

**Minutes of an Official Community Plan Advisory Committee held in the City Hall Council Chambers, Courtenay B.C., on Thursday, May 13, 2021 at 12:00 p.m.**

**Attending:**

**Chair:** Norman Carruthers: Economic Development  
**Deputy Chair:** Betty Donaldson: Seniors and Older Adult  
**Members:** Tanis Gower: Environmental Stewardship  
Erin Nowak: Environmental Stewardship  
Lindsay McGinn: Health and Social Services including Housing  
Sheena Campbell: Health and Social Services including Housing  
Derek Constantino: Development Community  
Don Ferguson: Arts and Culture  
Sheila McDonnell: Health and Social Services including Housing  
Dianne Hawkins: Business Community  
Tom Dishelvoy: Development Community

**Regrets:** Bob Wells, Mayor  
Garry Renkema: Development Community  
Annelies Henckel: Youth and Young Adult  
Charlotte Kimmins: Youth and Young Adult

**Staff:** Tatsuyuki Setta, Manager of Community and Sustainability Planning  
Nancy Gothard, Policy Planner  
Ian Buck, Director of Development Services (part way through meeting)

**CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOMING REMARKS**

**1.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**1.1 Adopt January 21, 2021 OCP Advisory Committee meeting minutes**

Moved by McDonnell and seconded by Gower that the Committee adopt the January 21, 2021 OCP Advisory Committee meeting minutes.

Carried

**2.00 INTRODUCTION OF LATE ITEMS**

**3.00 STAFF REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS**

<b>.01</b> PRESENTATION – OCP PROJECT STATUS - NANCY GOTHARD, POLICY PLANNER, CITY OF COURTENAY 8000-01	The presentation provided an overview of project status, policy framework and amended project timeline facilitated by Nancy Gothard, Policy Planner, City of Courtenay.
--	---

<p>NORM CARRUTHERS</p>	<p>Re: point of order.</p> <p>Norm Carruthers asked if anyone on the Advisory Committee no longer wished to serve given that the timeline for the project will exceed the originally estimated timeline of 16 months. Some members indicated that so long as the project does not extend more than an additional 6 months, that they will remain on the Committee. All members in attendance agreed to remain on the Committee.</p> <p>Norm Carruthers asked if anyone on the Advisory Committee wished a reelection of the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee given that the Terms of Reference indicate that the Chair and Deputy Chair shall be elected annually. All members in attendance supported the existing Chair and Deputy Chair appointments for the remainder of the Advisory Committee term.</p>
<p>NORM CARRUTHERS</p>	<p>In the following discussion on staff’s presentation, the Chair asked that the members formulate their responses around the questions of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The most critical factor/issue in your representative sector</li> <li>2. Key issue you see that has yet to be resolved</li> <li>3. Biggest danger to final adoption of the new OCP</li> </ol>
<p>TANIS GOWER</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Critical factor in environmental sector is restoration. How we will implement is a question still outstanding.</li> <li>➤ Key issue that remains to be resolved is how environmental policies will be able to keep up alongside the extreme pressure of growth right now. There is a lot of work to implement these policies.</li> <li>➤ Biggest danger to the work is the competition of the OCP goals with intense development pressure.</li> </ul>
<p>DIANNE HAWKINS</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Economic section looks overall quite good.</li> <li>➤ In our stakeholder session discussed the multitude of issues affecting businesses – housing and social. This is an expanded range of topics from traditional business considerations.</li> </ul>
<p>LINDSAY MCGINN</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Can see stakeholder feedback being incorporated – thank you.</li> <li>➤ Critical factor in social/community wellbeing sector is using simplified language to ensure the document is accessible. An equity lens would suggest this is required. Another critical factor is the need for a social planner function.</li> <li>➤ Key issues to be resolved: The timeline in Part A of the document is problematic – conveys only colonial story; equity lens means that we should be ensuring meetings can accommodate all members (e.g. youth couldn’t attend because in school/working); tension between vibrant spaces and how those spaces will be used if there is a lack of community support for those experiencing vulnerabilities in our community.</li> <li>➤ Biggest danger to the work is the time and resources to implement the plan while also moving at the ‘speed of trust’ to do this work truly collaboratively, with attention on including harder to reach voices.</li> </ul>

