

Meeting District of Sechelt with Sechelt Community/Ratepayers Associations
Monday, March 4, 2008 at Library Committee Room
Chair: Doug Smith
 Unofficial SCAF Minutes
 Minutes by SCAF Secretary, Bob D'Arcy

1. Call to Order at 7:07 PM

- a. Opening Remarks by Chair, Doug Smith – Welcomed all and reminded all that courtesy and good manners should be the rule. (See addendum 1 with full text)
 - i. Round table introduction of all attendees (see list following)
- b. Opening remarks by Mayor Reid – Welcomed all and expressed some concern with what some members have said and done which will come out later. As elected officials we have responsibilities and expect some respect and consideration.

2. Call for additions to agenda – none advised

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

Proponent	#	Time	Question or Issue
SCAF	1	7:15	<p>Visioning and how it will the new process is be handled</p> <p>a) Is an outside professional to be engaged? DoS advised that this was subject to budget BUT if it appeared that the cost was going to be included then the Planning department would already be preparing an RFP for the position to go out momentarily. This is a simple RFP since it is personal and not corporate. Think in terms of April. Best guess at budget was \$140,000 but that looked at 2 years. Some confusion was expressed regarding the fact that Sandy Hook and Tuwanek did not have a neighbourhood plan but a hope that Visioning and the Plan could go forward together. If all plans are in harmony then it is hard to say how long it will take to integrate the Vision with OCP. After discussion there was some feeling expressed that one year or maximum 2 years could do the job thus saving on budget and time. The idea to “drag Visioning concepts into the plans”. Would this mean doing a new OCP for all? Maybe. The Mayor concluded that a consultant was needed to spearhead the project.</p> <p>b) Will Council agree to follow OCP policy until the Vision plan is adopted? (West Sechelt) – Matheson expressed concerns over “unbelievable” rate of change and frequent changes to OCPs and zoning. With Visioning coming on could not the rate be stopped or slowed? The Mayor responded that it was not valid to depend upon a 1986 zoning plan when new higher density was desired among other things. Allan pointed out that he counted over 770 lots ready for building and that since this council came in there were 23 Comprehensive Development Zones created so the standing OCPs seemed to be ignored. Others brought up examples of SilverBack, Allendale, and Pacific</p>

			<p>Spirit.</p> <p>It was described that a brochure setting out Visioning was being prepared with a view that developers would get one and be asked to 'consider' Visioning before submitting plans. They advised that some developers had been given Visioning material and asked to submit revised plans. Some asked that compliance be pushed harder and Allan felt that staff should be more clearly guided that council and the community wanted Visioning concepts implemented.</p> <p>Janisch pointed out that the OCP amendments going forward did not update the OCPs but just responded to particular wishes of a specific developer.</p> <p>D'Arcy opined that much of the problem was perception and the concern of residents about certainty of their neighbourhood character after settling in. The process seemed broken somewhat since it did not reassure residents.</p> <p>While housing clusters were described as a big step forward it was pointed out by Jackel that the whole infrastructure must move forward too.</p>
Davis Bay	2	8:02	<p>Does the District know why the Province turned down the Highway project? (Steeves) –</p> <p>The Mayor gave some history and said that the gold plated plan then set had escalated in cost to near 16 million dollars. Nevertheless the matter was not dead as a new official was representing the Province and it seemed some more realistic and manageable plans were surfacing. In essence it "is not dead". A big part of any change would be developing bypass roads in the communities to save traffic always going onto the highway. Also maybe instead of raising the road in Davis Bay it could just be paved wider with new drainage pipes put in. The DoS is committed to revisiting the whole matter.</p>
West Sechelt	3	8:15	<p>Many progressive organizations in the public and private sector will allow staff or in some cases union representatives to sit on a selection panel for senior staff positions. Would the District of Sechelt consider a policy to allow community representatives or a community representative on such a panel? (Matheson) –</p> <p>Seemed like a good idea but there were logistical issues. The Mayor questioned how the representative would be chosen and Smith suggested that the community associations (not just SCAF) might submit a list of candidates and then the DoS could pick one or choose to pick none.</p> <p>Asked what the real advantage would be it was opined that the chosen individual would be outside the "culture" of "City Hall" and so would contribute more of the 'culture' of the residents. Allan opined that it brought another set of eyes to the decision but asked if staff could advise if other communities were using this.</p>
DoS	4	8:24	<p>Mike Shanks letter (Shanks) –</p> <p>Councillor Shanks read out a letter he had prepared addressing many concerns and issues he has ranging from the tone of SCAF minutes to the position of the Village Association on downtown revitalization. Upon completion of the reading Smith asked Shanks, "Thank you. Could we get a copy of your letter – of your comments, your</p>

