

**Municipality of North Cowichan**  
**Public Hearing for OCP Bylaw No. 3900, 2022**  
**MINUTES**

**July 18, 2022, 2:00 p.m.**  
**Electronically**

Members Present            Acting Mayor Debra Toporowski  
                                 Mayor Al Siebring (arrived at 4:11 p.m.)  
                                 Councillor Rob Douglas  
                                 Councillor Christopher Justice  
                                 Councillor Tek Manhas  
                                 Councillor Kate Marsh  
                                 Councillor Rosalie Sawrie

Staff Present                Ted Swabey, Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)  
                                 Sarah Nixon, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer (D/CAO)  
                                 George Farkas, General Manager, Development and Community Services  
                                 Chris Osborne, Manager, Planning  
                                 Jason Birch, Chief Information Officer  
                                 Michelle Martineau, Corporate Officer  
                                 Patricia Taylor, Planning Technician  
                                 Rob Conway, Director, Planning and Building  
                                 Tricia Mayea, Deputy Corporate Officer

**1. PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION**

Acting Mayor Toporowski explained how the two parts of the Public Hearing would be conducted, including breaks, and acknowledged that Mayor Siebring was unable to attend the hearing until 4:00 p.m. at which time he would assume the chair.

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

There being a quorum present, Acting Mayor Toporowski called Part 1 of the Public Hearing for Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3900, 2022, which was being conducted electronically through Cisco Webex, to order at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 18, 2022.

There being a quorum present, Mayor Siebring reconvened Part 2 of the Public Hearing for Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3900, 2022, which was being conducted in in-person at Mellor Hall, Cowichan Exhibition Park, at 2:04 p.m. on Tuesday, July 19, 2022.

**3. EXPLANATION OF THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS**

On Monday, July 18, 2022, Acting Mayor Toporowski provided an explanation of the process for Part 1, the virtual portion of the Public Hearing, and read out the following:

“The purpose of the public hearing was to provide an opportunity for residents and other interested parties to share their views with Council on the proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3900. The role of Council during this hearing is to maintain an open mind and to listen to the representations being made by individuals who wish to share their concerns and

comments directly to Council - it is not a question and answer session. However, it is open to Council to seek clarification from staff or any speaker at this hearing on issues of relevance to the public hearing. However, as I previously mentioned, Council members will not be entering into any debate with members of the public or each other until after the close of the public hearing and the bylaw comes forward at a Council meeting for further consideration.

The order of business for this public hearing shall be conducted as follows:

- The Corporate Officer will advise Council of any petitions accepted or late correspondence received;
- The Director of Planning & Building and Manager of Planning will present an overview of the proposed bylaw, which may be followed by questions of Council if a member requires clarification on what has been presented;
- The Corporate Officer will then provide a summary of the correspondence received and published in today's agenda;
- The members of the public will then be invited to speak. IT staff will demonstrate how you can raise your hand electronically so that you can address Council. Once you are recognized, you will have 3 minutes to complete your address. You will see a timer appear on the screen after you have stated your name and address which will display how much time you have remaining. You will hear a beeping sound when you are down to 5 seconds and then again when your time is up. If you have not finished speaking you will be muted if you refuse to cede the floor to the next speaker. However, if you are unable to share everything that you have to say, you will be provided with additional opportunities to speak after everyone has had an opportunity to speak for the first time.
- If there are less than 20 members of public in attendance when we open the floor, I will not be imposing this time limit.
- Once there are no further hands raised, Mayor Siebring will call 3 times asking if there are any further submissions, if no one raises their hand, he will adjourn the public hearing to reconvene in person tomorrow at 2:00pm in Mellor Hall."

On Tuesday, July 19, 2022, Mayor Siebring provided an explanation of the process for Part 2, the in-person portion of the Public Hearing, and read out the following:

"The purpose of this public hearing is to provide an opportunity for residents and other interested parties to share their views with Council on the proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3900.

The role of Council during this hearing is to maintain an open mind and to listen to the representations being made by individuals who wish to share their concerns and comments directly to Council - it is not a question and answer session. However, it is open to Council to seek clarification from staff or any speaker at this hearing on issues of relevance to the public hearing. However, as I previously mentioned, Council members will not be entering into any debate with members of the public or each other until after the close of the public hearing and the bylaw comes forward at a Council meeting for further consideration.

The order of business for this public hearing shall be conducted as follows:

- The Corporate Officer will advise Council of any additional late correspondence that has been received that was not read out yesterday during part 1 of this hearing;

- The Director of Planning & Building and Manager of Planning will present an overview of the proposed bylaw, which may be followed by questions of Council if a member requires clarification on what has been presented. This is the same presentation that was given yesterday;
- The Corporate Officer will not be repeating her summary of the correspondence received, if you haven't already done so, I would encourage you to review that correspondence in binder, and for those at home who may be watching the livestream, all of the correspondence received has been uploaded to the public hearing webpage ([www.northcowichan.ca/PublicHearings](http://www.northcowichan.ca/PublicHearings));
- The members of the public will then be invited to speak. Once invited to do so, please step up to the podium and wait until I call upon you to begin. You will have 3 minutes to share your comments and concerns. There is a timer at the podium which will display how much time you have remaining after you state your name and address. The light on the timer will turn yellow when you are down to 5 seconds, and then turn red when your 3 minutes are up. Once your time is up, please take your seat to allow the next person in line to address Council. If you are unable to share everything that you have to say, you will be provided with additional opportunities to speak after everyone has had an opportunity to speak for the first time.
- However, if there are less than 20 members of public in attendance when we invite comments the floor, I will not be imposing this time limit.
- Once there is no one left in line, I will call 3 times asking if there are any further submissions, if no one steps up to the podium, I will close the public hearing.

Once this hearing is closed Council may not receive any new information from either proponents or opponents of the OCP. However, Council may receive clarification and opinions in respect to issues raised at this public hearing from staff or outside experts on matters raised during this public hearing. The OCP will then come back to Council at our August 17<sup>th</sup> regular meeting for further consideration."

