

Electoral Area H

Official Community Plan Review



Working Group Meeting #4 – May 26, 2016

Growth & Development Continued

Pre-Reading Comments

Introduction

In preparation for the May 26, 2016 Working Group meeting an online survey was circulated to Working Group members. The purpose of the survey was to provide an opportunity to review information about the topics on the agenda and to provide comments. The comments were compiled into this document and circulated to Working Group members on May 24, 2016. The original survey is included as an attachment to this document.

Commercial / Light Industrial in the Horne Lake / Spider Lake area

Comments

#	Response
1.	Any kind of industry (other than tourist) would be completely out of character with this residential/resort area.
2.	Spider Lake and Horne Lake are a long way from Bowser and if those folks think they need some area for that type of development there, they should be accommodated. Lets have some room in the OCP review for that discussion.
3.	Let the residents of Horne Lake and Spider Lake areas make these decisions. It should be noted though that some commercial/light industrial activities could contaminate these very important RDN water resource areas. These RDN water resources may be vital water supplies for all the wonderful high density development the RDN sees in the future for this area. Certainly within the lifetime of this OCP -- 5 years? Another consideration would be potential fire hazards. Would there be an increased fire risk from the industrial activities? Without more specific information how can an informed decision be made? Tell us what is being proposed if you dare.
4.	I'm not familiar enough with what's been happening in Horne Lake / Spider Lake areas lately., however when I did visit Horne Lake in the past, it was a recreational area surrounded by logging lease lands. I guess my question is "where would customers for these types of businesses come from?"



	<p>During the Bowser Village Center planning program, I believe more emphasis was put on keeping and promoting Bowser as a commercial center for the area.</p>
5.	<p>Leave the OCP as it stands today in regard to this subject. Grow Bowser Village is the goal.</p>
6.	<p>I bow to local resident's opinions, but I would hate to see the recreational and relaxed life around Horne and Spider Lakes lessened by too much commercialism (over-use of signs, noisy machinery, etc.).</p>
7.	<p>I think the original intent was to keep the Horne/Spider lake areas free from commerce, and I still think that's a good idea.</p>
8.	<p>Is a gravel pit light industrial? The question then becomes "What is the meaning of Light Industrial." Some examples are given in the Bowser Village Plan but nothing concrete. Also, What is being proposed as Commercial/Light/Industrial land use in the Horne Lake and Spider Lake Area that generates the question. Examples are important.</p>
9.	<p>There is some confusion as to the definition of Light Industrial / Industrial vs Commercial. If the need is for a business park with a manufacturing base then perhaps this is better situated outside of the village centre. This could be similar to the area on Hwy 4 and Church road outside of Parksville. It does not detract from the downtown core rather it enhances the services available. Business such as sand and grave, large building supply operations, RV sales and light manufacture can be concentrated in an area outside of the village core as the usually require more space.</p>
10.	<p>In the mid 1990's the Inland Island Hwy and Horne Lake Intersection/Interchange became one of the main transportation hubs for area H. Prior to this the Horne Lake/Spider Lake area was accessible via Horne Lake road for primarily rural/recreational/forestry users. In 2003, when the last OCP was updated the lack of services for the Horne and Spider lake area was identified and discussed. Things have changed substantially over the past 13 years.</p>
	<p>The Horne/Spider lake area only has seasonal services requiring residents to travel 15 minutes or more to either Bowser, Qualicum or Buckley Bay. This is not the norm within the RDN for any other area that has this number of residents or recreational users, to say nothing about the travelling public. Services considered basic for most of area H are not available and require considerable planning, time or expense to purchase. The Horne and Spider lake areas are under serviced and need support through the OCP to make change that contribute to the economic, environmental and employment opportunities in the area.</p>
	<p>The potential to dilute the customer base for businesses in Bowser can be offset by providing services to the travelling public through needed employment opportunities. The majority of the Horne/Spider lake areas have three directional options to provide services from either Bowser or other locations (Nanaimo through to Courtenay). Residents will continue to use Bowser for many services and attracting the travelling public through the Gateway to Lighthouse/Spider/Horne lake country (Horne Lake intersection) will likely increase business. The customer base for Bowser could improve vs being diluted.</p>
	<p>There has been a significant decrease in employment in area H and loss of our youth (300</p>



have moved away in the past decade) who can not find jobs in our community. We need to support opportunities to attract our youth back to our community. Supporting services that are compatible with Bowser/Qualicum Bay within the Spider/Horne lake area will contribute to the growth and development of area H.

