

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013
7:00 PM**

(RDN Board Chambers)

A D D E N D U M

PAGES

LATE DELEGATIONS (Requires Motion)

2 **Jim Crawford**, re Rural Village Centre Study.

3 **Ian MacDonnell**, re Regional Growth Strategy with respect to Deep Bay.

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

4 - 5 **Dave Bartram**, re Rural Village Centre Study.

O'Halloran, Matt

From: Jim Crawford <jcrawford@kwik.net>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 11:30 AM
To: O'Halloran, Matt
Subject: Committee of the Whole
Attachments: Jim Crawford.vcf

Matt, please register us as a delegation to speak at the Committee of the Whole Meeting tomorrow night.

I am the project manager for Baynes Sound Investments on our Deep Bay project.

I will be addressing the Rural Village Study which is on the meeting agenda.

Please e-mail me a confirmation. I've attached my contact info. Thanks. JWC.
Sent on the TELUS Mobility network with BlackBerry

O'Halloran, Matt

Subject: FW: Committee of the Whole meeting March 12 2012 (To be added to the agenda as a delegation)

From: Ian & Sandy MacDonell [<mailto:bowsermac@shaw.ca>]

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 4:18 PM

To: Hill, Jacquie

Cc: Bill Veenhof; O'Halloran, Matt

Subject: Re: Committee of the Whole meeting March 12 2012 (To be added to the agenda as a delegation)

Hello Ms. Hill

The subject of matter I will peak to is the Regional Growth Strategy as it relates to the RGS Update of 2011, the recommendation to receive the Dialog report regarding the RGS update process commenced with this report in 2012 and the staff recommendation as it relates to Deep Bay in the Dialog report to be received on the evening of March 12 at said meeting.

I trust this is satisfactory

Regards

Ian MacDonell

Dave Bartram
4819 Ocean Trail
Bowser BC, VOR 1G0

9 March 2013

Dear RDN Directors

Rural Village Centre Study

During my time as an RDN Director for Electoral Area H, it was my understanding that the Rural Village Centre Study's underlying purpose was to determine which RDN designated Village Centres has the potential to develop to evolve into complete, compact, mixed-use centres that allow people to live, work, play and learn within a walkable environment. In other words to evolve towards self-determination, eventually in the form of incorporation and thereby protect the rural lands outside the Village Centre from urban sprawl. This was not to be a short term goal but a vision and one that would evolve over many years depending to a large extent on the desires of the people of the Village Centre. At least that was my understanding of the purpose of the Rural Village Centre Study when I voted for its approval. I believe the Rural Village Centre Study being presented for the RDN Board's approval is flawed in three critical areas of omission as it addressed the Village Centres in Electoral Area H, and in particular Deep Bay.

The first omission is the Study's stated reason for the inclusion of Deep Bay as a Rural Village Centre. It states that this was "based on direction from the RDN Board in 2011 relating to an application for a proposed mixed-use development in Deep Bay." This is only partially true. During the OCP Review of 2003 many residents of the Deep Bay Area wanted to include Deep Bay as a Village Centre. This request was not addressed as we were at the end of a two year public consultation process and it was deferred to the next update of the Area H OCP. This was then addressed during the initial stages of the Area H Village Centre Plan community development work. The majority of residents from the Deep Bay Area participating in the public consultation process requested that Deep Bay Area be included in the Area H Village Centre Plan review. The Area H Community eventually decided to limit the Village Area Plan to Bowser as it was too difficult and cumbersome to include Dunsmuir, Qualicum Bay, and Deep Bay along with Bowser. As Bowser was the most commercially developed it was chosen by the community to proceed and the Terms of Reference were changed and approved by the RDN Board. Dunsmuir and Qualicum Bay were designated to proceed at a future date and wording was added to the Bowser Village Centre Plan to look at Deep Bay area. The RDN Board adopted the Bowser Village Centre Plan and its inclusion in the OCP which included the statement requested by the Deep Bay residents that Deep Bay be considered as a Rural Village Centre. To suggest that the reason the RDN Board of Directors included Deep Bay because of a proposed development is a fatal flaw. Yes the proposed development presents an opportunity for Deep Bay but there is a process for the RDN Board of Directors to deal with development applications. The inclusion of Deep Bay as a Village Centre has to be based on the purpose of

the study and the desires of the residents living there and not based on a development proposal that has not yet had any RDN Board or public review.

In my view the only purpose a discussion of a proposed development would have on a Deep Bay Village Centre has to do with the opportunity such a development could present to the residents within the boundaries of the proposed Village Centre, such as fire protection, water reservoir, wells, wastewater management, exit roads, environmental protection, community parks, etc. However, these are community amenities that are negotiated by the community and RDN Staff during a Development Application process before the RDN Board of Directors consider approval.

The second issue I have with the report is the exclusion of Deep Bay resident input in the final conclusions. The Report states on page 9 that the project is intended to be “primarily a quantitative study that aspires for a higher degree of objectivity.” Given adequate explanations and opportunities to discuss should it not be the residents of the area and the Area Director and ultimately the RDN Board of Directors that provides the “higher degree of objectivity”? If the exclusion of the residents’ input is not considered or even intended to be part of the RVC Study and given at least equal weight to the other factors then one would wonder how any Rural Village Centre in the world ever moved forward to self-determination.

Finally, and probably the most important flaw in the “quantitative study,” is the designated boundaries of a proposed Village Centre in Deep Bay. The boundaries proposed in the study did not include those areas known as “The Spit,” “Kopina Estates”, and “Lighthouse Estates (areas on either side of Jamieson Road and part of the Deep Bay Improvement District.)” These areas are integral to Deep Bay and considered by the majority to be Deep Bay. The approximate populations are 50, 100, and 700 respectively. As stated on Page 16 of the Final Evaluation Report, “The importance of the boundary locations cannot be understated as they strongly impact baseline results, particularly as they relate to urban structure measures.” The non-inclusion of these areas results in an incorrect assessment in every category investigated and therefore makes the RVC Study Report assessment of Deep Bay invalid. I personally do not understand how any meaningful Rural Village Centre conclusion of Bowser/Deep Bay area can be made without including these areas.

From my perspective these three flaws in the Area H portion of the Rural Village Study, especially the conclusions drawn regarding Deep Bay are flawed and need further review/refinement before this report is accepted by the RDN Board of Directors.



Dave Bartram