffers. Easy acceptance by Park Board.

For full details on the Bowser Plan and meeting dates see the RDN website: rdn.bc.ca

Now is the time to

Buy Into The Bowser Plan!
March 4, 2010

Doug and Pauline Bryant
6216 W. Island Hwy
Qualicum Beach, B.C. V9K 2E3

We are residents of Area H in Qualicum Bay. We DO NOT want what is planned for Bowser Village or any other part of our area. We like the way it is out here and want it left alone. We moved out here to get away from larger populations and big homes. LEAVE OUR AREA ALONE AND THAT INCLUDES INSPECTORS.

Doug Bryant

Pauline Bryant
Good morning, Carol.

As mentioned below, there are a lot emails being sent locally with a high concern regarding the issue below. This document should be protecting our Village, not promoting high density development. It may be an amendment to the OCP, but it should still be supporting it ... supporting the Values of the OCP, which have not changed.

Protecting our environment and water and keeping the rural feeling in the Village was explicit in our discussions, but the document does not detail how that is being applied.

Regardless of running out of time and money, a document that does not support what was intended, should be rejected. Some of us may have to volunteer to work further, but it is better than passing a document purely for the sake of efficiency.

Respectfully,

Diane Sampson
(250) 757-8775

Begin forwarded message:

From: Diane Sampson <diane.sampson@shaw.ca>
Date: March 9, 2010 9:41:33 AM PST
To: Ian Birtwell <ianandelisabethbirtwell@shaw.ca>, Brian Dane <bgdane@shaw.ca>, Ann Jaeckel <annjaeckel@shaw.ca>, Christo Kuun <christokuundesign@shaw.ca>, Elizabeth and Helmut Meuser <meuser@shaw.ca>, Peter and Kerry Mason <surveyor@nanaimo.ark.com>, Michael Recalma <michaelrecalma@hotmail.com>, Josianne Sequin <julianna_mtl@hotmail.com>, Mac Snobelen <bowserbuilders@shaw.ca>, Brenda Wilson <bwilson@islandnet.com>
Subject: VILLAGE PLAN

Good morning,

There is great concern regarding the issue Wayne is addressing. This was to be a "Village Plan". We talked about what makes a village and how it is important to the community. This seems to have become a "Residential Plan", allowing residential housing.
everywhere, including on the main level where commercial should be.

In my view, there should be an area designated specifically for Commercial/Residential that only allows homes above commercial space.

As well, total heights should be included for housing and, in areas designated only residential (whether high, mid or low), a percentage amount of space for a building on a property should be designated; i.e., 35%, etc. This will help preserve the natural, rural environment.

Please continue to send your comments to the RDN.

Respectfully,

Diane

Begin forwarded message:

From: Wayne Osborne <omegabluefarms@gmail.com>
Date: March 9, 2010 5:53:45 AM PST
To: "Thompson, Paul" <PThompson@rdn.bc.ca>
Cc: Bowser Builders <bowserbuilders@shaw.ca>, Angelika Quint <tomsfoodvillage@shaw.ca>, Amar Bains <amarbens@shaw.ca>, quint4ad@telus.net, Bob Hunt <steelehunt@shaw.ca>, brian.kingzett@viu.ca, Catherine Watson <catherine.w@shaw.ca>, David Bartram <DWBBartram@shaw.ca>, Diane Sampson <diane.sampson@shaw.ca>, Dianne Eddy <d-eddy@shaw.ca>, dick.stubbs@gmail.com, Gerard Quinn <quinnir@hotmail.com>, Jim & Theresa Crawford <jcrawford@kwik.net>, Josianne Sequin <julianna_mtl@hotmail.com>, Lisa Verbicky <verbicky@shaw.ca>, Lynette Twigge <ltwigge@shaw.ca>, dartagnan@sprynet.com, Margaret Healey <nmhealey@shaw.ca>, Micheal Recalma <michaelreca1ma@hotmail.com>, Patty Biro <shipshore@shaw.ca>, Sharon Waugh <Waugh@eyesonbc.com>, "Thorkelsson, Paul" <PThorkelsson@rdn.bc.ca>

Subject: Re: Village Plan

Paul,

What you choose to respond to and what you are ignoring is very revealing indeed. Instead of picking apart people’s semantics, why not address the real meat of the matter and explain why the RDN staff felt it necessary to convert the commercial area into what will essentially become a residential area by allowing ground level residential? This was done behind the Village Plan

/03/2010
Committee's back and AFTER our last meeting.

