



Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee Minutes of Special Meeting

Date:	Saturday, November 4, 2017
Location:	Lions Club, Hart Bradley Memorial Hall 103 Bonnet Avenue, Salt Spring Island, BC
Members Present	Peter Luckham, Chair Peter Grove, Local Trustee George Grams, Local Trustee
Staff Present	Stefan Cermak, Regional Planning Manager (RPM) Jason Youmans, Island Planner Seth Wright, Planner 2 Jaime Dubyna, Planner 1
Media and Others Present:	Pat Maloney, Dillon Consulting Heather Shay, Dillon Consulting Dan Godin, Dillon Consulting Wayne McIntyre, Salt Spring Island CRD Electoral Area Director Matt Steffich, Chair, CRD Ganges Harbourwalk Steering Committee Robin Williams, Chair, CRD Transportation Commission Six (6) Vancouver Island University School of Planning students Gulf Islands Driftwood Reporter Approximately 140 members of the public

These minutes follow the order of the agenda although the sequence may have varied.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Luckham called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. He introduced himself, the Trustees and staff and acknowledged that the Local Trust Committee is meeting within Coast Salish Territory and expressed his gratitude.

Questions of clarification related to the format of the meeting were asked by the audience.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

By general consent the agenda was approved.

3. INTRODUCTION

Pat Maloney introduced herself and provided an overview of the purpose of the afternoon's meeting and how it was scheduled to unfold.

Planner Youmans provided an overview of the Local Trust Committee's Ganges Harbourwalk planning project. He described the objectives of the project and work done to date. He provided an overview of proposed Bylaw No. 491 which has been created as an incentive to property owners adjacent to the Harbourwalk.

Questions of clarification were asked by audience regarding recent developments regarding the Ganges Harbourwalk project.

Matt Steffich, Chair of the CRD Ganges Harbourwalk Steering Committee provided an update on the Steering Committee's activities which include four studies currently underway related to the Harbourwalk: archaeological, geotechnical, structural and environmental.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

There was discussion and the following comments were noted:

- A member of the public asked what sort of First Nations consultation has been undertaken. Staff described First Nations engagement efforts undertaken to date. It was noted that while responding First Nations were generally supportive of reviving the Harbourwalk using the existing infrastructure, they did not support increased upland development.
- A member of the public suggested that no Harbourwalk was better than a commercialized Harbourwalk area. Staff noted that public support for the Harbourwalk has been established, and that the day's discussion was exclusively about what form of development is appropriate adjacent to the Harbourwalk.
- A member of the public asked who would be liable in the event new development was subject to flooding resulting from climate change. Staff noted that flood hazard mapping was provided on all tables and that this would form part of the workshop later in the day.
- A member of the public asked who has been paying for studies associated with the Harbourwalk project. Staff noted that the flood hazard mapping was part of a CRD-wide initiative. Archaeological, seismic, geotechnical and environmental assessments related to reuse of the existing Harbourwalk infrastructure are being funded by the CRD.
- A member of the public asked whether Islands Trust has assessed the amenity value of completion of the Ganges Harbourwalk relative to the increased value to the properties adjacent if they are rezoned. Staff indicated that such an appraisal has not yet been undertaken pending finalization of the zone to be offered the upland properties.
- A member of the public commented that the proposal provided by the Ganges Marina was beyond the scope of the Official Community Plan and out of scale with Salt Spring.
- A member of the public asked why a statutory right-of-way (SROW) can't be secured. Staff stated that a 2005 letter concerning the Ganges Harbourwalk from Crown Lands BC says that Crown Lands will not authorize an SROW through an area leased to another party without that party's consent.

- A member of the public asked what sort of environmental studies had been undertaken to date. Staff noted that the CRD was in the midst of undertaking an environmental study related to Harbourwalk construction. No environmental studies had yet been undertaken concerning upland development, but that the LTC may consider such as the project advances.
- A comment was made that the density shown in the plans submitted by Ganges Marina is “not Salt Spring.” Staff indicated that the purpose of the day’s meeting is to create dialogue about what the community wants to see. It was emphasized that no application is on the table, and that the Local Trust Committee is seeking the community’s advice on what form of development is appropriate on the upland.
- A member of the public asked what traffic and parking studies have been undertaken to date. Staff responded that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure responded to proposed Bylaw 491 that they did not have any concerns. Staff stated that any development proposed on the subject lots would be required to comply with the parking requirements of the Land Use Bylaw unless special variance was granted. Staff suggested that advancement of bylaws to increase density and intensity may warrant further investigation of traffic impacts.
- A member of the public asked whether the LTC would defer further advancement of the Ganges Harbourwalk project until after the next election. The Chair stated that the trustees are present and have heard the comment.
- A member of the Salt Spring Island Farmers Institute reiterated that Farmers Institute’s commitment to using its land to provide Harbourwalk access provided the concerns it has raised in past correspondence to the LTC are addressed.
- A member of the community asked why there is no First Nations representation on the CRD’s Harbourwalk Steering Committee. A member of the steering committee indicated that an application for steering committee membership has been received by the committee, but the committee has not yet met to consider it.
- A former member of the Salt Spring Island Farmers Institute offered clarification on comments made previously concerning the Farmers Institute position on Harbourwalk completion.
- A comment was made that the waterfront is not an “embarrassment” or “eyesore” that needs fixing. A comment was made that local government effort would be better spent on addressing concerns about potable water, roads, and sidewalks.
- A comment was made expressing concern about rezoning the waterfront for increased development. Trustee Grove reminded the audience that purpose of the meeting was to determine what should happen on the foreshore and what community members see as acceptable.
- A comment was made by an owner of land adjacent to the proposed Harbourwalk that they want to see the Harbourwalk completed while getting something in return for their compromised riparian rights. They expressed their commitment to attractive, green development.

