

Regional District of Nanaimo
Summary of the Electoral Area ‘A’ Official Community Plan Review
Citizen’s Committee Meeting Held on Monday, October 18, 2010 at 6:30pm
At the North Cedar Improvement District Hall
2100 Yellow Point Road

Joe Burnett	Committee Chair
Mike Hooper	Committee Member
Ray Digby	Committee Member
Jill Maibach	Committee Member
Brian Collen	Committee Member
Jack Anderson	Committee Member
Garry Laird	Committee Member
Joanne McLeod	Committee Member
Henrik Krieberg	Committee Member
Geoff Macaulay	Committee Member
Devon Wyatt	Committee Member
Bert Vermaskari	Committee Member
Chris Pagan	Committee Member
Carol Mason	Chief Administrative Officer
Greg Keller	Senior Planner
Stephen Boogaards	Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by the Chair. There were approximately 20 people in attendance.

MINUTES

The Chair asked the Committee for a motion to adopt the summary of the September 13, 2010 meeting.

MOVED Geoff Macaulay, SECONDED Garry Laird, that the summary of the Area ‘A’ Citizen’s Committee meeting held on September 13, 2010 be adopted.

CARRIED

CORRESPONDANCE

The Chair asked for a motion to receive the correspondence in the agenda package from:

- Robinson Contracting in support of Kipp Road proposal
- Schoolhouse Road Developments in support of the Kipp Road proposal
- D. Haley
- Keith Brown
- Mayta Ryn

MOVED Henrik Krieberg, SECONDED Garry Laird that the correspondence be received by the Citizen’s Committee.

CARRIED

NANAIMO AIRPORT UPDATE

The Chair introduced Carol Mason, the Chief Administrative Officer for the RDN. Ms. Mason provided a brief overview of the history of the airport beginning with safety improvements for the runway expansion. When the airport was expanding the terminal the RDN understanding was that they have no control over airport use. The RDN position was clarified in a press release in 2007. Only recently has there been discussion of doing more groundside uses on the airport lands. The RDN has asked the airport to work on the development of an accord to ensure that anything that happens is harmonised with the RDN objectives. The airport commission has committed to that process.

Mike Hooper clarified that the Nanaimo Airport Commission would like to work with the RDN on an accord and does see itself as a regional airport. The committee members clarified that it was only the groundside uses they have questioned on RDN jurisdiction and which would not have regional implications. With respect to jurisdiction, Carol Mason indicated that the airport could make the case that any groundside use is necessary for their operations. She explained that taking the airport to court is very expensive and there is no guarantee that the RDN would win. She indicated that it would be more effective to work with the airport to make sure their master plan complies with the OCP.

The group discussed the role of Area 'A' citizens in the development of the accord and the need for more local representation. Ms. Mason explained that the airport cannot do anything contrary to the Regional Growth Strategy. If the airport was to recommend something that is not consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, then the Regional Board and member municipalities would question the development. As a worst case scenario, the RDN could take legal action, though she is not expecting the accord to fail. The Chair also clarified that the Citizen's Committee would have input during the accord process.

The group discussed the relations between the accord and the policies of the OCP, with specific reference on how development permit guidelines would apply. The suggestions were to include language and a qualifier in the OCP saying that policies do apply for non-aeronautically related land uses. Greg Keller suggested that the RDN is not yet in a position to clarify between groundside and aviation uses to include in the OCP. Ms. Mason explained that the RDN has clarified its expectations with the airport that land use regulations would apply to non-aviation uses.

Several persons in the audience had suggested that the airport had revealed groundside land uses in their initial public consultation in 2006, including hotels and repair stations. Mr. Hooper clarified that at the time the airport was only speaking to additional parking and related infrastructure. Laurie Gourley accused the RDN of being disingenuous, suggesting that the RDN had known what was being planned by the airport. His organisation the Mid Island Sustainable Stewardship Initiative (MISSI) had provided the RDN with a legal opinion in May that the RDN had jurisdiction over groundside lands, but the RDN had posters at the OCP open houses saying that they have no jurisdiction. He stated that the RDN should include language in the draft OCP that there is jurisdiction and rescind it later when there is an accord.

The Chair clarified that the letter from MISSI had not been considered by the Board until September, after the open houses had occurred. Ms. Mason clarified that local governments are permitted to protect legal opinions. This is necessary so that the local government is protected if they need to take legal action. She stated even though the intention was for the RDN and the airport to work together, the RDN does not want to give away its advantage if they need to take the airport to court.