Need for light industrial use and if it can be located within Village Centres

Comments

#	Response
1.	Needs some discussion.
2.	<p>I do not feel we need a transfer station in area H...they are expensive to operate, I am sure a feasibility study would show the area would not wish to support it...I feel Courtenay and Parksville</p> <p>are enough for this area. People who dump indiscriminately are going to continue to do this, as they won't pay no matter where the transfer station is.</p>
3.	<p>Examples give: "transfer stations", "recycling facilities" – sounds like the RDN wants to make Bowser the RDN dumping zone.</p> <p>There are already sufficient transfer stations within the RDN. Making local pickup available would make sense because of the distance. The RDN talks about being green so provide annual garden waste pickup, annual heavy garbage pickup, etc., as a service to the rural areas. After all, don't all the municipal areas have this service multiple times a year. Recycling facilities are big facilities and are already provided within the RDN. Making more of these facilities in outlying areas would be uneconomical. Much of Area H benefits from the tourist industry. Somehow I don't see big industrial recycling facilities as a "must see" item for the tourist.</p>
4.	<p>I believe a transfer station would be better suited in a light industrial area the same as a recycling facility. Outside of a Village center would probably work better.</p> <p>Shellfish processing facilities would work in Area H, but again, outside of a Village center.</p>
5.	<p>Transfer station for what? chickens? or trash? If you are speaking about garbage then: NO it should not be located in a Village Center...rather on some provincial land just outside of Bowser. Open top 40 foot containers and a loading ramp to walk up to dump into.</p> <p>Recycle Containers would be appropriate within the village center in a neat and tidy area/fashion.</p> <p>remove the containers to Nanaimo when full. As far as shellfish goes...there should be local sales at the wharf in Deep Bay of oysters, and anyother seafood. Whats with the restrictions on that anyway?</p>
6.	<p>The shellfish industry has not been appreciated on the water, where it disturbs the free use of previously available beaches, views, anchorages and bays. However, the ancillary land-</p>



	based processing and related activities are less obtrusive, and are beneficial to the local economy.
7.	<p>The Bowser Village Centre is already squeezed for space.</p> <p>I can not imagine where in the Bowser Centre a 'recycling' facility or a shellfish processing facility could be accommodated. Each would come with an 'odor' and the 'centre' area is at present primarily residential.</p> <p>Perhaps behind Toms grocery and the gas station would be an 'out of the way' location for recycling or shellfish processing but I cannot imagine either being a benefit to residential development.</p>
8.	The points made in favour of light industrial use at the meeting made sense to me.
9.	I would oppose a transfer station in a Rural Village Centre. It is not appropriate. Area H Residents, particular the major population centres of Deep Bay to Bowser, want a solution to not having to drive to the Parksville Transfer Station. The cost of gas/diesel and the hour return trip are major dissatisfiers and result in Illegal Dumping. That is the issue. A Transfer Station is a red herring. The solution is some sort of a regular community pickup of stuff for the existing transfer station. Obviously it would cost the user but It would be cheaper and better for the environment all around.
10.	<p>The Horne Lake strata holds clean up weekends for our strata owners, 2 weekend in the spring and one in the fall. The strata provides multiple 40 yd. roll off containers for garbage and metal recycling. There are facilities for owners to drop off paint, batteries, cardboard, appliances, electronics etc. that are all taken for recycling. These weekends are very successful providing a service for owners to clean up around their cottages on a regular basis, and are funded through strata fees.</p> <p>Possibly similar type events could be coordinated for other Area H communities on a user pay basis.</p>
11.	Pleas see previous comments

Development permit areas for form and character

Comments

#	Response
1.	An important addition for discussion: the 1000m offshore designation in the current OCP (or is this part of A6 above?).
2.	need to go over this in group
3.	<p>"Input so far indicates that there may be some cases where these requirements are too onerous and are unduly stifling development."</p> <p>Without further details, it is difficult to judge. Give actual examples of what is "unduly</p>



stifling". Perhaps the real-time developers out there do not feel it is stifling but rather the cost of doing business. Development is expensive. Small time developers will have to be more creative at how and what they develop.

