



MEETING SUMMARY

District of Highlands: South Highlands Local Area Plan

What: Task Force Meeting #7 (Phase 2), South Highlands LAP

When: 5:30-8:00pm, Tuesday, September 20, 2021

Where: Zoom Meeting

Please note: *This document is meant to provide a summary of key discussion topics, discussion points, and outcomes from the meeting. These are not meeting Minutes nor a Record of Decision.*

PARTICIPANTS

Task Force

Leslie Anderson (Council Rep)
 Marcie McLean (Council Alternate)
 Regine Klein
 Lexie LeGrande-Beigun
 Rick Lester
 Bob McMinn
 Scott Richardson
 Mel Sangha
 Terri Wood
 Kim Vincent (Absent)

Project Team

Laura Beckett
 Municipal Planner, Highlands

 Evan Peterson
 Barefoot Planning

 Jennifer Kay
 TownSquare Planning

Guests

Peter Kickham & Glenn Harris– CRD

Observers

Ann Baird
 Gord Baird
 Karen Burns
 Libby McMinn

District Staff

Loranne Hilton
 Chief Administrative Officer, Highlands



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



SUMMARY NOTES

Opening

1. Evan led a roundtable of introductions
2. Councillor Representative/Liaison Leslie Anderson spoke to the group:
 - a. SHLAP process went to Council for clarification. Council reaffirmed that the role of the Task Force is to provide broad input and provide a diversity of views. Council's role is to let the Task Force do their job.
 - b. The Council liaison role is to listen, and is process-focussed.
3. Laura discussed further details about Council's direction, addressed slides about the process.
4. The topic of who would be able to fill out the survey was raised, and the question was asked "Who is the larger community?" It was determined that this would be addressed later in the agenda.

May 18 Task Force Meeting – Summary

5. The May 18, 2021 Meeting Notes were discussed.
 - a. There was a request that the discussion and concerns regarding the concept of utilizing/raising taxes for remediation be included in the notes.

Other Communications – CRD Letter (May 17, 2021)

6. Questions were directed to Peter Kickham and Glenn Harris, both of the CRD. Responses to questions and comments included:
 - a. Larger concern is having a remedial target that cannot be accomplished. This will lead to a brownfield situation, meaning that Millstream Meadows would become an undevelopable site.
 - b. Question: If CRD can't receive a certificate of compliance because of offsite migration, what will CRD do? Response: That is not considered an option because the extent of the migration has been delineated and the plume is stable or shrinking according to a hydrogeologist.
 - c. Question: Is CRD's application for a certificate of compliance based on the current OCP land use designation of the property? Response: Yes. It is based on the commercial land use in accordance with the Contaminated Sites Regulation. This is similar to the OCP land use designation currently on the property.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



- d. Use of groundwater for drinking water purposes will be prohibited on the Millstream Meadows property. CRD drinking water is available at the property boundary along Millstream Road.
- e. Question: What is CRD's responsibility in case of more contamination found in the future? Response: Legislation and regulations require that all previous property owners pay for remediation. The requirements of the certificate of compliance will seek to mitigate future contamination. Liability in the Contaminated Site Regulation is retroactive.
- f. Question: How can the outflow of contaminants be mitigated? Response: Current contamination is very deep. The source of contamination had been largely removed in 2008, when the CRD and Province funded an \$8 million excavation of the most contaminated soil on the site. There has to be proof that the plume is stable. We have been able to provide this.
- g. Question: How would CRD address contamination if structures are built over the location of the contamination and contamination is found in the future? Response: Structures built at the surface will not be affected by the subsurface contamination. Due to the depth of contamination, there was no practically feasible way to physically remove the deep groundwater contamination.
- h. Question: Has CRD run an analysis for the Contaminated Sites Regulation "wildland standards"? Response: The land cannot meet that standard.
- i. There was a question about a memorandum of understanding between the CRD and the Provincial Crown. It was noted that the cost sharing of the remediation at Millstream Meadows is shared between the two parties: 61% is paid by the CRD and 39% is paid by the Provincial Crown.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575

Demographic Questions and Who Can Participate

- 7. Comments, questions, and feedback included:
 - a. The survey should be mailed out to only the Highlands, because outsiders of Highlands should not tell Highlanders what to do.
 - b. Tenants of Millstream Industrial Park (MIP) deserve a say because they pay the taxes that MIP owners pay.



