

**Meeting District of Sechelt with Sechelt Community/Ratepayers Associations
Monday, November 14, 2007 at Library Committee Room**

Chair: Doug Smith

Unofficial SCAF Minutes

Minutes by SCAF Secretary, Bob D'Arcy

1. Call to Order at 6:58 PM

- a. Opening Remarks by Chair, Doug Smith – Welcomed all and reminded all that courtesy and good manners should be the rule. (Brief interruption by Steeves correcting Smith for slip of tongue when he used SCAF to describe meeting)
 - i. Round table introduction of all attendees (see list following)
- b. Opening remarks by Mayor Reid – Welcomed all and expressed the importance of meetings such as these and we were here to elect a chair

2. Call for additions to agenda

- a. DoS – road salt
- b. Tuwanek – status of Spit proposal and Tuwanek Hotel appeal

3. Items for Discussion (Time is given to show length of discussion)

Proponent	#	Time	Question or Issue
DoS	1	7:04	Chairmanship of the Council/SCAF meetings (Councillor Shanks) Expressed that he was perturbed that Herz was not Chair but that SCAF had just put Doug Smith up to be Chair. It was explained that Herz had left and someone had to do the job. When asked what he would like to have done he did not seem to have an answer or suggestion. Gallant made a motion to appoint Smith but Steeves said that was a nomination and not a motion. A call for nominations was made and DoS nominated Ken Matheson who declined. Shanks nominated Ware but he declined. Gallant nominated and D'Arcy seconded the nomination of Smith, amended to a 6 month appointment. On a show of hands this was carried with Shanks against.
Davis Bay	2	7:17	A discussion on being up to speed on the DOS Long Term Capital Plans. Steeves wanted to know why there seemed to be no feed back when items were submitted for the Long Term Capital budget. Would be good to see if it "is in the works or ignored". Matheson described how West Sechelt had a similar issue but had asked for and had received a long letter itemizing the status of each issue the WS had raised. He was happy with the result at this point. This revealed that no one else receives such treatment. A show of hands also revealed that many associations had not received any letter in the spring or summer of 2007 calling for submissions to the Budget. Brown contradicted those associations and said that the package had been sent to all. The associations reiterated their position clearly. Brown continued that Council sees the association lists but that he and Planning just cherry picked items and made up a list that they could submit to council. He knew that associations wanted to lobby for their items. Mayor Reid said that DoS needed input from the associations and therefore they should be asked and also get some advice about the status of items. He also declared that lobbying by associations was

			<p>proper and expected. He emphasized that DoS had to respond. Ware asked the point of the associations being asked if they never can see what happens to their requests.</p> <p>Steeves and others expressed that they were not really interested in the 'big package' but those items for their area.</p> <p>Thirkell said that as a councillor he would like to see a condensed list of the 'wants' of the associations as it would assist him in the budget process.</p> <p>Settled that DoS will undertake to give some sort of feedback to submissions by the associations and report to council as to how this would be undertaken.</p>
SCAF	3	7:45	<p>Rerouting of Highway 101 in the Village and the problems at Wharf –The Mayor advised that the DoT plan was rejected for the one way street system. An alternate with 2 left turn lanes at Wharf was being worked upon but it presented issues with the diagonal parking on Wharf. Poole advised that a meeting had been held with the SDBA to review and alternates that allow for only parallel parking but with some off street parking may be possible. The bypass was not possible now and is not on the DoT radar as they do not see Sechelt as having traffic issues. Suggested that lobbying of the Provincial authorities 'might' have results.</p>
SCAF	4	7:52	<p>Visioning – Implementation/next phase – describe in detail the process and timetable. Harvey explained that the associations saw the adoption of this program as critical and specifically steps to see that it was followed as best as could practicably be done.</p> <p>Mayor advised that the planner from Whistler had been here to advise on implementation and funds had been set aside to develop the implementation process but it might be some years in the making.</p> <p>Inkster expressed his concerns should the plan be just shelved.</p> <p>Steeves said some of it was so costly or that private property was involved so that it could never be done. It was explained that it was a "guide to what could be" and even private property might be affected by zoning and such.</p> <p>Shanks and Poole advised that a brochure was in process for developers so they could see how they should plan things and the Planning department were preparing other guidelines fitting the Visioning idea.</p>
SCAF	5	8:00	<p>Explore feedback on referrals and on agreements (as well) which affect the community – can we get anything? Harrington reminded council that this item had come up at prior meetings and still there seemed to be no process for associations to hear anything about the impact of their responses to referrals. Further, staff time was wasted as the referrals were so lacking in information that associations had to take up staff time to get the barest of detail. This call was echoed by Matheson, Steeves, Harvey, and Gallant. Gallant made the further point that properties adjacent to a development were not even getting notices and the associations had to give residents a 'heads up'.</p> <p>Brown acknowledged that important and useful information came back from the associations but then said that associations got the referrals as a 'favour' since there was not need to advise them of anything.</p> <p>Thirkell felt that all residents within an area affected, as set out in the OCP, should get a notice of items.</p>