To eliminate the guidelines developed in the Bowser Plan defeats the purpose of planning. People buy land or homes or develop property based on these plans and guidelines. Devaluation will occur if we let sloppy development/developers redesign what has taken years to establish as a young developing community.

We are again focusing on Bowser, Bowser, Bowser at the expense of all the other communities that are getting short shrift in this process. Bowser has already had 2 years to create the Bowser Plan. Nothing will change without public sewers to accommodate the high density planned. And during this OCP process they have had their day(s) -- let's get on with discussing ideas and needs from other community areas--more than 3/4's of the population exist outside Bowser. Isn't this supposed to be a "Full OCP Review"? Or is it just an extension of the Bowser Plan?

4. Cut the beurocracy to a minimum. Protect the Marine environment, the beaches and park trails.

Stick to the original OCP with large lots, defined in size as 1/2 acre or larger. We are a rural area--when will the RDN admit that? Dont try to make us a suburb of Nanaimo...most of us shop in Courtenay anyways. All you ABCDS and such are not english. This is a citizens review; use plain language. Just let development continue as it has over the last 40 years. The character of the area speaks for its self; just look around...what is out of place are condos, hi rise, and clustered housing. LARGE LOTS, SINGLE FAMILY HOMES, SEPTICS.

5. 1. We have yet to discuss protection of our beaches, and the 1000 m zone offshore of Deep Bay and Bowser. In particular, how do we protect the ancient fish weirs, lagoons, etc. built by First Nations on our local beaches?

2. As for stifling development, let's hear the details. As long as the public (especially local neighbours) are fully informed AND LISTENED TO WITH RESPECT, perhaps there is something that can be done. For example, do we need more RDN staff to facilitate some of the bureaucracy?

6. Yes, we hear that the RDN is almost impossible to deal with for those wishing to develop or make rezoning changes. However, rules are in place to protect environment and lifestyle....

Imagine that 'money is no object'. Would we not be more thoughtful about the future and the impact that bulldogging our way to get what we want would have. Personal agendas should not surpass the long term good of community.

7. Excessive red tape is definitely a hindrance to start-up businesses. However where the restrictions are essential to preserving the basic principles of the OCP, regulations should be strict.

8. Mac (Irly Store) has mentioned this several times. I guess I don't know what the issue is/are to carte blanche say we need to simplify and make them less costly. What DPA/DPAs are the issue. I would need some examples of the issue before agreeing to changing "costly and time consuming requirements." This maybe a good idea but without understanding the issue I



would be hard pressed to change anything.
9. I the process should be simplified for the property owner or developer . There should be a one stop process with the exception of highly sensitive environment areas the need for DPA's can be eliminated and dealt with in a more timely and efficient manner through the building permit and inspection process

Clustered Residential Development

Comments |

#	Response
1.	Zoning should be restricted to minimum sizes that would permit on-site septic field.
2.	The majority of the people who spoke at our group meeting were definitely in favor of clustered development. In a development plan, it can be put right into the plan whether it can be a gated community or otherwise. It stands to reason that in a community with clustered housing and varied other housing, with walking trails and biking trails, buildings open to the public, that it would be designated open to the public. It seems to me that after out meetings, that certain organizations may mobilize their members to put forth concerns. And of course that is acceptable, however, there are many others who may not have attended meetings or have not been contacted that wish to have open to the public trails and biking paths in cluster housing developments.
3.	No! No! No! "Cluster Residential Development" protects nothing. This is an absolute myth perpetuated by the RDN. In 5 years down the road, development will fill in all that lovely green space. Rules change, they always do. No Cluster Residential Development in Area H!
4.	I was in attendance at that meeting and there was NOT a lot of support for clustered housing other than Omar BSI and his two side kicks. CLUSTERED HOUSING is an URBAN idea and does not fit within the current OCP nor the current look of our community. The real fear that is being created is the fear of doubling our population so the RDN can get all that tax revenue. Just let us build out as projected in our current OCP...when you pulled in the "secondary suits" just by doing that YOU DOUBLED OUR POPULATION....enough is enough. WE ARE NOT A CITY. Most of us moved here because of the rural values and lifestyle...why do you continue to threaten that? THERE IN LIES THE FEAR. fear of what the RDN is really doing to our home community behind our backs. Why do you not TELEVISION all the meetings? its 150 km round trip for us to drive to one of your meetings of the whole....that is rediculous. Put your meetins on camera like other towns and citys. What are you afraid of?
5.	1. I could not find section 5.13 in the RGS! 2. We have many instances (one very local) of strata developments which impinge upon local access to trails, roads, etc. Also we have a local shared septic system that was built too