In the meantime, please quit insulting our intelligence by suggesting that the land is to be available for mixed commercial use when it's obvious the intentions are residential for the most part. Otherwise, why was the change needed?

Simply calling it Commercial doesn't make it so. Or is that the plan, to keep repeating a lie until it is believed?

Wayne Osborne
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 10, 2010 2:08 PM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: Bowser Village Plan

From: BRIAN DANE [mailto:bgdane@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 10, 2010 1:39 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Bowser Village Plan

I would like to register opposition to the Bowser Village Plan as it currently exists. My objection is centered on the definition of Commercial Mixed Use in Section 4.2.1 in which it is stated that Building Arrangement would allow for residential uses at or above street level. It is my understanding that the definition approved by the committee was for residential above street level only. This change would completely alter the intent of the definition and allow for residential only development instead of predominantly commercial and undermine the "commercial village" aspect of the plan.

Yours very truly,

Brian Dane
Bowser, B.C.
To the R.D.N. Board & Paul Thompson

Policies 1.1. - No!

The People of Area H should be allowed to participate & vote on all hearings or meetings to do with any new development in Area H. No fast tracking!

Any all meetings about development in Area H must be open to all Area H residents & held at Lighthouse Community Hall so such meetings are accessible to all Area H residents.

Any all costs must be paid by developers including but not inclusive to - Road costs, sewerage, upgrading or water mains etc., building a new fire hall & purchase of all firefighting equipment etc., environmental or green costs etc. Parks & greenspace maintenance etc. So as existing Area H taxpayers will not be taxed to death.

Page 24-5.1.3. - No change or downsizing of existing cottage industry businesses.
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 11, 2010 4:09 PM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: The 50 year Bowser Plan

-----Original Message-----
From: Yvonne Slater [mailto:yans@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2010 3:55 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Cc: jstanhope@shaw.ca; Dave & Joyce Bartram; Thompson, Paul
Subject: The 50 year Bowser Plan

Please accept this submission as an indication of how many ordinary residents of the Bowser area feel about the proposed plan to push through an agenda that has not been properly and thoroughly researched to the satisfaction of the citizens. In particular, we are looking at the water situation for the future, road access and sewage treatment proposals. These items need more research, and then all data MAILED to the residents so we may sit and assess the situation.

Thank you.

Norm and Yvonne Slater
March 11, 2010

To: THE REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO--BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: Robert and Joan Menzel
4477 Maple Guard Drive
Bowser, BC. V0R 1G0

SUBJECT: BOWSER VILLAGE CENTRE PLAN

We are opposed to the Plan in its entirety. There is no information available to the residents, as to water availability for services of potable and sewer connections. A study done by The R.D.N. to determine if there is a quantifiable source of water, to satisfy the more than 3000 expected new residents, should be in place and results shown to the public before Land Developers determine their future profits. Dry summers have us here in Bowser metered and anxious about water use during dry summers.

A first requirement for the present and future residents of any community is a source of dependable water.

Will the R.D.N. propose an amendment that will prove out yes or no to water supply for those three thousand new residents, that in time, may come.