#### **4. ACCEPTANCE OF PETITIONS AND LATE CORRESPONDENCE**

During Part 1, on July 18, 2022, the Corporate Officer advised Council that there were no petitions submitted, however, the Municipality did receive 43 items of late correspondence that was distributed to Council earlier that day. Of those submissions, 31 identified that they were supportive of the new OCP, 7 were opposed, and 4 simply shared their comments. The Corporate Officer read out each submission that Council has received as their content would be considered by Council when deciding whether to adopt the bylaw. Where multiple submissions included the exact same wording, the submission was read once and the Corporate Officer identified the names of each person who submitted the correspondence.

Copies of those submissions were uploaded to the Public Hearing webpage and included in the public hearing disclosure binder so that attendees at Part 2 could review and comment on them on July 19, 2022.

During Part 2, on July 19, 2022, the Corporate Officer advised that the Municipality received an additional 10 items of late correspondence that was distributed to Council earlier that day. Of those submissions, 6 identified that they were supportive of the new OCP, 6 were opposed, and 1 submission included 2 letters from the Duncan Chamber of Commerce in relation to public

engagement. The Corporate Officer read out each submission that Council has received as their content would be considered by Council when deciding whether to adopt the bylaw.

During Part 2, on July 19, 2022 at 8:45 p.m., the Corporate Officer advised that the Municipality received an additional 13 items of late correspondence while the public hearing was being conducted that were distributed to Council as they were received, and 12 of them were read into the record. Of those submissions, 11 were opposed, 1 was in support and 1 was not read as it was disrespectful and aggressive in nature.

## **5. INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSED OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (OCP) BYLAW**

The Director of Planning & Building, Rob Conway, and the Manager of Planning, Chris Osborne, presented an overview of the Official Community Plan (OCP), including what is an OCP, who uses the OCP, what must be included, the process for finalizing the OCP, how public input was sought, and the timeline for further consideration of the bylaw. The same presentation was given during Parts 1 and 2 of the Public Hearing.

## **6. SUMMARY OF CORRESPONDENCE**

The Corporate Officer advised Council during Part 1 of the Public Hearing that there were 128 submissions from the public in response to the notice that was published in 4 editions of the newspaper between June 23<sup>rd</sup> and July 14<sup>th</sup>. Of those submissions, 103 identified that they were supportive of the new OCP, though some had concerns, 12 were opposed, 12 simply shared their comments or it was unclear as to whether they were in support or opposed to the bylaw. Plus one submission was blank.

Comments and concerns included: request for personal property to be excluded from the urban containment boundary; use of the forest reserve for green burials; that the OCP should be left as it is; it is a step in the right direction; supportive of infill development; need for more trees and new parks; development outside of the urban containment boundary and its impact to trees and traffic; that it is well thought out and considers the sensitive ecological area, land use, housing needs, water supply capabilities and social needs; the extensive public engagement process undertaken; diverse development that will help with more affordable housing; how it addresses many of the economic and environmental pressures confronting North Cowichan; that it is a true community plan that will protect and enhance local economies and encourage more affordable and accessible housing while taking steps to reduce GHG emissions; the need for new guidelines; support urban containment boundary as drawn; addressing the challenges due to climate change; the approach to growth management and land use policies; measures to limit urban sprawl; the emphasis on sustainability and becoming more resilient; don't overbuild; maintain farmland; focused development; that it does not address legacy properties; need input from First Nations; objection to 6 story residential buildings and high density within the University Village; the active transportation initiatives; need to remain flexible when making future decisions; need stronger policies to protect and regenerate watersheds, soil, forests and ecosystems; prioritize local food system; support local businesses that have lower environmental impacts; the identifications of some grammar corrections and the nonexistent streams shown on map 3; need for enhanced food security; economic development policies are more resilient and have fewer negative impacts on climate and the environment; require new building to include alternative energy sources or construct in a way that can be easily changed later; need to address narrow strips of land for landscaping between sidewalks and curbs; postpone

consideration of the OCP because of COVID; it encourages more appropriate housing and protection of natural assets; does not have community's best interest at heart; it is community-oriented and holistic and will provide clear policy direction; allows thoughtful development while protecting the regeneration of the Quamichan Lake watershed; provide alternative forms of housing within the Quamichan Lake neighbourhoods; lacks tangible, practical strategies and applications; doesn't provide information on how seniors needs will be addressed; doesn't address the insufficiencies regarding services, resources and infrastructure; lack of regulations related to short term rentals; needs more emphasis on property ownership; the OCP is very forward thinking; the overarching framework of ecological and climate action for each chapter; the principal of reconciliation and relationship building; needs to be updated to reflect the current state of the environment; need for wide access to local green spaces and community gardens; lack of walkability and infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians in the community; unsafe walking routes; the noise put out by the race track; encourages appropriate housing and protects agricultural space; decisions need to be based on local needs, not globally, and shouldn't try to control everything; need to preserve the small town feel; need neighbourhoods with sidewalks, parks, bike lands and services closed by, balanced with protected agricultural land and rural spaces; the dumping of fill into wetlands; there is a better way to move forward rather than backwards; offers a sound framework for providing affordable and diverse housing, livability and expanded economic development; how it addresses land-use, urban sprawl, the economy, the environment, affordable housing, poverty, food security, reconciliation, livability, walkability and transportation; it recognizes the interconnectedness of all aspects that form a healthy community; we cannot have business as usual; does not speak to the extension of the municipal sanitary sewer system to unconnected rural areas; land use policies that will lead to a well-planned built environment; greater emphasis on sustainability and resiliency due to climate change; the adoption of the doughnut economics policy framework; an urban containment boundary that addresses environmental and social concerns; should contain policies related to growth densification, creating and maintaining green corridors and active transportation networks, public transportation, childcare and respect for nature and the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem health; need to concentrate our impact in specific area to improve walkability and mitigate wildlife impacts; lack of proper infrastructure, such as water traffic issues, regarding new development; changes to the urban containment boundary that affect the property owner's long-term plans; noise impacts of properties within UCB and small acreages due to noise from dogs, chickens, roosters, and donkeys; it encourages economic growth in a way that supports and respects the environment and the people we live with; integrating universal design principles in private and public development to ensure accessibility for all community members; creating a detailed Biodiversity Protection Strategy; encouraging the development of growing industry sectors; climate action and energy plan tax is unfair; the focus on reconciliation and social justice; provides hope that property may be preserved and protected as park land; the proposed policies will make the housing problem worse; it should provide direction of a vision, not dictate every step of development and create restrictions; nothing in bylaw will address the issue of affordable housing; need developers to improve their planning and construction to foster inclusion, connectedness and engagement; includes principals that enable the spaces in between and around buildings to support and grow a sense of belonging, accessibility, inclusion, connectedness and engagement; the disruption in supply chain has highlighted the need for stronger/greater food; the policies to strengthen the unique character of North Cowichan communities; the amount of control, restrictions and surveillance