			<p>response?" Shanks advised," I can do that." Smith then, "OK". (Note: The letter was too complex and long for your secretary to have any confidence he would be able to report on it correctly so upon receipt of the response from Councillor Shanks a copy will be made an Addendum 2 to these minutes) * Secretary late – see Addendum 2</p> <p>Smith then advised that steps had been taken to "tone down" the minutes of the SCAF meetings and this had been settled at the last meeting. It appeared that DoS were only looking at the minutes of January 22/08 whereas another meeting had been held – February 19/08 - which contained some words on this.</p> <p>The Mayor said he felt the minutes of SCAF should be respectful and he said they were not. Allan opined that he preferred minutes that showed the mood of the group so he could learn from them.</p> <p>It was suggested this be revisited at the next meeting to see if there was progress.</p>
SCAF	5	8:48	<p>Referral Process –review proposed new policy as submitted to DoS on Feb. 21st -</p> <p>Copies of the proposed process were available but DoS advised that since this was the first they had seen it that they were ill equipped to comment. Smith advised that he had hand delivered hard copies for the Mayor and Council to the DoS some time ago. This raised the concern about mail failing to get to the council (several SCAF members advised the same problem with their mail). The Mayor noted concern and that this would have to be investigated with this agenda item maybe tabled. Brown advised he had received his copy so some discussion might go forward.</p> <p>Brown advised that referrals really were only seeking information not available to planning such as maybe some trail that planning did not have mapped. They were not seeking opinions. Opinions would be heard at the public hearings after first reading.</p> <p>Nevertheless when the matter was pressed it was advised that a "meeting of all stakeholders" was to be held in April and this sort of proposal could be evaluated then.</p> <p>D'Arcy emphasized that this proposal was being set out for the community associations only and not for developers and others who might be at such a meeting.</p> <p>The Mayor again stated his wish to review the matter but as far as he was concerned for the moment the suggested April meeting would be the time and place to go over this with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Janisch suggest, at least, to save paper the lined page attached for comment to referrals be dropped.</p>
Davis Bay	6	9:07	<p>District Referrals & changing project criteria & information.(Steeves) - Cited example of developers meeting with Davis Bay with what appeared an excellent proposal. A subsequent referral did not address size. When it came back again it had changed substantially (gotten much larger) so suddenly there are potential objections to the plan. These unannounced changes do not seem correct or helpful to any consultation process.</p> <p>Brown attempted to explain that some of the changes were just to allow for future expansion when the community was ready for it but not for a larger project now.</p> <p>It was confirmed that APC get referrals at the same time and in the</p>

			<p>same format as the associations</p> <p>Others commented that similar changes had affected them. Matheson opined that this was where the early meetings with the developer and the associations were important since then concerns could be made clear.</p> <p>Inkster wondered if there was a tipping point where the association went from 'for' to 'against' and Steeves advised that she could not answer since it would require review by her association first.</p>
--	--	--	---

Closing Remarks by Mayor: He noted he appreciated the willingness the associations bring to the table but he needs to see more respect for positive meetings.

Closing Remarks by Chair: Smith emphasized all extra time and work put in for little return by council and by staff and that it is acknowledged and appreciated by community members. It is a shame to see negativity growing and this is not helpful. Be mindful of how issues are presented and not to make matters personal. Sometime, we (SCAF) too perceive we are approached in an intimidating or almost bullying fashion when we all have the common goal of a better Sechelt. Smith thanked all for attending.