<p>low in a swamp, forcing residents to make up for the failure of a developer with expensive strata fees. To the extent that clustered housing leads to this situation, it should be avoided. Every residence should have its own septic system, so there is a clear path to enforcement.</p> <p>3. The RDN designation of resort properties which should not be occupied year-round is under attack by residents who no longer wish to leave for long periods. It should either be enforced, or the zoning should be changed. This would require public input.</p>
<p>6. good.</p> <p>It will be interesting to see where and how many new lots this would apply to</p>
<p>7. This is certainly not the impression I got on the topic of cluster housing at the last meeting. At best I would say the approach to cluster housing was mixed. Personally I am opposed to cluster housing and feel the present development options in the Deep Bay area are more than adequate. Cluster housing would require an expensive sewage system with the cost being well above which many residents would be capable of affording. Is the RDN attempting to drive seniors on minimum pensions out of the area ?</p>
<p>8. Clustered residential development is totally inappropriate for a rural area such as Deep Bay. It runs contrary to the very reason people consider moving to the area and is inconsistent with the quality of life here.</p>
<p>9. The issue of gated communities (not allowed in our Area H OCP) is the result of the Lighthouse Landing Estates not allowing Deep Bay Residents to walk across their property. Prior to it being built some residents walked all over this area at their leisure. This has morphed into some calling this a "Gated Community," which it is not. The Shared Septic issue expressed is also the result of Lighthouse Landing Estates having a septic system that, it seems, was not built properly. It was also built before the regulations we have today. There are residents in Deep Bay that have been opposed to the Lighthouse Landing Estates ever being built and are using it as fodder for an "concern" about Clustered Development.</p>
<p>10. Cluster housing creates a better sense of community with more public and green space for the enjoyment of everybody. Community gardens can also be incorporated in to the design and layout. To control gated communities from happening the building permit could stipulated all roads are public and given to the RDN at completion. Also a bylaw could be in place and enforced if violated or right of ways registered on the title.</p> <p>Community septic systems if designed and installed properly are effective, however a sewer system would address this problem completely. Many old individual septic systems are also failing in area H.</p>

Any further questions on the land clearing on Horne Lake Road?

#	Response
1.	Your link to bylaw 500 is poor unless you provide the details that development there is likely like the BSI Lot A lands--5acre parcels.
2.	RDN should make a concerted effort to rid that road of SCOTCH BROOM for ever.



3. Any rezoning would have to be accepted by a local referendum.
4. Thank you for this... please keep us updated

Any further questions on the Bowser Village Wastewater Study?

#	Response
1.	That's good.
2.	You spent \$300 thousand dollars to study 40 homes and 10 businesses for sewage treatment? who hired you?
3.	No one outside Bowser should be forced to join the Bowser wastewater system.
4.	I have concerns as to the type of sewage treatment system that would be suggested.
5.	I live in the area between Deep Bay and the Bowser Village Centre. I want sewer and it's not to foster development. It's to protect the ocean.
6.	If there was a possibility to have the sewer extend beyond the village centre, would this proposal be considered by the RDN? The village centre is very small and I am sure the study will reveal there is not a large enough base to make this economically possible. ie there is no economy of scale.