that is proposed throughout the OCP is alarming; this draft is merely a first step towards supporting the equitable evolution of our community; good urban design, plays a significant role in equitable access for citizens; equitable access to social infrastructure is reduced for many in our community due a lack of functional walkability; and, development has prioritized cars over people, which has resulted a lack of consistency for pedestrians.

All of these submissions were included in the agenda and made available to the public on the website and were included in the public hearing disclosure package that was made available to the public during Part 2 at Mellor Hall in the Cowichan Exhibition Grounds on July 19, 2022.

Acting Mayor Toporowski recessed the Public Hearing at 3:13 p.m. and reconvened the hearing at 3:23 p.m.

## **7. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

The following comments were received from the public during Part 1 of the Public Hearing:

1. Rob Priestly was in support of the OCP and quoted a statement on page 6 of OCP that we humans are not separate from the nature we absolutely depend on it for our health, wellbeing and survival, noting that the quote is like a vision statement and shows that the OCP places emphasis on interconnectedness and sustainability – key guiding principles, biodiversity that the web of life is expensive, critical and fragile. He spoke for all the wild plants, animals, fungi and endangered species that reside in North Cowichan who need space, time and opportunity. He noted Section 6.1.1 of the OCP says the municipality will protect and regenerate local ecosystems and the connections between them and restore the environment to maintain and improve biodiversity, ecological health, and integrity, and asked that these words be followed up with action such as protecting and conserving sensitive ecosystems in the municipal forest reserve. He concluded by stating the OCP is an opportunity to come together, reconcile differences, address past wrongs and heal.
2. Cathy Wachs, was in support of the OCP
  - a. The first time she spoke she noted that the OCP will rocket North Cowichan into the present time. She asked that the OCP be accepted as presented and that to delay the passing of the bylaw until after another election is disrespectful to the voters who chose this Mayor and Council, and it would disrespect the democratic process to prevent the people who were elected from doing their job. She concluded by thanking everyone for their hard work on the OCP.
  - b. The second time she spoke she noted that it is very disturbing what is happening with climate change caused by the burning of fossil fuels and the news from Europe. She stated we need to use the trees to absorb carbon from the atmosphere so let's preserve the trees we have and plant more to do what we can to prevent an out of control climate change.
3. Arlene Robinson, was in support of the OCP
  - a. The first time Ms. Robinson spoke she noted the great amount of time and work involved in putting together an OCP. She would like to see more detail in the OCP about only having one secondary water treatment and if that third step had been taken we'd have clean water that we could divert and use for the Crofton Mill instead of wasting water from the Cowichan River and Lake Cowichan, noting that this detail can be added later as opposed to holding up the OCP now. She concluded by stating that water is important and it should be a priority.

- b. The second time she spoke she thanked North Cowichan for their community involvement and support of non-profits. She commented that we need to keep young families here and feels the OCP will do that. She reiterated her concern for the need of tertiary treatment water so we aren't wasting it, using drinkable water for industrial purposes and the sewage are two things that we really need to look at - saving our water, recycling water are so important. She does not see why people would want to hold up the OCP, noting it is the first step, we need housing and we need the environment protected.
    - c. The third time she spoke she commented that she thinks some people don't realize how much work has gone into this OCP and includes people from all walks of life that bring their input. She reiterated that she sees no reason to hold up approval of this OCP. She added that she thinks it is an excellent OCP because it addresses climate problems, affordable housing, density, green spaces and protection of our forest.
4. Gail Mitchell, was in support of the OCP and noted she was in agreement with the first two speakers. She does not want to see it get delayed because the draft came out in December, there have been 35 amendments since that time, and now it is seven months later. Many people have been involved in the OCP and she thanked them for their work noting again she was in full support of the OCP.
5. Carreen Unguran, was in support of the OCP and noted she volunteered as a Community Ambassador and has been engaged since 2019, and thanked everyone involved in it. She noted the OCP is a large complex policy document that covers the challenges that North Cowichan faces, it finds new ways to encourage economic growth while respecting the environment and the people in our community, the revisions to the urban containment boundary encourages land development in focused areas which will protect remaining ecological corridors and make living, working and obtaining services more manageable for people and will revitalize Crofton and Chemainus business centers and businesses. The policy incorporates accessibility and inclusion. The land use policy provides flexibility for property owners to develop carriage homes and secondary suites in a wider range of neighborhoods enabling families to support each other and increase the supply of rental units. The land uses also allow for wide range of commercial uses to support small businesses.
6. Valerie Russell, was in support of the OCP and thanked Council. She noted that we are in a climate emergency and we must consider this into the future. The plan has been in the works since 2019 with numerous times to provide input and urged Council to act now.
7. Barbara Allen, was in support of the OCP, commended Council, and acknowledged the effort to include people with disabilities. She voiced a concern whether the maps are incorrect.
8. Johanne Tomio, was in support of the OCP.
  - a. The first time she spoke she thanked everyone who contributed to document, noted it is very comprehensive and intricate with multiple facets. She voiced concerns about the sewage treatment in North Cowichan and would support a movement towards tertiary treatment because it enters our water systems. She feels it is important that waterways and water is supported as much as possible including wetlands and other water areas. She would like North Cowichan to play a strong roll in educating the public about how to take care of the environment while using recreational areas.