Next Meeting – to be at venue to be set by DoS and the date of May 13th was chosen for the meeting to be at the library room at 7 pm. Agenda items would be submitted to the SCAF secretary as agreed. A confirmation letter from the DoS was requested.

Adjournment – At about 9:28 PM by the Chair

SUPPLEMENTAL – The Attendees

From District

Mayor Cam Reid	Councillor Darren Inkster
Councillor Michael Shanks	Councillor Keith Thirkell
Councillor Warren Allan	
Bill Brown, Administrator	

From the Associations

Davis Bay	Helen Steeves, Sue Thompson, Ron Paulson
East Porpoise	Lorraine Gallant and Val Morris
Sandy Hook	Sue Jackel and Bob D’Arcy
Sechelt Village	Doug Smith and Alice Janisch
Tuwanek	No attendee
West Porpoise	No attendee
West Sechelt	Ken Matheson and Marguerite Johnson

Addendum 1

Opening Remarks – Chair Doug Smith

We enjoy living in a democracy. A precept of the democratic process provides citizens the right to free expression without fear of intimidation or retaliation. We embrace this right.

The process of community building is strengthened by vigorous debate. Buyin and commitment is reinforced when you receive adequate input from the stakeholders.

Our association represents a majority of active residents within the community. By listening to and receiving input from associations, governments better serve its residents.

When viewpoints become vociferous it usually means the participants feel they are not being heard. We all want to continue to improve the character of Sechelt. We share many similar goals.

The important point is to find common ground on which to build a better community. We can all learn from our experiences and work harder at seeking solutions together.

We feel that some of our minutes may have been a bit too editorial. SCAF is an evolving association. Our minutes now reveal only the facts as expressed during the meetings.

We believe that we need to keep pursuing the higher purpose of our mission, and continue to work together to improve the status of the residents of Sechelt.

That is why we feel it is important to continue to discuss and help resolve common issues with the District of Sechelt. We fully believe these meetings are beneficial for both parties.

Thank you

Addendum 2

Letter for Item 4 above – Councillor Shanks

Replaced with email exchange:

- Douglas to Shanks, "Greetings Mike, When requested during the meeting last night you agreed to give me a copy of the letter you read out. Please let me know where I can pick it up, thank you, Douglas Smith, Chair – SCAF"
- From Shanks "In the light of the information I received after our meeting last night and today the offer to give you a copy of my letter has been withdrawn. Mike."
- Response by Chair Smith (with no answer at 'press time') "Greetings Mike, What information are you referring to? Cheers, Douglas"

Meeting District of Sechelt with Sechelt Community/Ratepayers Associations
Monday, March 4, 2008 at Library Committee Room
Chair: Doug Smith
 Unofficial SCAF Minutes
 Minutes by SCAF Secretary, Bob D'Arcy

1. Call to Order at 7:07 PM

- a. Opening Remarks by Chair, Doug Smith – Welcomed all and reminded all that courtesy and good manners should be the rule. (See addendum 1 with full text)
 - i. Round table introduction of all attendees (see list following)
- b. Opening remarks by Mayor Reid – Welcomed all and expressed some concern with what some members have said and done which will come out later. As elected officials we have responsibilities and expect some respect and consideration.