Yours sincerely Robert and Joan Menzel
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 15, 2010 8:36 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: 50 yr Plan

-----Original Message-----
From: Dave Bartram [mailto:dwbartram@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 13, 2010 11:13 AM
To: Thompson, Paul; Thorkelsson, Paul
Subject: FW: 50 yr Plan

For your file. Dave

-----Original Message-----
From: Terri Efford [mailto:t.efford@shaw.ca]
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 10:13 AM
To: dwbartram@shaw.ca
Cc: gamerica@shaw.ca
Subject: 50 yr Plan

We are very concerned about the recent change in the plan for the Bowser area plan, from "above street level to "at or above street level".

This is a very unique area and we must proceed with caution to protect all of our natural resources, especially our wonderful water.

Our dealings with the RDN to this date have been very disturbing and this appears to be another slight of hand to push development through against the residents wishes.

Terri Efford/Gordon America
5350 Isl Hwy Wst
Qualicum Bay, BC
V9K 1Z2
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 15, 2010 8:37 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: 50 Year Bower Plan?

---

From: Heather [mailto:sadsak@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 13, 2010 11:44 AM
To: jstanhope@shaw.ca; dwbartram@shaw.ca; Thompson, Paul
Subject: 50 Year Bower Plan?

Dear Elected Representatives:

I wish I could say I was surprised to read the flyer in the mail about the way the R.D.N. had changed the wording proposed for the Bowers growth area. I believe the first draft of the proposal was with the community and showed the community wishes. In all good faith there should have been a meeting of the minds to clarify the need for this simple change which in actual fact is not so simple if put to the test.

I am beginning to think that we should with-hold our RDN taxes and hire a lawyer and a planner to get heard and support for what we wish in the area we call home. Through my own experience I feel we vote for these reps, but they really don't represent us - the constituance. They will not and do not support residence who are trying to follow the community zoning.

The Community has put together what they would like to see better in their own community. They live here, therefore, are the ones with the direct impact on their lives due to community plans. This is the reason for forming committees and associations in communities. These people live here.

I realize that this government doesn't support individuals unless the political agenda is pointing their way but it is time to stop and really listen to the people.

Having had my own experience with the local government I am not impressed with the lack of support they show.

Heather Wallance
2450 Whistler Rd W
Q'ualicum Beach, BC
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 15, 2010 8:40 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: The 50 year Bowser plan

From: CARMEN SCHOTT [mailto:carmenschott@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 14, 2010 3:02 PM
To: dwbartram@shaw.ca
Cc: jstanhope@shaw.ca; Thompson, Paul
Subject: The 50 year Bowser plan

As an area H resident I would like to state my opposition to the proposed 50 year Bowser plan.

I do not believe that a small community like Bowser is the right place for a development of that size. There are serious concerns regarding the water supply, however,

I am most appalled at the possibility of a sewer pipe leading out into the ocean close to one of the areas most beautiful beaches (Qualicum Bay) and several shell fish farms in its vicinity.

This is the 21st century! An archaic 'solution', as described above, should not even be considered by a public body like yours, that prides itself in green sustainable environmental management.

Yours truly,

Carmen Schott
310 Boorman Rd.
Qualicum Beach, BC
Dear Mr. Stanhope:

I am writing to express my concerns about the Bowser Village Plan. I participated in the writing of the last OCP for Area H and it is expressed in several places therein that we wish to protect the rural integrity of the area. This ‘amendment’ does not adhere to these wishes.

We have a vibrant and charming community in Bowser which has been enhanced by the building of Magnolia Court in the village centre am not against slow growth but the purpose of this Plan seems to be to pave the way for development; making it easier for developers with an amendment to the OCP which would allow for higher density residential use. An OCP is normally for five years and I see no reason to plan for 50 years. It is arrogant and presumptuous to plan so far in advance. I also disapprove of developers being allowed to sit in on OCP meetings.

I am concerned about the water supply should there be high density housing;
I am concerned that there is not enough protection for commercial areas;
I am concerned about the sewage management should a pipeline be introduced leading to goodness knows where;
I am concerned that Deep Bay is being considered for a village centre and
I am concerned that our house taxes will increase in the event of higher density.