- b. The second time she spoke she thanked everyone for their work on the OCP and stated she is in full support of the adoption of this OCP. She commented on a previous speakers concerns over the language in regards to the municipal forest reserve. She supports changing the language to sustainable management rather than sustainable harvesting and suggested that the public is not interested in harvesting the forest.
9. Martha Lescher, was in support of the OCP noting there has been lots of time and lots of opportunity for public engagement. She noted that water was a concern – not just the quantity of water but the quality of the water. She added her support for increasing density (nothing higher than 4 story) but wants to keep the water clean and life giving. She does not support 6 story buildings or cramming people into small spaces, as it blocks views and casts shadows on gardens. She does not support the university village which is a floodplain. She would like the density to be kept to a sustainable level.
10. Lon Wood, was in support of the OCP stating it is balanced and a step in the right direction. He noted that a lot can happen between now and the election so adopt it now. He acknowledged that he wished he could have done more to take part but he feels everything has gone in the right direction and the OCP takes a common good approach - quality vs quantity of life.
11. Cynthia Montgomery, was in support of the OCP, she thanked everyone who worked on it, and noted that the local economy needs this OCP as every sector has been affected by COVID. She noted that people need a place to live - building affordable housing in specified growth areas is necessary and this OCP provides that. Plans for low income apartments and condos for young workers and families in more concentrated areas allows those who can't afford a car to walk or bike to work and amenities, making life more affordable.
12. Jordan Noble, provided comments on the OCP, noting that since COVID and due to rising housing costs, we are in a housing crisis and the number one goal should be housing. Effective zoning and planning is necessary and he commended the OCP for encouraging densification and growth within the urban containment boundaries (UCB) but noted there are suitable properties outside of UCB that are zoned for subdivision today but the proposed new OCP will make it challenging for property owners outside the UCB to subdivide even if they are zoned for subdivision under the current land use bylaw. There are many items in the OCP that restrict subdivisions. He ended by stating that the OCP should be a tool that encourage productive development not a tool that restricts development where it is already approved.
13. Jane Kilthei, was in support of the OCP and thanked everyone involved in the development of a visionary 2022 OCP, noting that it tackles the challenges and crisis of our time. She stated that she believes the plan offers both a vision and practical framework for affordable housing, greater housing diversity, walkable livable neighborhoods, communities supporting and expanding local economic development, safe guarding sensitive environmental areas, improving food securities moderating and adapting the challenges of climate change and also taking steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and hopes that we can move forward with a bylaw that eliminates fossil fuel from the built environment with this plan as a basis.
14. Peter O, was in support of the OCP but wondered whether the OCP could recognize human noise as a source of pollution under article 6.2, as human noise from neighbours can create a lot of stress.
15. Steven Volker, was in support of the OCP

- a. The first time he spoke he stated he was in support of the OCP as written and the urban containment boundary (UCB) as drawn, noting the documents are excellent and represent 3 years of hard work by staff and all involved, and added that extensive community outreach was conducted. He commented that the OCP fully meets the challenges of a rapidly changing planet due to climate change, population growth and emerging environmental constraints. It balances environmental protection with provision for growth including essential housing where critical infrastructure has capacity to serve and absorb development by encouraging infill and continuous growth. He noted that the tightening of the UCB around Quamichan Lake provides a better buffer against urban sprawl and guides growth away from the watershed and preserves the lake and wildlife and prevents destruction of Garry Oaks and ecosystems.
- b. The second time he spoke he added that Quamichan Lake is the crown jewel of North Cowichan and asked for additional protection by establishing a broader protective buffer around the southern reaches of the lake to ensure water flowing into the lake is the highest quality. He asked that development not be allowed on its shoreline to add more pollution to the lake. He urged Council to adopt the OCP as it serves the broader public good and provides wise stewardship, and to reject pressures to return to shortsighted policies of the past that have allowed hodgepodge developments to demolish ecosystems and degrade the quality of life of our community.

Mayor Siebring arrived at the Public Hearing at 4:11 p.m. and assumed the Chair.

16. Icel Dobel, spoke on behalf of Where Do We Stand in support of the OCP and its recognition of the natural environment. She noted that she agreed with most of the speakers but wanted to add one concern regarding the language pertaining to the municipal forest reserve and asked that after this draft OCP is passed the reference to quote "sustainable harvesting practices" be removed and more neutral language be incorporated into the draft OCP such as "sustainable forest management".

Mayor Siebring recessed the Public Hearing at 4:15 p.m. and reconvened the hearing at 4:25 p.m.

17. Christine, was opposed to the OCP, stating there is a lack of accountability in the whole document. The growth areas conflict with climate change in particular in our water. She questioned the population data that is used for all areas of North Cowichan. She noted nothing in the document speaks to sensitive archeological sites in particular along the water. She spoke to concerns about Hermits trail, and asked who determines what affordable housing is.
18. Steve Jones, was in support of the OCP, thanked everyone, and stated he has talked about the OCP with people in his neighbourhood and wanted to mention one thing – it touches on a variety of areas from culture to economic. He commented on section 6.2 Limiting Human Impacts which speaks about soil, water, air, noise and light as it relates to his neighbourhood. There was development happening near where he lives and an impact rock breaking machine pounded the ground Mon – Fri from 8 am to 5 pm, non-stop every 10 seconds for a period of time. The sound was terrible and negatively affected the mental health of a lot of the residents in the area. He noted that noise can be a health issue, and asked that noise be reduced where possible including vehicles and noise from private

property. The OCP makes an attempt to help residents who are living here and affected by things going on in their neighbourhood.