2. Call for additions to agenda – none advised

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

Proponent	#	Time	Question or Issue
SCAF	1	7:15	<p>Visioning and how it will the new process is be handled</p> <p>a) Is an outside professional to be engaged? DoS advised that this was subject to budget BUT if it appeared that the cost was going to be included then the Planning department would already be preparing an RFP for the position to go out momentarily. This is a simple RFP since it is personal and not corporate. Think in terms of April. Best guess at budget was \$140,000 but that looked at 2 years. Some confusion was expressed regarding the fact that Sandy Hook and Tuwanek did not have a neighbourhood plan but a hope that Visioning and the Plan could go forward together. If all plans are in harmony then it is hard to say how long it will take to integrate the Vision with OCP. After discussion there was some feeling expressed that one year or maximum 2 years could do the job thus saving on budget and time. The idea to “drag Visioning concepts into the plans”. Would this mean doing a new OCP for all? Maybe. The Mayor concluded that a consultant was needed to spearhead the project.</p> <p>b) Will Council agree to follow OCP policy until the Vision plan is adopted? (West Sechelt) – Matheson expressed concerns over “unbelievable” rate of change and frequent changes to OCPs and zoning. With Visioning coming on could not the rate be stopped or slowed? The Mayor responded that it was not valid to depend upon a 1986 zoning plan when new higher density was desired among other things. Allan pointed out that he counted over 770 lots ready for building and that since this council came in there were 23 Comprehensive Development Zones created so the standing OCPs seemed to be ignored. Others brought up examples of SilverBack, Allendale, and Pacific</p>

			<p>Spirit.</p> <p>It was described that a brochure setting out Visioning was being prepared with a view that developers would get one and be asked to 'consider' Visioning before submitting plans. They advised that some developers had been given Visioning material and asked to submit revised plans. Some asked that compliance be pushed harder and Allan felt that staff should be more clearly guided that council and the community wanted Visioning concepts implemented.</p> <p>Janisch pointed out that the OCP amendments going forward did not update the OCPs but just responded to particular wishes of a specific developer.</p> <p>D'Arcy opined that much of the problem was perception and the concern of residents about certainty of their neighbourhood character after settling in. The process seemed broken somewhat since it did not reassure residents.</p> <p>While housing clusters were described as a big step forward it was pointed out by Jackel that the whole infrastructure must move forward too.</p>
Davis Bay	2	8:02	<p>Does the District know why the Province turned down the Highway project? (Steeves) –</p> <p>The Mayor gave some history and said that the gold plated plan then set had escalated in cost to near 16 million dollars. Nevertheless the matter was not dead as a new official was representing the Province and it seemed some more realistic and manageable plans were surfacing. In essence it "is not dead". A big part of any change would be developing bypass roads in the communities to save traffic always going onto the highway. Also maybe instead of raising the road in Davis Bay it could just be paved wider with new drainage pipes put in. The DoS is committed to revisiting the whole matter.</p>
West Sechelt	3	8:15	<p>Many progressive organizations in the public and private sector will allow staff or in some cases union representatives to sit on a selection panel for senior staff positions. Would the District of Sechelt consider a policy to allow community representatives or a community representative on such a panel? (Matheson) –</p> <p>Seemed like a good idea but there were logistical issues. The Mayor questioned how the representative would be chosen and Smith suggested that the community associations (not just SCAF) might submit a list of candidates and then the DoS could pick one or choose to pick none.</p> <p>Asked what the real advantage would be it was opined that the chosen individual would be outside the "culture" of "City Hall" and so would contribute more of the 'culture' of the residents. Allan opined that it brought another set of eyes to the decision but asked if staff could advise if other communities were using this.</p>
DoS	4	8:24	<p>Mike Shanks letter (Shanks) –</p> <p>Councillor Shanks read out a letter he had prepared addressing many concerns and issues he has ranging from the tone of SCAF minutes to the position of the Village Association on downtown revitalization. Upon completion of the reading Smith asked Shanks, "Thank you. Could we get a copy of your letter – of your comments, your</p>