Overall I am fed up with having to fight for rural integrity and thoughtful planning for the benefit of ALL residents. Mr. Stanhope, I do not support this Plan.

Respectfully

Ann Jaeckel

15/03/2010
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 15, 2010 8:43 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW. Bowser Village Plan.

From: Greta Taylor [mailto:gptaylor@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 15, 2010 12:23 AM
To: jstanhope@shaw.ca
Cc: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Bowser Village Plan.

COPY TO ALL DIRECTORS PLEASE

March 14th 2010

Dear Mr. Stanhope,

I wish to advise you and all the RDN Directors that my husband and I are completely and utterly opposed to the Bowser Village 50 year plan.

Along with many other residents in this area, I worked on the last OCP which we understood would be for five years, after which we would formulate a new OCP. However, for some unknown reason, this Bowser Village Plan has been brought forward as an amendment to the OCP instead. We feel there should have been a new OCP for another five years, that is plenty far enough into the future to plan for in these uncertain times. In our OCP the residents of Area H stated they were not against development, but required growth to be steady and in keeping with the rural area that we all treasure. This is why we came to live here 17 years ago.

This Bowser Village Plan has gone way over the top in size and content, to the extent of having three story buildings and extremely high density, which brings us to our greatest concern - that of the water supply for such a huge development. The only source of water for all our needs, including fire fighting, is from rainfall and whatever snowpack there is. We feel that there will be an insufficient supply of water in times of drought. The RDN has said on several occasions at the Bowser Village Plan meetings that there is sufficient water supply for this Plan, but they have not carried out an official Hydrology study so how can they be certain of how much water would be available for all the additional residents over the next 50 years?? Three or four years ago when Land and Water B.C. had a plan for 2500 homes and two golf courses in this area, they did drill for water, even went below sea level, but were unable to find water and had to abandon their project.

Another concern for us is the density and the three story buildings. If this goes ahead, it would mean that the residents would have to pay out for a new fire truck capable of reaching the top of the three story buildings and most of the residents here are on low fixed incomes. It would be almost impossible to continue to live here if we are saddled with huge payments for new fire equipment etc. If this plan is approved Bowser will no longer be a pleasant village in a rural area any more, but will, unfortunately, become a town and not a very nice one at that.

The other concern is that of sewage. Where will the sewer pipe be located? Will it empty into the ocean? (but I thought the RDN was going green now) Will the sewage have to be transported to the French Creek facility at huge cost again to the residents. The last time this matter was brought up, it had to be shelved because of the cost and the residents were against it. We do not seem to have heard much about this subject in connection with the Bowser Plan up to now. Could it be that the RDN feel the only way to get a sewage plan in Bowser is to have a huge development plan such as the Bowser Village Plan approved and in place before a sewage disposal plan
can be formulated and installed?

Mr. Stanhope, Ladies and Gentlemen, these are a few of our concerns, we have more but too many to state herein. We truly prefer to see Bowser grow steadily and with much better planning.

We hope you will consider our concerns carefully and appreciate our feelings on this matter. Please do not allow this Bowser Village Plan to go to third reading.

Thank you.

Peter and Greta Taylor,
244, Hembrough Road
Bowser, B.C. V0R 1G0
Tel: 250 757 8909
email: gptaylor@shaw.ca.
Sir: re: Bowser Village Node Plan: citizen submission:

The ocean is very important to us in Bowser. But unless our newly submitted plan for the Village Node includes careful research that accurately assesses future water supplies and also provides ways to purify storm-water treatment which not only keeps impurities (oil, animal waste, chemical runoff) out of the sea, but can keep rainwater for our land, we are in danger of killing the ocean life and suffering from water shortage. Please make very careful review and any necessary corrections for these two vital elements of a self-sustaining modern-day community which wants to border on a healthy ocean.