The committee members discussed the advantage of more substance to the section on the airport in the OCP. Mr. Keller suggested the advantage of nothing in the OCP on the airport lands, since the airport would be required to comply with the rural zoning on the property for any non-aviation related land uses. The draft OCP also tries to include language to consult with the Citizen's Committee if there should be

any amendment to the OCP regarding the airport lands. Ms. Mason clarified that the airport would need to apply for a rezoning if they want to change the permitted non-aviation land uses. Jack Anderson requested that Mr. Keller prepare a fifth paragraph for the airport section on RDN current knowledge of their jurisdiction based on the recent information received. Mr. Anderson also requested that Mr. Hooper host a community charette for ideas on the airport lands that the community may welcome.

KIPP ROAD INDUSTRIAL PROPOSAL

Greg Keller introduced Maureen Pilcher to speak on behalf of the owners of the Kipp Road property who have requested an amendment be included to the draft OCP to change their property from Rural Residential to South Wellington Commercial and Industrial. Ms. Pilcher explained that the current owners of the discussed Kipp Road property did not own it until the OCP process had been underway and they do recognise that they are late in the process for making a request for an amendment. The owners indicated that have been contacting area residents gathering support for their proposal.

Ms. Pilcher explained that the Rural Residential designation for the property is not appropriate as the property is already surrounded by industrial land and it is adjacent to the highway. Kipp Road also experiences heavy truck traffic from adjacent industrial sites. The existing properties on the other side of Kipp Road are at capacity and the development of the subject property will not compromise the rural lifestyles in the area. The proposal is for a storage yard for the business, including somewhere to maintain their trucks. The development will exceed the development and environmental guidelines established in the OCP. The proposal includes buffering along the highway and Kipp Road, protection of water quality and the incorporation of some form of access to the adjacent parkland properties.

Members of the audience expressed concern that the project may proceed without the full consultation associated with a rezoning. Mr. Keller explained that the proponents must still apply for a rezoning, but for that to occur each the OCP and Regional Growth Strategy must support the industrial land use. He did acknowledge that it was unfortunate the group came together so late, as the developer's forum was meant the address these amendments.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS

Greg Keller explained the discussion from the last couple of meetings to make a hybrid of all the options for implementation. He explained the amount of development potential remaining outside of the Growth Containment Boundaries. The reasons given for controlling growth is compact communities, rural values, environmental protection, preserving agricultural land, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging development on land within the Growth Containment Boundary. He also reviewed the nine options for managing growth. The committee at previous meeting requested a hybrid of options 4, 5, 7, and 9.

G. Keller explained option 4 as amenity zoning that creates new zone with a base density and a bonus density. The bonus density will require the provision of community amenities, such as environmental protection or parkland. It does not reduce subdivision potential, but it will make subdivision more costly. Option 5 is for more incentives and disincentives such as a reduction in application fees or more stringent requirements for water supply. It does discourage development not consistent with OCP goals, but it does make subdivision more costly. Option 7 is a phased approach to implementation of minimum parcel sizes to give people more time to make financial decisions. This does prepare property owners for change, but it could create a rush of subdivision applications and take longer to achieve the vision of the OCP. Option 9 would allow for clustering to reduce the subdivision footprint. It does permit more efficient forms of subdivision and protect rural character, but it does not reduce subdivision potential or car dependency.

The Citizen Committee discussed the 1 hectare minimum parcel size requirement for community services funding from the Province. Ms. Mason clarified that the 1 ha requirement must be met in the entire regional district and so far only 2 electoral areas meet this requirement. Mr. Keller explained that it is only Rural Residential properties within the North Cedar Improvement District under 2000m² minimum parcel size that are affected by possible implementation. Some of the committee members expressed concern with the complexity of the options that may possibly be confusing to communicate to the public.

The Citizen's Committee discussed possible consultation on the implementation options. Some of the committee members suggested that the public who said they wanted to protect rural values and greenspace early in the OCP consultation might not have understood that it would mean changing the zoning. During a roundtable of committee members the consensus was that if the Board is serious about following through with implementation than people should be consulted. The committee agreed for a separate process for implementation by including language for a consultation process in the OCP.

MOVED Henrik Krieberg, SECONDED Ray Digby, that the OCP support a public process for considering implementation options specific to minimum parcel size.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 pm.

Certified correct by:

Director Joe Burnett, Committee Chairperson