			<p>response?" Shanks advised," I can do that." Smith then, "OK". (Note: The letter was too complex and long for your secretary to have any confidence he would be able to report on it correctly so upon receipt of the response from Councillor Shanks a copy will be made an Addendum 2 to these minutes) * Secretary late – see Addendum 2</p> <p>Smith then advised that steps had been taken to "tone down" the minutes of the SCAF meetings and this had been settled at the last meeting. It appeared that DoS were only looking at the minutes of January 22/08 whereas another meeting had been held – February 19/08 - which contained some words on this.</p> <p>The Mayor said he felt the minutes of SCAF should be respectful and he said they were not. Allan opined that he preferred minutes that showed the mood of the group so he could learn from them.</p> <p>It was suggested this be revisited at the next meeting to see if there was progress.</p>
SCAF	5	8:48	<p>Referral Process –review proposed new policy as submitted to DoS on Feb. 21st -</p> <p>Copies of the proposed process were available but DoS advised that since this was the first they had seen it that they were ill equipped to comment. Smith advised that he had hand delivered hard copies for the Mayor and Council to the DoS some time ago. This raised the concern about mail failing to get to the council (several SCAF members advised the same problem with their mail). The Mayor noted concern and that this would have to be investigated with this agenda item maybe tabled. Brown advised he had received his copy so some discussion might go forward.</p> <p>Brown advised that referrals really were only seeking information not available to planning such as maybe some trail that planning did not have mapped. They were not seeking opinions. Opinions would be heard at the public hearings after first reading.</p> <p>Nevertheless when the matter was pressed it was advised that a "meeting of all stakeholders" was to be held in April and this sort of proposal could be evaluated then.</p> <p>D'Arcy emphasized that this proposal was being set out for the community associations only and not for developers and others who might be at such a meeting.</p> <p>The Mayor again stated his wish to review the matter but as far as he was concerned for the moment the suggested April meeting would be the time and place to go over this with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Janisch suggest, at least, to save paper the lined page attached for comment to referrals be dropped.</p>
Davis Bay	6	9:07	<p>District Referrals & changing project criteria & information.(Steeves) - Cited example of developers meeting with Davis Bay with what appeared an excellent proposal. A subsequent referral did not address size. When it came back again it had changed substantially (gotten much larger) so suddenly there are potential objections to the plan. These unannounced changes do not seem correct or helpful to any consultation process.</p> <p>Brown attempted to explain that some of the changes were just to allow for future expansion when the community was ready for it but not for a larger project now.</p> <p>It was confirmed that APC get referrals at the same time and in the</p>

		<p>same format as the associations</p> <p>Others commented that similar changes had affected them. Matheson opined that this was where the early meetings with the developer and the associations were important since then concerns could be made clear.</p> <p>Inkster wondered if there was a tipping point where the association went from 'for' to 'against' and Steeves advised that she could not answer since it would require review by her association first.</p>
--	--	---

Closing Remarks by Mayor: He noted he appreciated the willingness the associations bring to the table but he needs to see more respect for positive meetings.

Closing Remarks by Chair: Smith emphasized all extra time and work put in for little return by council and by staff and that it is acknowledged and appreciated by community members. It is a shame to see negativity growing and this is not helpful. Be mindful of how issues are presented and not to make matters personal. Sometime, we (SCAF) too perceive we are approached in an intimidating or almost bullying fashion when we all have the common goal of a better Sechelt. Smith thanked all for attending.

Next Meeting – to be at venue to be set by DoS and the date of May 13th was chosen for the meeting to be at the library room at 7 pm. Agenda items would be submitted to the SCAF secretary as agreed. A confirmation letter from the DoS was requested.

Adjournment – At about 9:28 PM by the Chair

SUPPLEMENTAL – The Attendees

From District

Mayor Cam Reid	Councillor Darren Inkster
Councillor Michael Shanks	Councillor Keith Thirkell
Councillor Warren Allan	
Bill Brown, Administrator	

From the Associations

Davis Bay	Helen Steeves, Sue Thompson, Ron Paulson
East Porpoise	Lorraine Gallant and Val Morris
Sandy Hook	Sue Jackel and Bob D’Arcy
Sechelt Village	Doug Smith and Alice Janisch
Tuwanek	No attendee
West Porpoise	No attendee
West Sechelt	Ken Matheson and Marguerite Johnson

Addendum 1

Opening Remarks – Chair Doug Smith

We enjoy living in a democracy. A precept of the democratic process provides citizens the right to free expression without fear of intimidation or retaliation. We embrace this right.

The process of community building is strengthened by vigorous debate. Buyin and commitment is reinforced when you receive adequate input from the stakeholders.