			<p>Janisch felt that not only were responses important from DoS but that the associations should have an opportunity to ask questions about what was finally decided but never heard the final decision.</p> <p>In one example cited by D'Arcy about fish egg production Williams was able to advise that this was not a minor item as implied by the referral but a serious matter affecting residential status and an item with a long history having been before DoS before in the past.</p> <p>Harrington suggested that Planning ought to find out how other comparable municipalities handle referrals to see if there are lessons there.</p> <p>Steeves pointed out her special situation with no meetings in summer so that spring and summer referrals caused problems.</p> <p>Mayor Reid said the DoS had a policy of responding to all correspondence and therefore this referral matter should not be an exception. Promised a full report on a procedure to be initiated and followed for the next meeting of this group.</p>
SCAF	6	8:20	<p>SilverBack – is it proceeding/when/and terms of agreement? Do we get to see them first in light of public hearing submissions calling for changes? D'Arcy explained confusion over public statements and asked if the agreement was or would be open to public scrutiny since it should contain the answers to so many concerns of the residents.</p> <p>The Mayor advised that the agreement was nearly finished but that there was no certainty that the project would go ahead. It is now up to the developer and he is known to have become involved in other projects. He is free to proceed or sell the property or sit on it. The proposed agreement does include about \$8 Million for the sewer plant and provision for roads and other infrastructure items. Although D'Arcy pointed out: there had been a motion passed by Council (Bylaw #19096) for a “workshop” ,and; that the Administrator had called for and then called off such a gathering, and; posting on the District website was promised, the Mayor advised the public do not get to comment on the agreement. It would appear the workshop will not be held.</p> <p>Poole advised that the public would get a chance for viewing and some input when the actual development permits were drawn up as these would contain the details such as appearance, road allowances etc.</p>
SCAF	7	8:27	<p>Sewage – advise current capacity and expected capacity along with plans for action when current capacity is reached or exceeded. Brown advised there has been some confusion over the current capacity since it was calculated on last census figures with 2.25 persons per household whereas Sechelt has only 1.75 persons per household. This makes for a substantial reduction in the usage of the system. Notwithstanding this Sechelt has exceeded the maximum allowable flows at times and the DoS is trying to get this maximum raised from 3000 cubic metres to 4000. Based on the current population number the average is however only 2000. Depending what figures you use and depending on whether the maximum will be increased for peaks, there is still capacity for about 250 home units (some businesses take up more than one unit).</p> <p>The Mayor advised that they still hoped for SilverBack to come on</p>