19. Joe Allan, commented on the OCP stating he has never seen one this big and that it veers off into a lot of social issues that fall under the jurisdiction of the provincial and federal governments. Due to the size of the document, Mr. Allan suggested that Council hold off for 6 months before adopting it so people have time to take a closer look at it and digest it properly. He suggested that an OCP should be written in a way so that it never has to be amended and so that it allows things to happen as opposed to being a roadblock to people.

The Mayor called on Cliff Evans to speak several times but there was no answer.

As there were no further submissions at 4:50 p.m., Mayor Siebring recessed the Public Hearing for dinner and reconvened the hearing at 6:00 p.m.

The Mayor called for a second time for input from the public.

The following individuals spoke in response to the Mayor's second call for submissions from members of the public:

20. Cliff Evans, was in support of the OCP and spoke about a subdivision up at hidden hills, 120 acres that could potentially be finished and supply housing or RV room for whatever North Cowichan is looking for. He noted that on page 100 F it states North Cowichan is not going to allow strata's or gated communities anymore. If something was in the OCP to promote public roads, or to publicly fund them, this could maybe open land that is already there. Good job on OCP and in support of it.

The Mayor called for a third and final time for input from the public.

Mayor Siebring recessed the Public Hearing at 6:12 p.m. to allow a member of the public to connect to the public hearing by telephone so that he could be heard. Mayor Siebring reconvened the Public Hearing at 6:17 p.m., called for a final time for input from the public and no one wanted to speak. Part 1 of the Public Hearing adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

The following comments were received from the public during Part 2 of the Public Hearing:

1. Damaris Berry, asked that Council hold off on approving the OCP at this time and to allow the new council that is voted in in October to take care of it. She noted her questions and concerns regarding the new OCP and isn't even clear on what exactly it is. She did not see any advertising and did not receive anything in the mail telling her how important it is. She heard today that only 4% of the people are really involved in the feedback and this number seems very low. She stated that nobody seems to understand at this point how important it is and asked that Council hold off making a decision until the new council is voted in.
2. Dwayne Arseneault, asked that Council hold off on adopting the OCP as he just recently found out about it a couple weeks ago through word of mouth and he is not sure how it was advertised and a lot of people didn't know about it.
3. Larry White, was in support of the OCP, stating that the document is good; inclusive, strong focus on environment, and the result of listening to a lot of public input over the period. It is aspirational, heavy on words like strive to and light on words like will do and how to. He noted he thought there would be greater inclusion of policy statements but is here to speak about ecosystems. Section 4.4.1 says to preserve rare ecosystems through park acquisitions,

which is good but we already have the spaces, the rare ecosystems within the forest reserve. Forestry mandate is resource management and parks mandate is public access and amenities. He suggested that Council should be considering policies around environmental protection, establishing a new category of parks whose focus is on conservation rather than use by the public. How do we come up with conservation as a goal? He noted he did not see any input from First Nations on agriculture.

4. Thomas Lowen, was in support of the OCP and thanked everyone responsible. He noted the OCP is a guide to build healthy and more vibrant communities. He spoke to the development at 9090 Trans-Canada Highway not adhering to the intent of the old or the new OCP. He stated that building within the urban containment boundary with services such as shopping, schools, and urban infrastructure exists is cost effective and makes the services available to families, the elderly, you and I.
5. Beverly McKeen, spoke in support of the cultural aspect of the OCP, stating she appreciates the indigenous, the economy and smart growth. There has been a lot of growth in last 46 years. She noted concerns about food security and a new community in the Bell McKinnon corridor, stating that it is wonderful agricultural land there. She supports the new hospital but doesn't think a huge community with all the extra infrastructure should be built there. She loves the social input of the OCP, thinks the public had a lot of time to review the document and opportunity to speak to it, and thinks it was advertised well. She noted that protecting the urban containment boundary, the wildlife corridor, and water was important to her.
6. Lorna James, was in support the OCP but did comment that she would prefer less development and less growth but thinks the plan is a reasonable compromise.
7. Brian Senft, was in support of the OCP and thanked all the various people involved in the development of the plan and all of the citizens and stakeholder groups who participated in the process through the various public engagement opportunities and surveys. He noted it was a professionally organized and thorough engagement. He stated he supports every aspect of OCP draft including the social, environmental, ecological activities, food security, forest watersheds, the influence First Nation partners have on the community. He noted that water should be available and sustainable into the future, lands and forests must be protected, housing must meet needs of the valley - all fall within the OCP scope of work.
8. Marilyn Garside, commented on the OPC.
  - a. The first time she spoke she stated that her property and a couple others in her neighbourhood were taken out of OCP and UCB and put into rural residential zone which came as a surprise to her and her neighbours. She noted that the Municipality wants to focus on compact higher density growth in existing centers but her property is within walking distance to Cowichan Commons Mall, downtown Duncan, Cowichan District Hospital and Berkeley's Corner as the CVRD trail system is right outside their door. Their property is located near public transit, is serviced by municipal water, sewer and recycling, has patio homes for seniors and townhouses on the adjoining property and three 5 story rental buildings close by. Considering all of this she questioned why they would be taken out of the UCB.
  - b. The second time she commented about human powered transportation, noting the trails system is outside their door, which satisfies the transportation portion and North Cowichan's Climate Action and Energy Plan. If OCP passes their property will be rural residential which will accommodate single detached dwellings and

agricultural uses, minimum lot size for a subdivision is 4 hectares, making their property no longer developable. She concluded by asking how removing these properties from the OCP and UCB while developing agricultural land makes sense.

9. Bernie Jones, was in support of the OCP and thanked all who participated in the process. He noted he has served on many advisory committees and worked on many neighbourhood plans in the past and he feels that an excellent job was done engaging the community in the planning process and offered a number of ways that citizens could be involved. He noted the plan acknowledges that in 2022 an OCP should be more than land use and planning and this plan includes elements such as arts culture, safety, food security, First Nations, childcare, and housing. The framework of ecological and climate action and social justice and equity make the plan stand out.