Our association represents a majority of active residents within the community. By listening to and receiving input from associations, governments better serve its residents.

When viewpoints become vociferous it usually means the participants feel they are not being heard. We all want to continue to improve the character of Sechelt. We share many similar goals.

The important point is to find common ground on which to build a better community. We can all learn from our experiences and work harder at seeking solutions together.

We feel that some of our minutes may have been a bit too editorial. SCAF is an evolving association. Our minutes now reveal only the facts as expressed during the meetings.

We believe that we need to keep pursuing the higher purpose of our mission, and continue to work together to improve the status of the residents of Sechelt.

That is why we feel it is important to continue to discuss and help resolve common issues with the District of Sechelt. We fully believe these meetings are beneficial for both parties.

Thank you

Addendum 2

Letter for Item 4 above – Councillor Shanks

Replaced with email exchange:

- Douglas to Shanks, "Greetings Mike, When requested during the meeting last night you agreed to give me a copy of the letter you read out. Please let me know where I can pick it up, thank you, Douglas Smith, Chair – SCAF"
- From Shanks "In the light of the information I received after our meeting last night and today the offer to give you a copy of my letter has been withdrawn. Mike."
- Response by Chair Smith (with no answer at 'press time') "Greetings Mike, What information are you referring to? Cheers, Douglas"

Meeting District of Sechelt with Sechelt Community/Ratepayers Associations
Monday, March 4, 2008 at Library Committee Room
Chair: Doug Smith
 Unofficial SCAF Minutes
 Minutes by SCAF Secretary, Bob D'Arcy

1. Call to Order at 7:07 PM

- a. Opening Remarks by Chair, Doug Smith – Welcomed all and reminded all that courtesy and good manners should be the rule. (See addendum 1 with full text)
 - i. Round table introduction of all attendees (see list following)
- b. Opening remarks by Mayor Reid – Welcomed all and expressed some concern with what some members have said and done which will come out later. As elected officials we have responsibilities and expect some respect and consideration.

2. Call for additions to agenda – none advised

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

Proponent	#	Time	Question or Issue
SCAF	1	7:15	<p>Visioning and how it will the new process is be handled</p> <p>a) Is an outside professional to be engaged? DoS advised that this was subject to budget BUT if it appeared that the cost was going to be included then the Planning department would already be preparing an RFP for the position to go out momentarily. This is a simple RFP since it is personal and not corporate. Think in terms of April. Best guess at budget was \$140,000 but that looked at 2 years. Some confusion was expressed regarding the fact that Sandy Hook and Tuwanek did not have a neighbourhood plan but a hope that Visioning and the Plan could go forward together. If all plans are in harmony then it is hard to say how long it will take to integrate the Vision with OCP. After discussion there was some feeling expressed that one year or maximum 2 years could do the job thus saving on budget and time. The idea to “drag Visioning concepts into the plans”. Would this mean doing a new OCP for all? Maybe. The Mayor concluded that a consultant was needed to spearhead the project.</p> <p>b) Will Council agree to follow OCP policy until the Vision plan is adopted? (West Sechelt) – Matheson expressed concerns over “unbelievable” rate of change and frequent changes to OCPs and zoning. With Visioning coming on could not the rate be stopped or slowed? The Mayor responded that it was not valid to depend upon a 1986 zoning plan when new higher density was desired among other things. Allan pointed out that he counted over 770 lots ready for building and that since this council came in there were 23 Comprehensive Development Zones created so the standing OCPs seemed to be ignored. Others brought up examples of SilverBack, Allendale, and Pacific</p>