DEREK CONSTANTINO	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Overall the document appears fundamentally sound. Beyond the topics that relate specifically to development, the work looks well done. However, I have an extreme feeling of unease in the disconnect, even naivety, I see between the construction realities and the document. Admittedly my perspective is that the market can solve most issues so I feel that the City needs to allow the market to build more, to get out of the way to allow this to happen.</li> <li>➤ The impression I have is that the City is not zoning any more dirt, that the timeline to get development approvals is too long and the costs so high that this is a real problem.</li> </ul>
ERIN NOWAK	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Can see stakeholder feedback being incorporated – thank you.</li> <li>➤ Critical factor in the environmental sector is looking at nature beyond jurisdictional boundaries, particularly the watershed and regional scale. Pleased to see attention to systems and functions of ecosystems. However, concerned that there is a huge disconnect between local government policy timelines and development timelines that will make this work challenging to implement.</li> <li>➤ Key issue is cumulative impacts on watersheds, especially given the fast pace of development. Want more dialogs and workshops with development sector so we can work more collaboratively. There is more detailed work that the City is working on, that we need to work together on: Integrated Rainwater Management Plan, Subdivision &amp; Development Servicing Bylaw.</li> <li>➤ Danger is that there have been many months since the public has seen this work. Need to get this information to public, use smaller groups like the neighbourhood walkshops. And simplify the language to make accessible.</li> </ul>
DON FERGUSON	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Critical factor in arts and culture sector is that housing is the most critical factor.</li> <li>➤ The language looks similar to other OCPs – I can accept that is the industry standard.</li> <li>➤ Am concerned about inter-regional transportation at the announcement that Greyhound will no longer be operational.</li> <li>➤ Key issue is indigenous involvement. Concerned this lens is not strong. And certain equity groups not well represented: LGBTQ, Youth.</li> <li>➤ Danger is that it takes so long to adopt the plan that information in them becomes outdated.</li> </ul>
SHEILA MCDONNELL	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Will send in comments separately after more review. Did not have time for as much review as would like to dedicate.</li> <li>➤ Language feels opaque. Feel that it needs to sound alarm bells. This is a climate emergency OCP. Need to really get the message across and ensure this is a document that people will access regularly.</li> <li>➤ The School District could be mobilized. Partnership opportunities. E.g. fleet.</li> <li>➤ We are living with the legacy of some bad developments in the past. We need to ensure that we don't create new poor legacies.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I think alternative scenarios may be an appropriate way of looking at future projections. E.g. have heard that population increases may be much higher than anticipated.</li> </ul>
SHEENA CAMPBELL	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Tone feels a bit troubling. E.g. the paragraph on ‘what is an OCP’ talks about at the heart it being about ‘managing land use and physical growth’, but at the heart it should be about community-wellbeing. OCPs historically have overly reflected development interests, equity lens means genuinely incorporating more voices and interests.</li> <li>➤ Critical factor in the social/community wellbeing sector is income inequality. The City has limited authority on that, but can ensure that services are accessible to all.</li> <li>➤ Key issue is the need for a social planner. Need dedicated attention as we see the increase in intersection of inequities.</li> <li>➤ Danger is this sector not being at the table to include these views. Feels being at the table is a great step compared to the past.</li> <li>➤ Timeline of old photos in Part A reinforces dominant culture and that can be alienating to those who do not identify with this. Is a red flag for me.</li> <li>➤ Other danger is the ability to re-direct staff and work programs to these new ways of doing things, new priorities. Appreciate that change management processes are not easy and take dedication.</li> </ul>
BETTY DONALDSON	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Critical issue for seniors is long term care projects. The paper recently had a story on issues with two of our local facilities. This topic needs more attention.</li> <li>➤ Happy to see more use of visuals in the document. But where is the long term care facilities in the renderings? I should be able to see ‘myself’ living in one of these centres. I strongly support the network of neighbourhood and urban centres as a growth model, but I don’t see seniors explicitly in the visions yet.</li> <li>➤ Danger is affordability vs accessibility, and the fact that time for implementation was yesterday.</li> </ul>
NORM CARRUTHERS	<p>Acknowledged that Ian Buck, Director of Development Services joined the meeting.</p>
TOM DISHLEVOY	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The language so far feels very vague. Need more actionable language (away from ‘promote, support’ etc). Concerned that any of these green directions will never be implemented.</li> <li>➤ The document has lots of great ideas, but it’s the private sector that develops so City has to get out of the way of their ability to do that.</li> <li>➤ There is so much information in this document – too much. “a week’s worth of reading”. Too many graphics. We’re going to lose people. Need a document that Council can read in an evening that clearly outlines why we’re doing this, why leadership is needed, and key actionable policy.</li> </ul>