Mayor Siebring recessed the Public Hearing at 3:43 p.m. and reconvened at 3:57 p.m.

10. Steve Jones, Quamichan Lake Neighbourhood Association (QLNA), spoke in support of the OCP as it aligns with their mission and goals to protect the watershed and serve the community, noting that the incorporation of the climate action and social justice framework is visionary, progressive, and necessary. This OCP will provide clear direction moving forward and includes feedback from the community from over the last 2.5 years. The QLNA supports UCB to exclude lands along southeast and south shores of Quamichan Lake and noted it reflects the desire of their membership to allow thoughtful development to allow for aging in place and affordable housing while protecting the lake. The QLNA encourages Council to adopt the draft OCP and not delay any longer as many of their members have been involved in the process from the beginning and have been given ample time and opportunity for input.
11. Brenda Keeks, commented on the OCP stating they own 2.5 acre property, currently in UCB, on Maple Bay Road that they purchased in 2017 with a plan to build a multi-unit small place there with about 13 individual homes that would be clustered around the large house, and would turn the large house in to a care facility and to die there. She noted that her property will now be taken out of UCB, along with 4 other properties, even though they are surrounded by subdivisions. She noted they have been trying to farm and had bylaw officers visit them 3 times about the rooster crowing, twice about ducks and once about a rototiller in their garden. She ended by stating it is an idyllic notion to have urban rural neighbourhoods but the OCP needs to create a realistic UCB and a protection plan for the rural zone that surrounds it.
12. Peter Rusland, was in support of the OCP, congratulated everyone who has worked on plan, noted people have had 8 months to read it, does not want to see any more delays and asked that Council pass it now and fine tune it later. He noted that the enemy is sprawl and this plan replaces that with smart growth. The plan will take away the guess work for developers which will help with delays.
13. Maria Nevakowski, was opposed to the OCP
  - a. The first time she spoke she commented that there are a lot of opinions in the room and asked that the OCP be delayed, 800 pages is a lot to process, what is the rush?
  - b. The second time she spoke she asked if staff were tracking how many people at the public hearing were opposed and how many for.

- c. The third time she spoke she stated everyone is tired but you guys get paid to be here. She noted that she didn't care how much the OCP has cost to put together up to this point.
14. Savannah, was opposed to the OCP.
  - a. The first time she spoke she stated she recognizes the importance of environmental issues. She thinks the document spreads fear, doubt, confusion, and promises wrapped up in buzzwords. She stated that the plan is linked to the vision and agenda of several global corporations including the World Economic Forum and is being rolled out in 50 plus cities worldwide. She noted that holding a public hearing at 2 pm on a work day is inconvenient for those who work, the document is complex, confusing and convoluted and the public needs more time to dissect it and provide more input.
  - b. The second time she spoke she reminded Council that over the past 2 ½ years we have been actively distracted and trying to catch our breath while the world has been on fire, the pandemic pulled most of our attention. Doesn't have confidence in this plan moving forward and strongly encouraged everyone to vote against this plan or allow for more time and discussion. Postpone the vote of this OCP until after fall elections. She added that she finds it really challenging to sit here, she lives in the Cowichan Valley and we preach sustainability and climate change but don't acknowledge all the weather issues from chemtrails and how it's been engineered and pushed down on us. She added they are not conspiracy theorists, they are feeling desperate and are not the type of people that are typically ill informed.
  - c. The third time she spoke she stated that Council has a lot of work ahead of them to stay informed about globalists trying to take over our communities. She noted the environment is a top concern for people that live in the Cowichan Valley but it is not at the cost of infringing on the individual rights of our present and future land, work and security.
  - d. The fourth time she spoke she thanked staff and Council for the time and effort required to produce the draft OCP. She shared information, books, links, names with Council/Staff in reference to the World Economic Forum and doughnut Economics and encouraged them to look further into it.
  - e. The fifth time she spoke she stated that people on the island have been awake for a very long time and we are here to embrace people.
  - f. The sixth time she spoke she pointed out there was an online virtual meeting yesterday that was available for everybody who preferred to participate that way, or couldn't make it in person, and then today was for those that prefer to be in person. Having both is wonderful having only online is challenging for a lot of people and was happy to here in person.
15. Jay Smith, was opposed to the OCP, stating it was uniform and a copy and paste, and post your city name here, adding it is frustrating watching these things get pushed through. He commented about the pipe that feeds the Crofton Mill and that it leaks but we drain the lake to feed the mill.
16. Paul O'Rourke, was opposed to the OCP,
  - a. The first time he spoke he stated it is a cut and paste response by an international group that uses a bunch of buzz words to deliver an agenda. He noted concerns