			<p>Spirit.</p> <p>It was described that a brochure setting out Visioning was being prepared with a view that developers would get one and be asked to 'consider' Visioning before submitting plans. They advised that some developers had been given Visioning material and asked to submit revised plans. Some asked that compliance be pushed harder and Allan felt that staff should be more clearly guided that council and the community wanted Visioning concepts implemented.</p> <p>Janisch pointed out that the OCP amendments going forward did not update the OCPs but just responded to particular wishes of a specific developer.</p> <p>D'Arcy opined that much of the problem was perception and the concern of residents about certainty of their neighbourhood character after settling in. The process seemed broken somewhat since it did not reassure residents.</p> <p>While housing clusters were described as a big step forward it was pointed out by Jackel that the whole infrastructure must move forward too.</p>
Davis Bay	2	8:02	<p>Does the District know why the Province turned down the Highway project? (Steeves) –</p> <p>The Mayor gave some history and said that the gold plated plan then set had escalated in cost to near 16 million dollars. Nevertheless the matter was not dead as a new official was representing the Province and it seemed some more realistic and manageable plans were surfacing. In essence it "is not dead". A big part of any change would be developing bypass roads in the communities to save traffic always going onto the highway. Also maybe instead of raising the road in Davis Bay it could just be paved wider with new drainage pipes put in. The DoS is committed to revisiting the whole matter.</p>
West Sechelt	3	8:15	<p>Many progressive organizations in the public and private sector will allow staff or in some cases union representatives to sit on a selection panel for senior staff positions. Would the District of Sechelt consider a policy to allow community representatives or a community representative on such a panel? (Matheson) –</p> <p>Seemed like a good idea but there were logistical issues. The Mayor questioned how the representative would be chosen and Smith suggested that the community associations (not just SCAF) might submit a list of candidates and then the DoS could pick one or choose to pick none.</p> <p>Asked what the real advantage would be it was opined that the chosen individual would be outside the "culture" of "City Hall" and so would contribute more of the 'culture' of the residents. Allan opined that it brought another set of eyes to the decision but asked if staff could advise if other communities were using this.</p>
DoS	4	8:24	<p>Mike Shanks letter (Shanks) –</p> <p>Councillor Shanks read out a letter he had prepared addressing many concerns and issues he has ranging from the tone of SCAF minutes to the position of the Village Association on downtown revitalization. Upon completion of the reading Smith asked Shanks, "Thank you. Could we get a copy of your letter – of your comments, your</p>

			<p>response?" Shanks advised," I can do that." Smith then, "OK". (Note: The letter was too complex and long for your secretary to have any confidence he would be able to report on it correctly so upon receipt of the response from Councillor Shanks a copy will be made an Addendum 2 to these minutes) * Secretary late – see Addendum 2</p> <p>Smith then advised that steps had been taken to "tone down" the minutes of the SCAF meetings and this had been settled at the last meeting. It appeared that DoS were only looking at the minutes of January 22/08 whereas another meeting had been held – February 19/08 - which contained some words on this.</p> <p>The Mayor said he felt the minutes of SCAF should be respectful and he said they were not. Allan opined that he preferred minutes that showed the mood of the group so he could learn from them.</p> <p>It was suggested this be revisited at the next meeting to see if there was progress.</p>
SCAF	5	8:48	<p>Referral Process –review proposed new policy as submitted to DoS on Feb. 21st -</p> <p>Copies of the proposed process were available but DoS advised that since this was the first they had seen it that they were ill equipped to comment. Smith advised that he had hand delivered hard copies for the Mayor and Council to the DoS some time ago. This raised the concern about mail failing to get to the council (several SCAF members advised the same problem with their mail). The Mayor noted concern and that this would have to be investigated with this agenda item maybe tabled. Brown advised he had received his copy so some discussion might go forward.</p> <p>Brown advised that referrals really were only seeking information not available to planning such as maybe some trail that planning did not have mapped. They were not seeking opinions. Opinions would be heard at the public hearings after first reading.</p> <p>Nevertheless when the matter was pressed it was advised that a "meeting of all stakeholders" was to be held in April and this sort of proposal could be evaluated then.</p> <p>D'Arcy emphasized that this proposal was being set out for the community associations only and not for developers and others who might be at such a meeting.</p> <p>The Mayor again stated his wish to review the matter but as far as he was concerned for the moment the suggested April meeting would be the time and place to go over this with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Janisch suggest, at least, to save paper the lined page attached for comment to referrals be dropped.</p>
Davis Bay	6	9:07	<p>District Referrals & changing project criteria & information.(Steeves) - Cited example of developers meeting with Davis Bay with what appeared an excellent proposal. A subsequent referral did not address size. When it came back again it had changed substantially (gotten much larger) so suddenly there are potential objections to the plan. These unannounced changes do not seem correct or helpful to any consultation process.</p> <p>Brown attempted to explain that some of the changes were just to allow for future expansion when the community was ready for it but not for a larger project now.</p> <p>It was confirmed that APC get referrals at the same time and in the</p>