The ocean is a resource for our food, our enjoyment of life, and our economic welfare. Let us follow the examples set by Portland and Seattle, Vancouver, Victoria and Nanaimo which cities are beginning to understand the need to protect both water supply and ocean health by introducing more trees, shrubs, gardens and bio-solar-aquatic waste-water disposal on urban land.

Sincerely

A.P. Antonelli
March 14, 2010

Regional District of Nanaimo
Board of Directors
Mr. Joe Stanhope
Chairman of the Board

Dear Sir:

I have sent to you by e-mail my concerns regarding our property that is on the north border of Bowser Village Plan, at the end of Mapleguard Drive. (Lot A, Plan 44032)

We have been deemed to be in the proposed waste mgmt area of the plan and are as you can see by enclosed map, designated as medium density for family housing.

We take our water from Deep Bay Water district and have our own septic treatment and field.

We object without exception to the proposed By Law Amendment NO.1335.03.2010.

Can our property be removed from the Bowser Village Centre jurisdiction so that we may not be threatened and bullied into selling our land for subdividable house lots and Park Space.

WE have lived here since 1998 and chose this area because of the wildness of trees and space.

Residents of Bowser community chose to live here with no intrusion of congestion and traffic.

This Amendment to "THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN" will destroy all semblance of our country living that is enjoyed by the residents of Bowser.

More roads, as drawn, for future use of tenants, will bring congestion and traffic for reasons that we all moved here to get away from.
Please find enclosures:

Copy of RDN lawyers letter

Bowser Feasibility study

Bowser Village Sewer study

Land Use Concept & Designations, Map

Pages to 15 of Land Use Concept & Designations Proposals.

I have had no communication from our area director regards my concerns and I do not desire in future to have his input.

My concerns have no value to Dave Bartram

Respectfully:

Joan Menzel
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul  
Sent: March 15, 2010 2:39 PM  
To: Boogaards, Stephen  
Subject: FW: Bowser Village

Another...

M

From: Pearse, Maureen  
Sent: March 15, 2010 1:56 PM  
To: Thompson, Paul  
Cc: Thorkelson, Paul  
Subject: FW: Bowser Village

----- Original Message -----  
From: George Fairbrass  
To: jstanhope@shaw.ca  
Cc: dwbartram@shaw.ca pthompson  
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 11:58 AM  
Subject: Bowser Village

I decided to live in this area because of the rural setting 11 years ago. I think the proposal for the village is too fast and where are all the amenities to support such large growth. I am totally against this proposal.

George Fairbrass  
314 Dunsmuir Road  
Qualicum Bay B.C V9K 1Z9

15/03/2010
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 16, 2010 8:49 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: Village Plan

Hi Wayne: I have been thinking about this and after talking to Dave Bartram I read through the Commercial Mixed Use section again.

It looks to me like we have made room for Multi-unit residential and Affordable housing, that can be at street level with no connection to commercial development. "As I read it." I think this opens the door to the commercial land being used for higher density housing.

Residential – High Density land use section ....also allows for this kind of development

If the intention was to include residential with the commercial in the Commercial Mixed Use.

I propose that we change the wording too
In "Land Uses" ... Line three
  . Multi-unit residential [ In combination with commercial development]
     Line five
  . Affordable housing [ in combination with commercial development ]

In the section “Building Arrangement”
Line two
  . Residential uses at street level [ When used for seniors housing or Care Facilities ]

And in the section “Building Types”
Line two
  . Clustered multi-unit residential developments [ attached or part of the same development including ] retail or office use
     Line three
  . Attached or stacked town houses [ as part of a retail or office development ]

I think this address the “mixed use” more to how we talked about it
I would be interested to know your thoughts I think this will address some of the concerns.
Thanks Mac

16/03/2010
Hello Mac,

You are right, the changes made to the plan after our last meeting do in fact make additional room for multi-unit residential and Affordable housing in the commercial zone. My concern is that it removes all checks and balances needed to ensure the true purpose of creating a commercial zone is met. We create commercial zones to ensure Bowser has commercial lands available when they are needed in the future. Therefore, a commercial zone should be the slowest to develop, not be the fastest.