Any further questions about Deep Bay?

#	Response
1.	Over the years, I have spoken with the business owners in Bowser, they have voiced their concerns over any commercial development in Deep Bay. Especially Georgia Park Store who has the only Liquor Outlet in Area H. this is understandable, Also Tom's Market who has expressed to me that they operate on a fine line and another grocery store would put much stress on their store. This too is understanding and certain groups add fuel to the fire telling people there may be commercial in the Bayne's Sound development. Of course the People in Bowser are going to be concerned. Over the years I have seen the Qualicum Beach Council not allow franchise operations in Qualicum Beach, on any given day you can go to Parksville and see half of the people in Qualicum Beach in Tim Horton's and MacDonaldis having coffee before they go on to Nanaimo to Costco or Superstor to do their grocery shopping. Then they wonder why the stores in Qualicum change hands every 5 years or so as residents do not shop in their town. This is of no in area H, but diversified Housing is needed, not all people want to live on big lots, or sigle family housing, if we have someone who will build what is needed, supply sewers, in otherwords enhance area H, we should appreciate thier contribution. Certain groups may worry they won't be allowed in the Baynes Sound Property, it is up to the Community to make sure it is accessible to all.A
2.	Deep Bay is a residential community limited in size by Hwy 19A, the Ocean, and Bowser. Bowser Plan contains all the potential needs for the local area. Hotels, seniors housing, townhouses, commercial all belong there. BSI bought the wrong land to develop high



	density. There is no public sewage in Deep Bay, and residents don't want it.
3.	NO. BSI lands were purchased when the current OCP applied, indicating large lots. So yes, build on those large lots but no commercial activity as its residential. But, I thought BSI had no proposal before the RDN ?? We do not want nor need another Village Center near Deep Bay; we support our Bowser commercial community and village center and growth should be there and only there. Leave Deep Bay just as it is. No more commercial other than what is there now; no more services...our services are located in Bowser. Just get VIU its own entrance road out of our residential area and off the 4 lanes. The traffic to and from events at VIU is awful fast and dangerous on Gainsberg Road.
4.	Changing the zoning to allow smaller lots (as is already the case in most of Deep Bay) has always been acceptable. However, every single lot should have its own septic field and single-owner responsibility. Lots too small to permit this should not be allowed. Finally, ALL Deep Bay residents should have an equal voice, whether they are on the working group or not. If this means a referendum on the rezoning, so be it.
5.	More development in Deep Bay is coming whether present residents like it or not. This has happened all the way up Vancouver Island from Victoria. The BSI plan needs modification and buy-in from current Deep Bay residents but I feel it is a good thing. Working together with Bowser (ie: sewer development) seems to have some merit and agreement from residents in Deep Bay and Bowser. This joint plan should have more study.
6.	A village centre in Deep Bay is not wanted or needed. Merchants in Bowser and Qualicum Bay are already have trouble keeping in business.
7.	The last paragraph is an obvious "foot in the door" to permit unwanted and inappropriate development in Deep Bay.
8.	I would like to see the data which generates the statement "At this point we see little support either in the community or in the Village Centre Study for establishing a new mixed-use centre in Deep Bay. The Village Centre Study spoken about was produced by a consultant with inputs given by the RDN Staff with no input from the community.
9.	There was a community workshop in 2013 that came up with a very different plan than the one proposed in 2011. While it did not create a new village centre, there was a proposal to create a small eco tourism resort surrounded by cluster housing, lots of green space and public access to the green space and forehore area. This concept appears to be in keeping with the direction of the RDN. I it possible to have the developer talk about this plan and is it something the RDN would consider?

Any comments on the planned format for the June 7 Working Group meeting?

