

Rockland Neighbourhood Association
Minutes — Meeting of the Board of Directors
Volunteers' Cottage, Government House
Wednesday 6 February 2019, 7 p.m.

Present: Marc Hunter, Janet Simpson, Art Hamilton, Anthony Danda, Dave Clark, Bob June, Dave McWalter, Chantal Meagher, Susan Wynne-Hughes, Lawrence Bortoluzzi

Guests: Councillor Young, Gary Pemberton

Absent: Danielle McQueen, Dave McWalter, Lisa Macintosh

Meeting called to order at 7:03

Agenda

- Motion to approve AH DC
 - Approved unanimously

January Minutes

- Motion to approve AH LB
 - Approved unanimously

Councillor's Report/Neighbourhood Update

- Council met 3 times this week for strategic plan (150-200 items). Order of LAPs vs some initiatives intended to apply to whole city (e.g: rental only zones, city purchase of land for low cost housing, ensuring 2 and 3 br dwelling units, houseplexes and townhouses through city). If these intensification initiatives are accepted and implemented, much of the scope of the LAP will become less important. In Rockland, where no community centre and no downtown, houseplexes will be significant.
- Townhouses by Hollywood Park discussed. Proposal for very dense development has been put forward. Strong local opposition. One of the issues where difference between planners and neighbourhood is definition of 2.5 storey bldg. – planners' definition allows what presents as 3 story to be defined as 2.5 storey. The planning dept is in a quandary – council hasn't determined what order things will be done in. Likely will work on city-wide initiatives, then move to LAPs.
- There is some uncertainty following election of new council: some developers had been encouraged by planning dept, which then started looking at new requirements: e.g: need for low rent component, bike parking. City is relaxed wrt parking, especially for low cost units. Result: more negotiation. Likely to slow down development.
- info on strategic plan is available online e.g: parquettes, traffic calming, neighbourhood initiative focussed on placemaking or 'tactical urbanism', community gathering places, benches, places for public art, etc. Neighbourhood identifying such initiatives may have some success. Want the city more pedestrian and child friendly. Looking at publicly owned land for these initiatives.

- DC: being strategic: how suggest we move forward on traffic calming etc. initiatives? GY: engineering dept tends to focus on traditional sidewalks. Concern that opposition to sidewalks is on part of adjacent landowners (for parking, etc). Perhaps look at map and see where there could be alternatives for traditional curbed sidewalks that could calm traffic. Look for opportunities when property is subdivided, and sidewalks could go in at cost of developer.

BJ: strategic plan: is there any attention paid to the projections in OCP wrt population? Have we already accommodated the growth, but council is like a runaway train. GY: don't recall reference to growth targets, or neighbourhoods 'having done their bit'. We do have a general idea that growth is more environmentally sound if focussed in the city, rather than suburbs. Different councils have had different views wrt protection of traditional neighbourhoods. There is now a clear commitment on council to encourage densification – in particular, low cost rental housing. Council has been more inclined to see low income projects move forward (Pacific, Kool Aid), but less so for high end ones. Many new councillors have not experienced a public meeting.

Community centre? Focus of the council will be on lower income areas of the city. In RL, there are a number of streets that aren't yet developed – the idea of placemaking could be used to our advantage. St. Charles has a lot of traffic: something there? Improving community amenities.

JS: Motion: letter to council from LUC opposing imposition of overlaying zoning. BJ: seconded.

Discussion: object to the delay of LAP, and concerns about overlay city-wide.

Decision: LUC will draft letter to be considered by Board, and then sent by Marc to Council. To be distributed to other community associations for information.

Calendar Review

- February: CRA forms, pay for AGM venue.
- March: post AGM notes on website.

CM to do calendar of events for 2019.

Committee Reports:

Membership: messages aren't getting to people, so need to make sure AGM notice gets through.

Environment: preparing report for AGM

Land Use: Strategic planning: was to include a discussion of LAC and CALUCs, but didn't do so. All documents submitted to the city are on the website. CAC (Community Amenity Contribution) meeting: report commissioned by the city that said basis for calculation of CAC doesn't make a difference. Also, said that funds go into big pot, and not the community where the development will be – will go into affordable housing. Forced discussion toward the importance of it going to community. LAP meeting: each neighbourhood assn related their issues. RNA's concerns read out early in meeting, and were well received. See below.

Social: meeting next Friday with Government House to plan soiree. Also address music evening. Costs are key.

Nominations: Sandra Jackman will stand for secretary. Nominations Committee should contact Sylvia Mitbrodt, Carole Sabiston, Steven Hammond, all of whom have expressed a willingness/interest in joining the Board.

Woodland Garden: The city has put in a pipe for water supply.

AGM:

- aiming for 27 February 7 for 7:30-9:30
- AV training: LB, MH
- .guest speaker confirmed: John O'Reilley. Topic: a focus should be about HCAs enhancing the value of your property
- notification to membership – must be sent 2 weeks ahead of meeting.
- invitations to council members, mayor, heads of cultural organizations. JS has list.
- preparation of booklet: limit the number printed (save costs), send out electronically. CM
- constitution and bylaw changes: need to put in agenda, and notify 2 weeks in advance.
- DC has plexiglass display stands, if anyone wishes to use them

New Business

None

Attachments:

JES points raised at City of Victoria meeting regarding LAP:

What are you looking to get out of future neighbourhood plans?

- the data necessary for real discussion (ex. how many dwelling units have been created since the OCP? how many dwelling units have been created by the house conversions allowed in our zoning? how much green space have we lost in the past decade? what are the rents in existing buildings as compared to condo costs? etc.
- a commitment from the City to working with the residents of the neighbourhood (not wannabees and developers)
- updating our existing neighbourhood plan, rather than recreating one
- a recognition from the City that we have already met our projected population increases for Rockland, and that there is no need to densify
- appreciation from the City that Rockland really values its heritage
- appreciation from the City that Rockland is a vital neighbourhood in terms of the City's tree canopy
- a willingness to consider a neighbourhood-wide HCA
- a willingness to consider a neighbourhood-wide EDPA
- a commitment to working with the RNA, as a democratically-elected voice for the neighbourhood (Engagement Advisory Group and the Steering Committee)
- how the process will deal with "silos in staff"
- a process that is truly IAP2 "collaborative"

What preliminary work, if any, have you done so far?

- the RNA LUC has reviewed and provided new wording for the neighbourhood plan
- the RNA has featured discussion of the values and goals of the neighbourhood at the past 2 AGMs
- the RNA has formed Working Groups to address the issues around "What We Live In, What Surrounds Us, and How We Move Around"
- the RNA has held a meeting attended by neighbours, at which Don Luxton explained how the Shaughnessey HCA came about
- we have discussed with other neighbourhoods their experiences with the LAP process