Your idea does replace some balance, but unless some firm limitations are put in place (such as requiring, say 50%, floor area used for commercial in all developments) there is no assurance that we don't end up with a few small coffee shops dotting a condominium neighbourhood.

I guess my biggest problem with your suggestion is that it is trying to satisfy the short term agendas of a few key players at the expense of the community's long term needs. There is lots of room in Bowser for the multi-unit housing and Affordable housing, why does that use need to consume the commercial zone? Shouldn't commercial be the priority in the commercial zone, with residential as an "add-on"?.

In addition to the handful of agendas that are being satisfied by turning the commercial zone into a residential zone, there is a whole many Bowser residents who are looking at the plan and saying "too much too fast!!". And they are right, the growth to the community should happen at a natural pace for the community and should not be thrust upon them as decided by developer greed. By saying (as our committee's last draft did) that residential development is tied to commercial growth, we slow development and growth to a more organic "natural" pace that is healthy for the community. We save the commercial land for use when needed rather than see it gobbled up for short term profits.

As members of the committee, we were tasked to come up with a SUSTAINABLE plan that would work for most of the community, not just the RDN and 3 key landowners. When I listen to all the individual concerns with the plan, I sometimes wonder if we, as a group, forgot that.

Wayne

16/03/2010
On Tue, Mar 16, 2010 at 6:56 AM, Bowser Builders <bowserbuilders@shaw.ca> wrote:

Hi Wayne: I have been thinking about this and after talking to Dave Bartram I read through the Commercial Mixed Use section again.

It looks to me like we have made room for Multi-unit residential and Affordable housing, that can be at street level with no connection to commercial development. “As I read it.” I think this opens the door to the commercial land being used for higher density housing.

Residential – High Density land use section ….also allows for this kind of development


If the intention was to include residential with the commercial in the Commercial Mixed Use.

I propose that we change the wording too

In “Land Uses “... Line three

. Multi-unit residential [ In combination with commercial development]

. Affordable housing [ In combination with commercial development ]

In the section “Building Arrangement”

Line two

. Residential uses at street level [ When used for seniors housing or Care Facilities ]

And in the section “ Building Types”

Line two

. Clustered multi-unit residential developments [ attached or part of the same development including ] retail or office use

Line three

. Attached or stacked town houses [ as part of a retail or office development ]

16/03/2010
I think this address the “mixed use” more to how we talked about it.

I would be interested to know your thoughts I think this will address some of the concerns.

Thanks, Mac
Boogaards, Stephen

From: Thompson, Paul
Sent: March 16, 2010 9:08 AM
To: Boogaards, Stephen
Subject: FW: Submission for Bowser Village Centre Plan meeting March 16
Attachments: Submission from Sally Barton.pdf; ATT665296.txt

-----Original Message-----
From: Bowser Seniors Housing Society [mailto:bshs@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 15, 2010 10:17 PM
To: Thompson, Paul; David Bartram; Thorkelsson, Paul
Subject: Submission for Bowser Village Centre Plan meeting March 16

Paul, Dave,
I would like the chance to read my submission (attached) at the meeting Tuesday evening.
Sally
Thompson, Paul

From: Pat [gormin@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 16, 2010 12:20 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Bowser Community Plan

I would like to express my opposition to the Bowser current community plan due to my serious concerns RE: water supply, sewage, Residential density, the necessity of building permits that are not now required by the local neighbourhood.

I know that all of these concerns are shared by many (if not most) of the present community. More public input is required to avoid future problems.

Sincerely,
Bill McClean
435 Rembar Road,
North Qualicum
V9K 2A4

email C/O gormin@shaw.ca
Thompson, Paul

From: betty hilke [bhilke@telus.net]
Sent: March 16, 2010 12:38 PM
To: Thompson, Paul
Subject: Hello

A couple of days ago I e-mailed Mr J. Stanhope and failed to ask for a copy to be mailed to you.