- about water, he really cares about the environment, and the plan is a betrayal of him and his children and every single person in this valley.
- b. The second time he spoke about his business that employs 10 people and their plan to expand in Chemainus and hire more people, but was forced to jump through hoops including bicycle racks, the colour of the roof and other restrictions which made them go elsewhere. He noted this government made it unattractive to do business here and asked Council who they work for.
  - c. The third time he asked if Staff/Council were aware of what's happening in Europe right now with the farmers and stated the very same plan that North Cowichan is trying to implement here is there and noted the farmers recognize that this agenda is harming them and harming food production and that will happen here. Ask a farmer, don't ask a politician how to provide food for your family. Don't let this OCP pass and damage the ability to feed our kids.
17. Adrianna, was opposed to the OCP as a whole stating it is based on highly funded international influence and lobby groups such open society, the KR Foundation and she sees a familiar donut framework of which Nanaimo had in their OCP which was created by Kate Rawworth, the co-writer of United Nations development program who sits on the WHO Council of economic for Health. It is not a true Cowichan Valley community plan and asked that Council take time to wait until future council is brought in and allow citizens to look for conflict of interest.
  18. Mary Dolan, was in support of the OCP and spoke about childcare and homelessness. She commented on the open mindedness of council, good staff at planning dept., and that the policies in place at North Cowichan are supportive of childcare. Children need quality care and education during early years and environments that are conducive to their wellbeing to nurture them while their parents work and that the plan does this. She also indicated her support for a speaker earlier who spoke about the elderly and her dream.
  19. Rena Perbluck, was opposed to the OCP, stating she doesn't have enough time to read the document as she is too busy working. She stated it looks like agenda 2030 with the same donut. She noted we don't need organizations like the World Economic Forum and United Nations to filter our government. She spoke about chemtrails coming down in the sky and asked who is stopping this.
  20. Harvey Crowley, was opposed to the OCP as it does not go far enough to address food supply and water. He noted we are entering a hot period with 11 years of hotter than normal sun so we need to protect water and make certain of food in Cowichan Valley.
  21. John Koury, commented that we lost a decade and spoke about the 2011 OCP that was passed and that no local area planning, or bylaws or planning took place from it, creating an insecure, unaffordable community. He noted the growth of government in the community has outpaced the private sector. He stated that the OCP is ideological and meant to restrict growth, stop people from having families, and keep them in tiny homes in the middle of town.
  22. Kris Baskeville, was opposed to the OCP, owns a small property in North Cowichan, owns a business in Victoria and commented that words like equity, sustainability, and resiliency are wonderful words but they mean nothing and the words can be interpreted in so many ways. She noted the document reads like an ideal log and not an OCP and that it's a disappointment.

23. Ernie Van Boven, was opposed to the OCP as he only heard about it a week ago and he works a lot so has not had time to prepare. He asked that Council give more time for people to go through it and consider it thoroughly. He spent 5 hours reading it and the way the document is written is heading towards a nanny state not allowing and encouraging small business owners to use their own ingenuity and hard work to serve their neighbour well. He stated the OCP was disrespectful in this way.
24. Melissa Haley, was opposed to the OCP stating it is written to bring out emotion rather than a technical document. She noted plenty of buzzwords are used in the document but she just sees interference and restrictions, and nothing that helps the environment - just control about what people can do with their own property and reducing the standards of living.
25. Brian Johnson, was opposed to the OCP stating he depends on development to feed his family. He noted concerns that almost all OCP's being considered right now are identical, and is an international effort to push an agenda, agenda 21 and agenda 2030, and a UN template for Local Governments. He stated his analysis shows the wording and format is from the UN's template for Local Governments and as such reflects UN goals for restrictions on human life, including housing, transportation, food production and water access.
26. Margo Young, was opposed to the OCP, stating she owns 11 acres in R2 zoning purchased as an investment in the UCB knowing they could develop it at some point in the future. The proposed OCP will remove many lands out of that UCB resulting in huge financial loss to a lot of people who invested in their property. She noted they've been told we don't want urban sprawl, we don't want development, we don't want it around the lake but the property is beside a subdivision, next to the sewer and water hook ups. She stated that no property should be removed from the UCB unless the home owner wants it removed and that it is a big injustice to the people who own these properties. She ended by stating she wants to live on a bigger property and does not want to live in a 5 or 6 story high rise and neither do her children or grandchildren.
27. Sharon Horsburg, was opposed to the OCP and spoke to a property currently within the urban growth center that is sandwiched between subdivisions, is a small agricultural piece that the owner wants taken out of the ALR but this Council turned it down. She stated this doesn't makes sense as there is development all around that area and it has sewer and water at the property line. She asked that Council reconsider this small pocket of ALR property considering it's close proximity to grocery stores, schools and trails, and because they were unaware that this change was happening with the OCP. She also commented that not everyone is looking for affordable housing or rental suites, and there are people who can't afford to pay 1.5 million dollars for a townhouse, so she asked that Council look at the types of housing that is available to people. It doesn't seem right when you look at the land use designation in Chemainus on River Road close where they just put in that amazing active transportation system.
28. Masika Woods, was opposed to the OCP, spoke about a negative experience she had with North Cowichan with online meetings, and noted the OCP was produced during the pandemic without providing the opportunity for in person input. She stated the business community has not been properly represented as this process took place during a time when businesses were struggling to stay afloat, and online zoom meetings were not on their radar. She note that the OCP should not be considered until in person input has happened.
29. Nellie Feist, was opposed to the OCP stating she only learned about it two weeks ago and has concerns about origin of document template and how it ties to the UN's World

Economic Forum. She is concerned about whether her property will be in jeopardy and her way of life demonized. She asked that the process be put on pause so the people have the opportunity to look at it closer.

30. Shawn Johnny, was in support of the OCP and wanted to acknowledge what North Cowichan has done, noting that First Nations people are finally being acknowledged and inserted into decision making throughout the valley. He stated he is in support of the OCP because First Nations were included in drafting it.
31. Donna Jamieson, was in support of the OCP and thanked everyone involved for the thorough approach and hard work. She noted there have been 3 years of public engagement and so much opportunity for public feedback. She noted that affordable housing for all stages of life is important, walkable communities is important, a vibrant business community is important, industry is important, safeguarding the environment and it's natural resources is important, and protecting people and wildlife from wildfire and other calamities of climate change is important. She stated it is also important to continually engage with our First Nations community, and that balancing this all takes strong leadership. She ended by stating that she and her husband support the new draft OCP.
32. Ben Furduin, was opposed to the OCP and stated that the OCP, agenda 2030, agenda 2050 and agenda 21 have a lot of similarities all linked to the World Economic Forum.
33. Deb Savory-Wright was opposed to the OCP stating she has extensive concerns over the engagement process and lack of diverse community representation with no opportunity to participate in person to review the initial document, or maps that were large enough to see the boundaries, or opportunities to share thoughts and ideas with other members of the public. She noted that her biggest concerns of the OCP draft itself is the growth management and economy chapters and these were the two chapters where the survey results showed a split. She questioned whether the OCP was truly shaped by diverse groups from the community. She concluded by saying she hopes that some public meetings will be scheduled to allow the community the opportunity to ask questions and collaborate on some ideas in order to produce a true community driven OCP.
34. Valerie Russell, was in support of the OCP noting that we need to be concerned about our water which depends on our forests and forests are needed to clean our water and our air. She noted the health of our forests are in jeopardy, showing signs of stress due to hotter and dryer summers and we must work together to reduce the damage we have done. She stated the OCP is not perfect, but there has been a lot of public input and it has been revised due to this input. She noted that the community voted for this council and trusted this council to decide what would be good for the community and it would be disrespectful to not follow through with the OCP. She ended by saying that using templates to guide the creation of an OCP is a great idea.
35. Malcolm Graham, was in support of the OCP and suggested that anyone who objects to areas of the OCP should write down those concerns and send them to North Cowichan so they can understand what the issues are. He stated he objects to the proposed development close to Quamichan Lake because the developer wants to remove the restrictive zoning and make it a comprehensive development which means higher density and the elimination of protection of the Garry Oak trees and associated importance of man and wildlife – Garry Oak trees are a source of food for many wildlife species.
36. Vick Zandy, was in support of the OCP and is one of the 127 land parcels fronting Quamichan Lake. He note his concern about Quamichan Lake is one reason he supports the

