



MEETING SUMMARY

District of Highlands: South Highlands Local Area Plan

What: Task Force Meeting #8 (Phase 2), South Highlands LAP

When: 12:00-2:00pm, Tuesday, May 10, 2022

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	Project Team
Leslie Anderson (Council Rep)	Laura Beckett
Marcie McLean (Council Alternate)	Municipal Planner, Highlands
Regine Klein	
Rick Lester	Evan Peterson
Bob McMinn	Barefoot Planning
Scott Richardson	
Mel Sangha	
Terri Wood	Jennifer Kay
Kim Vincent (Absent)	TownSquare Planning
Lexie LeGrande-Beigun (Absent)	

Guests

Peter Kickham & Stephen Henderson– CRD

Observers

Ann Baird
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. Laura opened the meeting with the following:
 - a. Territorial acknowledgement of the Lək'wəḡən, SENĆOTEN and Hul'q'umi'num speaking First Nations
 - b. Happy 98th Birthday to Bob McMinn
 - c. The purpose of today's meeting: set the template for the full draft local area plan.
 - d. Question: "Are we being asked for opinions that may change the intent of the stated policies, or are we being instructed that the policy directions are decided and will not be subject to change?"
 - e. Answer: No, policy direction isn't decided until Council approves the local area plan. The Project Team needed high level direction for early local area plan drafting purposes from Council to create the document that is in front of you because all the research and public engagement input were not conclusive.
 - f. This is the last Task Force meeting, and as such discussion will be directed to be among voting members.
 - g. A Capital Regional District (CRD) representative enquired: "Whether there would be time at the end of the meeting to express CRD's concerns for how the draft plan will affect their land?"
 - h. Answer: It was indicated that that would happen pending timing, because priority was being given to Task Force voting members discussion.

High Level Draft Local Area Plan Presentation & Discussion

2. Evan Provided an overview of the High Level Draft South Highlands Local Area Plan.
3. A vote on the following question was taken: "Are you generally supportive of the high level direction in this draft plan?"
 - a. Result: One member voted in favour; Two members voted against; Three members were undecided.
4. Each member was invited to express their opinions. Some of the comments and responses included the following:



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



- a. One member was generally supportive. Mostly concerned about Gateway Area's broad description. Able to include discussion of implications?
 - b. Regarding the description for the Special Plan Areas (SPAs): How would the crown lands be purchased? How would these policies be implemented? Descriptions need more rigour. What are implications of these directions?
 - c. How will the Environmental Stewardship (ES) and Low-impact Development (LID) designations work in the Gateway Area with so many variables among the different properties?
 - d. Appreciated shift to ecological regeneration from development. Plan needs a context statement. What about providing measurements of net zero or net positive for evaluating applications in LID or ES areas respectively?
 - e. Takes great exception with the ES and LID designations. Believes survey results are inconclusive due to low public response to surveys. Wonders about the objectivity of Council's direction. Is of the opinion that this draft direction will not contribute to the financial health of the District. These directions are not possible for at least 15 plus years on the OKI and MIP sites due to active quarrying. What is implication for land owners? They will look to minimize the value of the land.
 - f. Not enough emphasis on the climate emergency. Finances are secondary in importance to the climate emergency and natural environment preservation.
5. After hearing everyone's thoughts, voting members were invited to a second round:
- a. GFL is a toxic timebomb. It should be ES. SPA crown lands needs to be "community" housing (distinct from affordable housing), in that community housing is provided at a reduced cost for people living and contributing to the Highlands community. For example, volunteer fire fighters. Glad the ES areas reflect survey results.
 - b. Entirely agree with community housing comments, but wants to maintain ecological integrity of crown lands. Suggests that if housing goes there, an applicant seeks to achieve a "net positive" (i.e., ecological and social outcomes) goal.
 - c. Regarding LID and ES designations: There is a way to get what everyone wants. OK Industries (OK-I) and Millstream Industrial



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



- Park (MIP) need to re-green while they develop in order to pay for greening.
- d. Concern about practicality of draft plan. Regarding parkland for crown lands, who will pay for that? Disagree with community housing. Gateway Area – accept ES at GFL and with LID at back of GFL. Quarry area is going to be a crater so it is hard to imagine how it will be ES. Also, not clear how the two LID areas can get connected via OK-I. Suggest that quarry bed be LID to connect the LID areas and to make plan practical and best for all involved. East of Millstream Road leading to Thetis Lake Park is ES.
 - e. What is motivation for land owners? Looks like Highlands will need money to protect undisturbed land. So, use disturbed land to accomplish that. OK-I will not be a crater. Once quarrying is finished, the land is planned to finish relatively flat and approximately 1-2m above the grade of Millstream Road. Language in ES and LID is too restrictive.
 - f. Three members suggested expanding the LID into the ES.
 - g. One member was of the opinion that the ES designation was a good place holder for land use, and that it should be left. Future Councils can consider its implications. Reiterated the desire for community housing on crown lands.
6. A second vote was taken regarding, “Are you generally supportive of the high level direction in this draft plan with the addition of [1] adding a context statement; [2] including wording around net positive in the ES designation and [3] including an opportunity for non-site specific community or alternative housing?”
- a. Three members voted in favour. Three members voted against.

Closing Remarks

7. There was a wrap-up with closing comments. The work and commitment of the Task Force members were acknowledged and greatly appreciated.
8. Meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575