- c. Public hearings, for example, do not restrict who may speak. Council members have the ability to give whatever effect they as individuals feel is appropriate to public input.
 - d. Not sure that the emphasis should be on the survey. It is one source of input into the local area plan.
 - e. The survey does not serve as a “vote” for the options.
 - f. We cannot trust people to self-identify truthfully.
 - g. Not interested in what non-Highlanders think.
 - h. The concern of “stacking” responses from one user can be identified by the IP (internet protocol) address associated with the survey.
 - i. Broad participation provides useful input and typically is more helpful to the outcome.
 - j. It is important to pay attention to the user demographic questions in the survey.
 - k. There was a desire expressed that the parents at Little Bears Daycare be able to fill out the survey.
 - l. One member expressed support for a mail-out to Highlands addresses. This could be supported by volunteers.
 - m. It is inward looking to only look to Highlanders.
 - n. A suggestion was made that volunteers could do the mail-out.
 - o. The Regional Growth Strategy is the appropriate time for regional residents to have their say about Highlands.
 - p. Concern was expressed for potential false expressions of support on community surveys, based on previous experience in a different project.
8. The Planning team suggested that the data could be sorted and analyzed according to the demographic questions of the survey, which would allow the project team to review feedback based on, for example, place of residence (e.g., in the Highlands), place of work (e.g., in the South Highlands).
 9. It was agreed that a mail out survey would be provided along with a digital survey on the LetsTalkSHLAP website. It was noted that one survey copy could be mailed and that the household could call the District office for additional paper surveys. In regards to the Task Force’s desire to mail out the survey, as well, the Project Team



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



acknowledged that staff would need to consider the logistics and budget.

Early Directions Survey

10. There was discussion about adding an option 3, which is representative of what the current OCP states.
11. The merits of including an Option 3 (existing OCP) were discussed including:
 - a. Including Option 3 would remove the challenges from Options 1 and 2.
 - b. Option 2 is not viable until after the mine is finished – no one will want to develop in that area because of the mine.
 - c. Don't define from top down what the outcome should be. Offer people the range of choices.
 - d. A continuum of choices ranges among Options 1, 2 and 3. These options collectively represent the different views on the Task Force.
 - e. Maybe people don't want change.
 - f. What if OKI and MIP go deeper in mining?
 - g. OKI's business exists because of society's demands and needs. The need for rock will continue whether it is sourced from these properties or others.
 - h. We have an opportunity to set the stage for a future that includes climate change action.
 - i. The "benefits" and "challenges" sections in Options 1 and 2 might be a stumbling block.
 - j. It would be instructive to understand the community's feedback to the "continuum".
12. It was agreed that the meeting would be extended to 8:00pm.
13. The Planning Team suggested that:
 - a. Rewrite the preamble to speak to the spectrum or continuum of options and the climate emergency.
 - b. Use only descriptive paragraphs for the options – Remove the "benefits" and "challenges" from existing Options 1 and 2.
14. Additional Task Force feedback included:
 - a. Continuum is a good idea
 - b. Make language simple, make choices stark and clear



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



- c. Agree with removing benefits and challenges.
 - d. Speaking to the climate emergency is critical. We are working on this plan for future Highlanders.
 - e. DPA 6 is part of Option 3 (current OCP)
 - f. What about providing a visualization/image of each image? MIP could be that image for Option 3
 - g. Tech park very unlikely while mine is ongoing.
 - h. Is it practical to suggest each option to each property?
15. The voting task force members unanimously agreed on the content of the survey with the following changes:
- a. Add an option that represents the current OCP land use direction for the subject properties, which would also include an “Industrial Containment Boundary”.
 - b. Rewrite the preamble to speak to the spectrum or continuum of options and the climate emergency.
 - c. Use only descriptive paragraphs for the options – Remove the “benefits” and “challenges” from existing Options 1 and 2.
16. Should the survey also ask the question if Hanington Road should be emergency access only?
- a. Task Force voting members generally agreed on this.
 - b. Laura was tasked with figuring out if the question is appropriate in light of approved zoning that was predicated on Hanington Road being open.
 - c. UPDATE: Based on existing zoning, having Hanington Road as emergency access is not possible. Laura advises that the survey question will remain as in the August 7 version, which is: “When connected as a through road to Langford, ensure Hanington Road remains a low-speed local road to mitigate any future traffic impacts from development.”
17. The Task Force voting members agreed on mailing out the survey to residents and landowners.
18. A concern was expressed that the survey would not be coming back to the Task Force for a final review.
19. Meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575