<p>NORM CARRUTHERS</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ From an economic development sector, it's important to realize that local governments have a limited role and their efforts are difficult to measure. It's a nebulous topic for a local government, but it's important for the OCP to reflect the spirit of the community and vision. Let people work out the details.</li> <li>➤ A key issue is the tension of the use of actionable words. Too many can lead to scope creep of a local government who does not have the resources.</li> <li>➤ Overall I appreciate this OCP is looking similar to other OCPs and I have comfort in where it's going. But would like to see the document flow more.</li> <li>➤ Danger is that the document becomes too big, too cumbersome and that linkages are lost. I like the idea of a top 10 implementation list.</li> <li>➤ The Advisory Committee could offer perspectives on implementation.</li> </ul>
<p>DEREK CONSTANTINO</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A point of clarification – it seems that there's a misnomer that the development industry doesn't want to build affordable housing, or work towards the vision the OCP provides. That is not true.</li> <li>➤ I think what we're seeing is an effort to merge socialized ideas into a market economy. This is a challenging task.</li> <li>➤ Remember that money will flow to where its easiest to do business.</li> <li>➤ We could be marrying more the development community with these topics.</li> </ul>
<p>IAN BUCK</p>	<p>Don asked asked Ian Buck some clarifying questions: what is purpose of this document? In Arts Council we have a strategic plan and an operational plan. What blend of this is the OCP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Other than Development Permit Areas, most other policies are to guide other City work and processes. The implementation of an OCP is a long process and requires a lot of resources. The Advisory Committee could identify what the priorities are from their perspective.</li> </ul>
<p>DEREK CONSTANTINO</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Electric vehicle trend is huge. Have to make sure that the charging infrastructure is in place.</li> </ul>
<p>SHEENA CAMPBELL</p>	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Electric vehicles are only marginally better environmentally. There is environmental impact in the creation of even electricity, and vehicles themselves. Important to bear in mind that what we do now has implications 10, 20 years from now. Let's ensure we're enacting policies that do no harm in those timelines.</li> </ul>
<p>BETTY DONALDSON</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ On transportation, would like to point out that seniors facilities can and do offer shuttle services.</li> <li>➤ A question for Ian: how different is the existing OCP from the proposed one. What is the implementation rate?</li> </ul>

IAN BUCK	<p>In answer to Betty’s question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The existing OCP reflects a different time with different planning focus and priorities. Now, local governments are tasked with including topics that are being ‘silently downloaded’ to them. Local governments need more funding to be able to address these new emerging responsibilities.</li> <li>➤ We have not tracked the implementation rate of the previous OCP. But monitoring will be important for this OCP, we can do better at that moving forward.</li> </ul>
ERIN NOWAK	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The cardinal directions are good, but the emergency of these issues is not communicated. Need simplified language on why this OCP is different. There is a lot of detailed language. Make it more front and centre.</li> <li>➤ The KFN engagement feels disingenuous. Information from a website does not feel respectful. Don’t include the information if we can’t honor it properly. There are opportunities for linking KFN history to the climate emergency – e.g. the story of Queneesh and how the glacier is melting.</li> </ul>
TOM DISHLEVOY	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Keep hearing threads of connectivity are needed to be stronger. Need to communicate somehow that when one pulls on one ‘thread’ of policy that it connects to other topics. E.g. autonomous vehicles are connected to health/environmental health outcomes because they are safer, allow for narrower roads.</li> <li>➤ The works feels like it’s in silos. This is traditional way of doing this. We need to find better more connected way.</li> <li>➤ Need 3-4 page document that you can read in 10 minutes. And it needs to direct staff to work on these items immediately.</li> </ul>
TANIS GOWER	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I have layout comments that I’ll share separately to assist with reducing redundancies, focusing message.</li> </ul>
NORM CARRUTHERS	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We should strive for consensus on overall ‘do-able/workable’ nature of the OCP. But not trying to get consensus on details. We can individually identify key challenges and technical items in the Council report.</li> </ul>
DON FERGUSON	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Also have layout comments and will share. We’re trying to espouse ecological values and yet the document has a lot of big colourful photos. This is a waste if we’re printing. The minutes from last time we met show that we were talking about a coles notes. Not seeing that happen. Have to rely more on the appendix for this information.</li> <li>➤ Reminding that I got sold on this project because we were told it would be a different OCP.</li> <li>➤ Agree that if we can’t engage with indigenous populations effectively, that the document should acknowledge that this work didn’t happen and needs to happen.</li> </ul>