			<p>same format as the associations</p> <p>Others commented that similar changes had affected them. Matheson opined that this was where the early meetings with the developer and the associations were important since then concerns could be made clear.</p> <p>Inkster wondered if there was a tipping point where the association went from 'for' to 'against' and Steeves advised that she could not answer since it would require review by her association first.</p>
--	--	--	---

Closing Remarks by Mayor: He noted he appreciated the willingness the associations bring to the table but he needs to see more respect for positive meetings.

Closing Remarks by Chair: Smith emphasized all extra time and work put in for little return by council and by staff and that it is acknowledged and appreciated by community members. It is a shame to see negativity growing and this is not helpful. Be mindful of how issues are presented and not to make matters personal. Sometime, we (SCAF) too perceive we are approached in an intimidating or almost bullying fashion when we all have the common goal of a better Sechelt. Smith thanked all for attending.

Next Meeting – to be at venue to be set by DoS and the date of May 13th was chosen for the meeting to be at the library room at 7 pm. Agenda items would be submitted to the SCAF secretary as agreed. A confirmation letter from the DoS was requested.

Adjournment – At about 9:28 PM by the Chair

SUPPLEMENTAL – The Attendees

From District

Mayor Cam Reid	Councillor Darren Inkster
Councillor Michael Shanks	Councillor Keith Thirkell
Councillor Warren Allan	
Bill Brown, Administrator	

From the Associations

Davis Bay	Helen Steeves, Sue Thompson, Ron Paulson
East Porpoise	Lorraine Gallant and Val Morris
Sandy Hook	Sue Jackel and Bob D’Arcy
Sechelt Village	Doug Smith and Alice Janisch
Tuwanek	No attendee
West Porpoise	No attendee
West Sechelt	Ken Matheson and Marguerite Johnson

Addendum 1

Opening Remarks – Chair Doug Smith

We enjoy living in a democracy. A precept of the democratic process provides citizens the right to free expression without fear of intimidation or retaliation. We embrace this right.

The process of community building is strengthened by vigorous debate. Buyin and commitment is reinforced when you receive adequate input from the stakeholders.

Our association represents a majority of active residents within the community. By listening to and receiving input from associations, governments better serve its residents.

When viewpoints become vociferous it usually means the participants feel they are not being heard. We all want to continue to improve the character of Sechelt. We share many similar goals.

The important point is to find common ground on which to build a better community. We can all learn from our experiences and work harder at seeking solutions together.

We feel that some of our minutes may have been a bit too editorial. SCAF is an evolving association. Our minutes now reveal only the facts as expressed during the meetings.

We believe that we need to keep pursuing the higher purpose of our mission, and continue to work together to improve the status of the residents of Sechelt.

That is why we feel it is important to continue to discuss and help resolve common issues with the District of Sechelt. We fully believe these meetings are beneficial for both parties.

Thank you

Addendum 2

Letter for Item 4 above – Councillor Shanks

Replaced with email exchange:

- Douglas to Shanks, "Greetings Mike, When requested during the meeting last night you agreed to give me a copy of the letter you read out. Please let me know where I can pick it up, thank you, Douglas Smith, Chair – SCAF"
- From Shanks "In the light of the information I received after our meeting last night and today the offer to give you a copy of my letter has been withdrawn. Mike."
- Response by Chair Smith (with no answer at 'press time') "Greetings Mike, What information are you referring to? Cheers, Douglas"