

## **Area F APC Minutes**

Date: 18 Feb 2013

Time: 7 PM

**MINUTES** of the Electoral Area F Advisory Planning Commission held on the above noted date and time at Honeymoon Bay Community Centre Meeting Room (aka Dining Room)

### **PRESENT:**

Chairperson: Sharon Devana

Vice-Chairperson: Joe Allan

Secretary: TBD

Members: Phil Archbold, Bill Bakkan, Peter Devana, Mary Lowther & Susan Restall

### **ALSO present:**

Director: Not available

Alternate Director - Dave Darling

Guests: Alison Garnett CVRD Staff - Planning Dept.

**Absent** – Bob Restall

The Chair, Sharon Devana called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM

### **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:**

It was Moved and Seconded that the minutes of the Area F APC meeting of 25 June 2012 be accepted.

Motion carried

### **ORDER OF BUSINESS:**

#### **Item 1 – Election of new Area F APC Officers**

In the absence of Area F Director Ian Morrison, Alternate Director Dave Darling called for nominations for Area F APC Chairperson.

Joe Allen nominated Sharon Devana, Phil Archbold seconded. There were no further nominations and **Sharon Devana was acclaimed Chairperson until the next election.**

Dave Darling then called for nominations for Vice Chairperson.

Peter Devana nominated Joe Allan seconded by Phil Archbold. There were no further nominations and **Joe Allan was acclaimed Vice Chairperson until the next election.**

Dave Darling called for nominations for Secretary.

Mary Lowther nominated Peter Devana seconded by Joe Allan. There were no further nominations and **Peter Devana was acclaimed Secretary until the next election.**

**Item 2 – Area E Proposed Revisions for their OCP 1490 amending bylaws 3680 & 3681 - Area F APC  
Comments & Recommendations**

**Note:** Prior to this discussion Alison Garnett was asked to clarify certain things:

1. Why are we being asked to comment on these amendments to the Area E OCP 1490?

Answer- Because the north eastern corner of Area F is included in the Area E OCP and therefore may be affected by these new Bylaws.

2. What is the status of this part of Area E/F?

Answer – It is in Area F but is also included in the Area E OCP.

3. Do you want us to comment on the entire Bylaw 3680 & 3681 or just specific clauses?

Answer – The specific clauses and policies that apply to this part of Area F.

4. Do you want general or specific comments.

Answer – Both

With those clarifications resolved, Alison explained to all, with the use of small scale maps, the area of concern (thereafter referred to as the “Sliver”) and the potential concerns to Area F.

She wanted to determine if we were supportive of these amendments as to how they might effect Area F.

## **Discussion**

Joe Allan initiated the discussion by questioning whether Wet Land Development Permits (Bylaw 3680 Policy 14.12) would apply to Area F, even this “Sliver,” which is defined as the common area in question. Answer was NO.

Joe then queried about the proposed Caretaker building that is being planned for the Chemainus River Park, which has been a victim of vandalism. If it is in Area F, are we in agreement to allowing the cabin to be built? The consensus was YES as long as it's built in the correct area closest to the problem. If the logical location for the caretaker's cabin is in Area F we would agree to the required rezoning for this purpose.

Joe next raised the question of Social Sustainability and Amenities (Bylaw 3681 Policy 7.11).

After a lengthy discussion by all members the following Motion was made and seconded:

**Motion : Area F APC requests that the Area E “Social Sustainability” Policies NOT apply to that portion of Area F that is in question ie “The Sliver”**

**Carried**

## **Amendment 3680 Discussion**

The entire Amendment was discussed with comments made on:

- \* Policy 4.2.1 –it doesn't apply to the “Sliver” area in question;
- \* Policy 7.10 – it doesn't apply now but will if the Paldi proposal goes through;
- \* Policy 13.2 Does apply to Area F “Sliver”;and
- \* Policy 14.12 does NOT apply to Area F.

## **Amendment 3681 Discussion**

The entire amendment was discussed in detail.

No specific concerns or comments were made with this “house keeping” amendment, however; Area F members came to a general consensus and recommendation that:

The negativity contained in both amendments (3680 & 3681) seems to be very restrictive in nature and could be improved by changing all negative wording to positive terminology that would be more inviting to future development proposals, other-wise prospective future opportunities could be lost by “first impressions” created by the negative restrictions currently depicted in these proposed amendments.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration and further action.

## **New Business**

### **Item 1 - Need for more Area F APC members**

Sharon informed attendees that since several people have recently tendered their resignations we need to consider recruiting new members in regions of Area F where we don't currently have representation.

It was agreed by the members that if we found any possible recruits we should forward their names to our Director for his further action, possible approval, and appointment.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business a motion was made for adjournment and seconded.

**Carried**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM**

Signed (Certified Authentic),  
Peter N Devana  
Secretary

## **Copies to:**

Area F APC members  
Electoral Area Services committee [ds@cvrld.bc.ca](mailto:ds@cvrld.bc.ca)

cc to CVRD Planner Alison Garnett  
cc to Area F Director Ian Morrison  
cc to Alternate Director Dave Darling