			board but failing that plans were being formulated to proceed through grants, loans and tax increases. Asked about the SIB contribution Reid confirmed that it is a partner in the current Dusty Road plant but has not yet opted into any new plant. The SIB has not used up its allotment in the current plant. If they wish to participate in the new plant the SIB will have to be financial partners contributing a fair share.
SCAF	8	8:40	Land Use Management Plan – exchange of information following meeting between community associations and provincial authorities, October 18. D’Arcy advised that this item was on the agenda to advise the DoS that the communities had met with the provincial representatives and made it clear that they thought the municipalities should be consulted in the first level of consultations whereas the “government-to-government” protocol between the Province and the “First Nations” meant that local governments. The mayor thanked SCAF for the advice and support and confirmed they were up to speed and along with the SCR and Gibsons would not support the process unless it was on terms acceptable to them all.
DoS	9	8:45	Sechelt Electors Association (Councillors Shanks/Thirkell) Shanks asked for a show of hands of those in attendance who were members of SEA. Nine attendees raised their hands. Shanks suggested there was some sort of conflict. Thirkell expressed concerns that DoS attended this meeting in good faith & hoped that community representatives had the same intentions. Morris responded firmly that SEA and SCAF were completely separate so there was no conflict. Citizens can certainly belong to more than one organization and both SEA and the DoS have the same goal – good local government. Each might approach the goal differently though. A motion for SCAF to cite the SEA website on the SCAF website had been unanimously defeated in June of this year so there was no issue here for the meeting to pursue. Ware advised he was not a SEA member but at any time he might join it or another political group or form his own but it had no bearing on his community efforts at this meeting.
Davis Bay	10	8:50	Information on where the district is at with regards to the park planned adjacent to the Seawall, i.e. plans, timeframe, community input etc. Brown and the Mayor advised that budget funds had been set up for a consulting process and the RFP for choosing a consultant closes at the end of November. No doubt the chosen consultant would be contacting Davis Bay in the consulting process.
West Sechelt	11	8:54	Would consideration be given to a policy that would see a percentage of monies collected for amenities be shared between the District overall and the specific community that was impacted by the development. (From prior meeting). The Mayor advised there was no policy on this but it was probably a good and fair idea. Brown cautioned that such a process could not be made part of the rules but the Mayor corrected that he was talking about a policy to apply and not a firm rule. It was agreed by all that a policy of allocating 25% of the cash-in-lieu of monies (not DCCs) should be reserved for the community affected and the remainder to the District funds. This proposal would go forward to council to adopt.

Tuwanek	12	9:00	Williams asked for advice on the status of the Spit plan they had sent to the DoS. It asked for DoS approval to restore the Spit and maintain it as had been the tradition since the Tuwanek Ratepayers Association built the Spit many years ago. DoS agreed to look into the status of the response and get back to the TRA. Williams asked about the status of the Tuwanek Hotel appeal and the Mayor advised it was in progress and that the DoS were not going to give an inch. Williams thanked the DoS for their ongoing support on this.
DoS	13	9:12	The Mayor explained the new restrictions on the use of road salt as a result of salt shortages and environmental concerns.
West Sechelt	14	9:15	Would it be possible to advance the timeline for a Tyler road / Village connector roadway? It was explained that if DoS went ahead on its own it might end up with the taxpayers carrying the cost whereas if DoS waited for the development to proceed then the entire cost would be borne by the developer. The costs were high so advancing the timetable at the DoS cost seemed a non-starter. Poole said there were possibly some alternatives to explore and he undertook that DoS would do so and advise the West Sechelt and Village group.
Davis Bay	15	9:18	Drain adjacent to seawall parking - will there be one & whose responsibility is it, Sechelt or Highways? How long do we have to have road flooding there? Mayor explained that this was a Highways responsibility and that plans were afoot in the overall upgrading of the highway from Field Road to the Conveyor Belt. It seemed to include elevating the road about 3 feet for the portion back of the seawall.
DoS	16	9:22	Appears that replacement for Joanie Heinrich has been located but since the person has not yet told their current employer no more can be said.

Closing Remarks by Mayor: Mayor Reid expressed that he felt it very important to hear the views of the community at meetings such as these and felt this meeting was very worthwhile. He suggested that if any community association should like a liaison member of council to attend one of their meetings they should call and the invitation would be welcomed. He thanked all for attending and participating.

Closing Remarks by Chair: Smith thanked all for attending and especially sticking it out for such a long meeting. He was sure the meeting served many good purposes and looked forward to the next one.

Next Meeting – to be at venue to be set by SCAF and a precise day could not be selected now so it was agreed that it would be in mid-February, 2008. SCAF would consult and advise with the DoS.

Adjournment – At about 9:40 PM by the Chair

SUPPLEMENTAL – The Attendees

From District

Mayor Cam Reid	Councillor Darren Inkster
Councillor Michael Shanks	Councillor Keith Thirkell
Councillor Barry Poole	
Bill Brown, Administrator	

From the Associations

Davis Bay	Helen Steeves
East Porpoise	Lorraine Gallant and Val Morris
Sandy Hook	Peter Harvey and Bob D'Arcy
Sechelt Village	Doug Smith and Alice Janisch
Tuwanek	Linda Williams
West Porpoise	Bob Ware and Marilyn Charles
West Sechelt	Ken Matheson and Ron Harrington