I am e-mailing the message to you that:-

I oppose the Bowser plan.

Betty Hilke
#12- 6350 W. Island Highway.
Thompson, Paul

Subject: FW: Bowser Village Plan

From: J Stanhope [mailto:jstanhope@shaw.ca]
Sent: March 16, 2010 2:08 PM
To: Pearse, Maureen
Subject: Fw: Bowser Village Plan

FYI,

Joe

----- Original Message -----  
From: Greta Taylor
To: jstanhope@shaw.ca
Cc: quallanding@shaw.ca ; giselerudischer@gmail.com ; maureenyoung@shaw.ca ; gholme@shaw.ca ; lwb@shaw.ca
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:57 AM
Subject: Bowser Village Plan

Dear Mr. Stanhope and RDN Area Directors,

I cordially invite you to attend the Public Meeting this evening regarding the Bowser Village Plan.

As Area Directors, you have the power to approve or disapprove very many aspects of development projects, such as building codes, changes to setbacks, variances, zoning, etc. etc. The Bowser Village Plan is being held up as an example to other areas that may shortly be working on new OCP's and could guide future developments and address future zoning of land developments in your areas. For this reason I think it is very important that, if at all possible, you attend this meeting in order to see the reaction of Area H residents, hear their comments, their ideas, etc. You would be able to ascertain whether or not this kind of Village Plan would work in your own Areas and if the residents of your areas would approve or disapprove of such a Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Greta Taylor
244, Hembrough Road,
Bowser, B.C., V0R 1G0
Tel: 250 757 8909
e-mail: gptaylor@shaw.ca

16/03/2010
To: Joe Stanhope and All Directors Voting on the Bowser Plan  
RE: Bowser Plan  
March 15, 2010

Water Supplies: Land Water BC Study in 2004

Available water resources are very limited in the Bowser and Deep Bay areas. When Crown Land was to be sold for development in 2004, Land Water BC did a study and extensive well drilling in the area. This study shows wells drilled between Bowser and Highway 19 indicating an inadequate water supply to service the development of residential units of similar size to the projected development of homes in the Bowser Plan. They even drilled below sea level to determine if there was an addition water aquifer. **NO WATER WAS FOUND! SOME TEST WELLS WERE DRY OR OF LOW CAPACITY.** The RDN has this report. It was on the RDN web site at the time the development was being reviewed!

As a Regional District, the first essential study necessary should be that adequate water supplies are available for the planned development. The projected plan is for more than 3,700 new residents, besides businesses.

While the Improvement Districts of Deep Bay and Bowser currently provide water to 1,400 residents, they do not have access to grants to do a proper evaluation of water supplies. The Improvement Districts do not control zoning and densities. Only the RDN has the power to do that. And we are now being assessed taxes for this type of review.

Residents pay to the RDN a special tax to do proper reviews required before zoning densities are bumped up to high-density housing and development.

Are we destined to become another Tofino village with desperately short summer water supplies because of over development? Last year Tofino Village Council emailed a letter that threatened the necessity of using port-a-potties on every block unless residents greatly reduced their usage of water.

We feel that the Bowser Plan is premature, given the very high density housing it supports **without adequately assessing water supplies.** We feel the RDN has a moral if not a legal responsibility to prevent residents from becoming victims of significant water shortages because of irresponsible zoning changes permitted by the Bowser Plan.

Dianne and Nelson Eddy  
5058 Longview Dr.  
Bowser, BC
03/15/2010 16:19 7579934

To: Joe Stanhope and All Directors Voting on the Bowser Plan
RE: Bowser Plan
March 15, 2010

Bowser Village Plan vs. Cedar Village Planning

Cedar Village Centre Land Inventory (2008) included the following information: Why didn’t the Bowser Plan include these basic types of studies and information before it was started? Questions regarding proportions of Commercial vs. Residential were not provided at the beginning of the plan and fundamental to the process.