#	Response
1.	I am hoping all of Deep Bay will attend and put their comments in. I hope you will be able to decipher who is the working group and who is not. I would have two columns in the registration area and written sign in.....for instance "Registered Working Group that have attended 3 meetings or more".....".Community Members".....address and email or phone number....sometimes a certain group will have people come to our meetings from another



<p>community. A certain group may have their plan well in place as usual, so I would suggest you be ready for that and make sure everyone has a chance to put their views forward. Best of luck.</p>
<p>2. "non-Working Group members who would be invited to observe".</p> <p>What are you afraid of?</p> <p>How dare the RDN insult this community with such a kindergarten set up. You insult the very fabric of this community. Never have I seen this community disrespectful. Never. But you insult us with this kind of nonsense. What are you afraid of? When a director has been elected by less than 18% of the population of Area H, then perhaps he should be more willing to listen to what the people have to say. This is a democracy. We are here to build consensus. What is the RDN here for?</p>
<p>3. You are idiots. WHAT HAPPENED TO DEMOCRACY IN CANADA? You are putting a muzzle on citizens who want to speak about what the RDN is going to do to our community? Will you have the RCMP there to protect yourselves? Screw your comment sheets. LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK. I have contacted the news media and they will be there with camera to let the people see what you are trying to pull off. A big crowd will be there and we know you are afraid of big crowds and the truth. THE TRUTH is...the RDN is attempting to railroad the citizens of Deep Bay. I was here when the BSI lands were ARL lands...and in a backroom deal we ended up with VIU on free land, and the rest of the BSI property was taken out of the ALR.....nice fat deal eh? Well...leave the ocp the way it is and let BSI build according to the layout of our existing OCP. its just that simple.</p> <p>Your socalled "format" is not going to be tolerated in a public meeting of citizens.</p>
<p>4. Deep Bay residents do not have a very effective means of communication because of the refusal by many to allow pamphlets in their mail. Also, I know of no database with complete email addresses for our residents (and of course, some do not have email at all). It will not be possible to inform observers of any restrictions. Therefore, all attendees at the June 7 meeting should be allowed to speak - perhaps with a timer along the line of the one in use at RDN Council meetings.</p>
<p>5. OCP members should attend early for any possible briefing that is needed.</p> <p>This is a good format but I understand possible frustration possibilities.</p> <p>Perhaps a time for 'written' comment or question from non-working group members could be arranged.</p>
<p>6. This is not my idea of democracy. When residents of an area are unable to address a public meeting on concerns over RDN proposals it creates a condition of distrust and anger.</p>
<p>7. This is an extremely elitist attitude to take on the task we've all been involved with. Our working group represents but doesn't dictate to local residents, and to silence those who've made the effort to attend a meeting directly affecting their property and quality of life is an outrageous attempt to control local input. Formulating written sentences is a much different action than speech and is inappropriate for this sort of meeting. To state that locals</p>



"may feel frustrated" (really?!) implies awareness of this slap to the community and is a dictatorial strategy.

8. I too am affronted and greatly disturbed by the dictatorial tone of your correspondence. A couple of points: 1) Area H's RDN director was elected by just a small percentage of eligible voters; he would be unwise to alienate us! 2) Your comments imply that a consensus has been reached that the people of Deep Bay WANT the development you/RDN seem determined to push on us, which is categorically untrue! Be advised that we homeowners are going to do everything in our power to ensure that the largest possible turnout of Deep Bay homeowners will be present at the next meeting - even if you suddenly decide to change the date again! From here on in, Deep Bay homeowners will now be kept abreast of whatever development plans you might have in mind. And homeowners have every right in the world to expect - no, demand - that they will have opportunities to speak their mind on any issue which they consider is important - whether RDN likes it or not! Here in Deep Bay, we older, retired folks still believe in democracy! And we'll fight to keep it that way! Jerry Flynn

9. I don't think there is any other option.

10. To have an effective, efficient meeting conduct as table seating workshop format composed of multiple viewpoints at each table. Past meetings in a town hall type of format tend to segment community groups and become shouting matches with little hope of consensus. We have had past meetings reviewing clustered housing schemes which had good buy in using this type of multi-stake holder table format.

11. The format looks like a workable solution , otherwise the meeting would go on forever and would be hard to control. All the working group meetings to date appear to be building on each other keeping the status quo in Deep Bay on this property is not a viable solution in 2016. We have an opportunity to design a very unique community rather than an area of 5 acre strips laid out in a grid pattern where we will loose all access to the green space and waterfront. Public input should come at the community open house rather than a working group session.