BETTY DONALDSON	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Graphically, would like to see more images of the estuary, is connected to KFN values.</li> </ul>
TOM DISHLEVOY	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The housing/buildings chapters are seriously underwhelming. There are not enough points included. Needs more detail. Is far from existing standards that other communities are doing.</li> </ul>
NORM CARRUTHERS	<p>Asked the members to share a round of concluding remarks.</p>
DON FERGUSON	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Overall is great work.</li> <li>➤ However a paradigm shift is needed. Away from boiler plate work. The info gets tighter and tighter with each revision (good) but the document in the process becomes more bland.</li> <li>➤ How can we have it all? A sexy fun document with sufficient justification and background? I will consider it a failure if it looks like all the other mid-size BC communities OCPs.</li> </ul>
DEREK CONSTANTINO	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ More graphics are needed. Agree that a graphic designer should be employed, not an urban design firm. If we're going to do it, do it properly.</li> <li>➤ Can't afford to keep delaying this work so let's get this done.</li> <li>➤ And don't forget that developers are not the "big bad".</li> </ul>
LINDSAY MCGINN	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I think it's ok to be honest, genuine and vulnerable about not being able to engage indigenous populations sufficiently. Let's name this and work towards it.</li> </ul>
DIANNE HAWKINS	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Have learned so much from this discussion. Am touched by how much we all care, the passion. We still have a lot of work to do. I don't disagree with any of the comments.</li> <li>➤ The language is overly wordy and flowery, that needs to change. I'm willing to spend more time on this to get more input.</li> <li>➤ I like the idea of framing as a strategic plan and an operational plan.</li> <li>➤ Agree more indigenous perspective needed.</li> </ul>
TANIS GOWER	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Can see the pieces coming together. It will be very important how everything is integrated and how it looks. I'm happy to help.</li> </ul>
SHEENA CAMPBELL	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I appreciate that City is working with KFN through a separate engagement process, but we need to know more about this otherwise we're operating in the dark on this.</li> <li>➤ Document feels like it's written by 15 people, that there's no flow. I did like seeing some very accessible language though, like 'delightful' being used.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The document reads as though we're going to do all this great stuff for the community, and then we're going to do some stuff "for them". Feels as though being truly inclusive and working on equity is not at the core of how the City works.</li> <li>➤ This process is marrying a number of perspectives, but more to be done.</li> </ul>
ERIN NOWAK	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We're here to work in partnership with developers. Our nature is our asset and is a marketable asset for developers.</li> <li>➤ It's too bad this Advisory Committee process won't go on after the OCP as it's very productive and useful to hear all the perspectives.</li> <li>➤ I do believe that staff genuinely want to uphold our expectations.</li> </ul>
BETTY DONALDSON	<p>Posed some questions back to the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Can we identify the urban indigenous population that has not been engaged?</li> <li>➤ Can we leverage the fundraising spirit of our community to achieve these goals through collective effort?</li> </ul>
TOM DISHLEVOY	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Housing affordability needs to be framed as a matter of public/subsidized housing. If the public controls that housing, we can ensure high standards and not put as much pressure on the market to deliver. Would really like to see a housing authority.</li> </ul>
SHEILA MCDONNELL	<p>Discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The discussion now has to focus on implementation moving forward.</li> <li>➤ We all have passion for a livable and inclusive community.</li> <li>➤ Both a short term and long term plan and actions are needed.</li> </ul>

### **3.00 EXTERNAL REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION**

### **4.00 INTERNAL REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION**

### **5.00 ESTABLISH DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**.01** ESTABLISH DATE OF NEXT MEETING                      Moved by Donaldson and seconded by Hawkins that a motion to establish a date for the next meeting be postponed, and that staff liaise with the Committee to establish the next meeting via email.  
**Carried**

### **6.00 NEW BUSINESS**

### **8.00 ADJOURNMENT**



**.01**

Moved by McGinn and seconded by Donaldson that the meeting  
now adjourn at 2:20 p.m.

**Carried**

**CERTIFIED CORRECT**

---

**Recording Secretary**

**Adopted this 18<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

---

**Chair**