The Cedar Village and Suburban Lands land inventory involves a four-stage approach that includes a land use inventory and a commercial needs assessment. (2007, see RDN website). Why weren’t residents of Area H provided with equivalent information in Bowser planning? This is what Cedar got!

Commercial Needs Assessment

Staff will conduct research on the commercial floor space to population ratio in order to gain a better understanding of the future commercial floor area requirements of the study area. Population statistics will also be obtained from Statistics Canada in order to identify trends in population and demographics.

The Ministry of Transportation will be contacted to discuss the road capacities in the Cedar Village Centre Area as well as potential road improvements should additional commercial be developed.

A questionnaire was developed by Regional District of Nanaimo staff to obtain feedback from the community on a variety of factors related to commercial development in the Cedar Village Centre. These include:

1. The catchment area for the Cedar Village Centre (who shops there?).
2. The commercial needs of the community.
3. Support for additional commercial development within or adjacent to the Cedar Village Centre.
4. To find out where the community shops and accesses other services.
5. The effectiveness of the Cedar Village Centre.
6. The strength, weaknesses, and opportunities for the Village Centre.
7. To identify what the communities concern are over development in the Cedar Village Centre.
8. To identify what community amenities may be desirable in association with additional commercial development.

So why weren’t equivalent studies done for the Bowser Plan that were done in Cedar? Why weren’t the residents who participated in the Bowser Plan provided with the tools for better village planning? The lack of background reports was sorely lacking and was requested by the Advisory Group. Ad hoc “feelings” without proper studies were used instead. This is a poor way to determine the needs of an existing village.

The RDN did not provide adequate information to the Advisory Group for good decision-making. And they hired part-time staff not familiar with the area.

We don’t need additional residential developments within Bowser Village Centre. There is more than an adequate supply of residential growth throughout the Lighthouse Community area. We need larger commercial development areas to service the quickly expanding residential developments in Lighthouse Community. Commercial businesses currently in the area are threatening to move to other areas because of lack of commercial lands available to expand their businesses. They cannot compete against land developers now speculating on high-density housing that most of Bowser Village area is being designated as, in the Bowser Plan. This will cause the price of land to skyrocket well beyond the price of plain commercial land. Besides losing long term businesses already here, we would also lose local jobs. Residents would then be required to shop in Courtenay. What happened to the complete village concept of “live, work, play” near home?

We ask that the Directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo oppose the Bowser plan because of the lack of support information available during this project. We now realize that current businesses cannot expand and will be forced to move to other areas to be able to expand. This is not what residents want. We need businesses to build here and stay here, not more houses! We want commercial businesses restricted to the Bowser Village Area, not spread all over the countryside. This is a very shortsighted plan!

Dianne and Nelson Eddy
5058 Longview Dr., Bowser, BC
March 9, 2010

Att: Dave Bertram

This is in regards to the "Bowser Village Plan." I am in total opposition to this plan of such immense progress! It is definitely not conducive to our beautiful rural town of Bowser.

Please do not let this go through. Progress is going to happen but not to this magnitude. Leave us be if you need to develop go somewhere else!!

Show the residents of Bowser respect with what they already have and enjoy!!

Sincerely,

Vikki Caradonna
4620 Bures Dr.
Bowser, B.C.
V0R 1G0

250 757-9244
Dear Director,

Sincerely,

ej

Paul Thompson, RDN Project Manager
Boulevard Villages Project

The goal of particular interest to me is: Clean and Design with Natural Diversity

Definitely no problem to discharge
sewage into the river. Real headend
systems, small to start, expand when
needed.

Enhancing Biodiversity

Enhance where we have destroyed
otherwise let nature rule.
Not every park needs grand vistas. Let
the people fulfill their wildlife and
identity quest. They already care
for food, water, and art.

Al R. Thompson