- A comment was made that an audience member would like the LTC to stop spending tax dollars on the advancement of this project. Staff offered that the community signaled its support for the Harbourwalk through previous engagement processes and that the purpose of today's meeting is to gauge community perspective on upland development.

A recess was called by the Chair at 2:04.

The meeting was reconvened at 2:17.

5. GANGES HARBOURWALK COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Seven (7) tables with approximately 12 members of the public at each table discussed a range of issues related to development of the upland adjacent to the proposed route of the Ganges Harbourwalk. Following approximately 1 hour of discussion, the table hosts reported out.

Trustee Grams left the meeting at 2:45 pm.

Table 1: Host Pat Maloney

Pat reported that her table was generally in support of a Harbourwalk, but did not support significant development on the foreshore, nor the filling in of the foreshore. They did not think that a Harbourwalk at the cost of this development was a good idea. They understood that the landowners had certain development rights under the current zoning. They felt that a short term solution would be a sidewalk on Lower Ganges Road. The participants also indicated that any upzoning of the subject lots should be a developer driven initiative and not a project of the LTC initiative. There was agreement that if the community felt the Harbourwalk was such a good idea, they could fundraise to construct, but they felt very strongly that the Statutory Right-of-Way should be provided to the community and that the LTC should push CRD and the province to gain that Statutory Right-of-Way.

Table 2: Host Heather Shay

Heather reported that her group was largely in favour of completing the Harbourwalk as it was designed by the consultant hired approximately 1.5 years ago, but not at any cost, and were not in favour of further development on the subject properties or foreshore. They do not wish to see intensification of the existing land use, although some were open to permitting small scale seasonal temporary commercial operations, such as removable carts. Moving forward they would like to see consideration and incorporation of First Nations history and culture into the Harbourwalk, as well as the connections to the ocean environment, perhaps in the form of interpretive plaques and authentic sculptural elements.

Table 3: Host Jaime Dubyna

Jaime report that several of her table guests were strongly against upland development and expressed interest in developing a park with landscaping, and no further development of buildings (aside from existing buildings). Others, however, were supportive of upland development and felt that a 2-storey (commercial 1st floor and residential 2nd floor) would really add to Ganges. Those who favoured some form of development were interested in retaining space between buildings to allow a view and a community park area. There was concern about

the fill, and development on it. Jaime's group also really felt strongly about re-naturalizing the fill area. The Bamfield boardwalk was cited as a good example.

Table 4: Host Peter Luckham

Peter reported that retention of the viewscape was important to his group – the maintenance of an uninterrupted view from road level. He stated that his group was not interested in a commercial component to facilitate Harbourwalk development, and that they wanted to provide access to the water in the least impactful way. The Crofton boardwalk was referenced as an example.

Table 5: Host Seth Wright

Seth reported that there was a consensus among table participants that the Harbourwalk would be a valuable community amenity, but should be non-commercial in nature, minimize impact on the marine ecosystem, be paired with restoration of the shoreline, and not permit a greater level of upland development than currently permitted by the existing zones. Some individuals felt that the LTC should lobby the Province and the CRD to more robustly explore the possibility of expropriation of the upland properties to support a more natural amenity orientation. There was also a significant amount of concern that the Harbourwalk should be oriented to serve island residents, rather than to encourage additional tourism, which may be approaching capacity at present.

Table 6: Host Dan Godin

Dan reported that there was little to no support at his table for development with a greater height/density than currently exists. His table concluded that a sidewalk is needed on Lower Ganges Road to create a better public environment. His table believed that access to the water, not just to the Harbourwalk, needs to be secured. There was an appetite for the Islands Trust and land owners to work closely with First Nations on the design of any future Harbourwalk-related development. Participants at Dan's table also expressed a desire to see the shore area re-naturalized.

Table 7: Host Jason Youmans

Jason's table was concerned about the LTC proactively increasing development potential of the upland properties when other downtown land owners have had to pay to rezone their lots. They wished to see Harbourwalk development made a separate issue from changes to upland development. Put the policies in place that would guide future development, but let the land owners come with their own proposals. There was some support at the table for modest development of the filled shoreline portion, but that the community could benefit from detailed images showing the form and character of what the area could like if sensitively developed. Two table members suggested that redevelopment of the shoreline should require buildings of the highest energy and water efficiency standards possible.

6. FINAL THOUGHTS, THANKS and NEXT STEPS

Chair Luckham thanked the participants for their interest and participation and advised them to check future Local Trust Committee meeting agendas for a follow-up report on the day's event from Dillon Consulting and further discussion at the Local Trust Committee table.

7. ADJOURNMENT

By general consent the meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

Peter Luckham, Chair

Certified Correct:

Jason Youmans, Recorder