OCP - the lake has been polluted for a long time and there has been a lot of discussion about how to address it but nothing has happened. The OCP is the first positive action to address the pollution and for this and many other reasons should be implemented as soon as possible. He stated he is not disputing the need for development and more housing but we need to work harder to look after our precious resources. He noted there have been many opportunities for public input, this Council has been working on the OCP for virtually their entire term, and it is time to adopt the OCP.

37. Jarred, was in support of the OCP and commented that two lakes that used to feed his ancestors are no longer usable. He noted there is no water left, the trees and mountains are weeping because they cannot survive, and the cedar trees are all wilting. He stated there is only so much we have and he likes the new plan as it shows that we only have so many resources and that continual growth is not a reality. He ended by stating a lot of individuals are not happy and are afraid of what will happen - change makes everyone afraid but we have to be ready to change because the way we are now will not work.
38. Jan Dwyer, was in support of the OCP because it puts restrictions and limitations on wild development and wild sprawl. She wants to see the rural country areas and farm land protected.
39. Michael Porter, was in support of the OCP and complimented all who helped to produce a comprehensive and extensive OCP. He stated he thinks Council got it right, achieving the best balance possible between the urban sprawl, preservation of important natural spaces, the provision of more housing, particularly for needed affordable housing and the First Nations interest in this land. He noted it would be folly to put off adopting the OCP for another 6 months, simply to turn it over to a newly elected council especially after you've worked so hard on it yourselves for the last 3 years. He urged Council to pass it now. He also spoke to the Scarlet McNutt development beside southwest corner of Quamichan Lake and how the developer wants to raise this 6 acre 50 odd Garry Oak ecosystem and all that lives within it to add townhouses and 3 to 4 story apartment buildings. He asked that the boundary line to phase it outside the urban containment boundary be maintained.
40. Marina Joe, was in support of the OCP and asked that Council accept the OCP to make this a place better, more livable with clean air. She noted she used to canoe pole at Quamichan Lake until it became too polluted. She stated Cowichan Tribes, Lyackson, Halalt and Penelakut gave their input. She ended by saying do what is right for this community and vote for the OCP.
41. Rob Snortsen, was opposed to the OCP stating he's seen corruption at every level of government and suggested that Council passing the OCP is a foregone conclusion. He stated he did not know about the OCP until a few weeks ago and then got really involved at that time. He stated it is 100 percent put together from the framework related to the UN and World Economic forum.

Mayor Siebring recessed the Public Hearing at 5:33 p.m. and reconvened at 6:06 p.m.

42. Bill Wollam, was opposed to the OCP stating he agrees with stopping urban sprawl but does not agree with reducing energy consumption and emissions and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 100 percent and electricity use by 12 percent within the next 30 years. He stated this is the kind of thing that the World Economic Forum just throws in there.
43. Jen Almore, was opposed to the OCP noting that there is more debate to be had and it doesn't need to be pushed through so fast. She noted a lot of buzz words are being used in

the document and stated there is a lot of innovation in the Cowichan Valley. She asked that the OCP be left for the next Mayor and Council to pass, she only recently became aware of it, has not had time to review it or participate online, and everyone needs their voice.

44. Riena Vancele,
- a. The first time she spoke she stated she cannot agree or disagree to OCP as not enough time has been given to review the document and meetings are scheduled at inconvenient times. She stated this Council betrayed tax payers and spoke about Council's decision in relation to 9090 Trans-Canada Highway (TCH).
  - b. The second time she spoke she continued on about 9090 TCH and the destruction of Henry Road. She talked about statements individual Council members had made in relation to the property, noted that realtors would not purchase if the zoning differed particularly if it was old or orphaned zoning and that the developer was fully aware of the inconsistencies with the purchase of this property and decided to go forward knowing this would be filled with many complexities. She asked council why would they approve a project before having any firm complete, concise proposals for access to the development implemented into the plan before it was approved. She talked about Council blaming Transport Canada. She wanted to know who pays for all this engineering when planning says there's no budgets for 5 years to upgrade Henry Road, the tax payers will. Who pays for the water coming across the highway, the tax payers will. There are strong doubts whether there will be enough water to accommodate all the people living here. There are no amenities close by.
  - c. The third time she spoke she continued on about 9090 TCH and the destruction of Henry Road, stating upgrades for assessments by engineering and are grossly minimized. She noted the TCH has raging nonstop traffic with no relief on congestions, on fumes, unbearable traffic noise, it has increased to the point you can't sit on your deck and must scream to hold a conversation and now North Cowichan is putting another highway in immediately in front of our doorstep, all to accommodate one man for-profit developer. She feels it will be absolutely horrible and unbearable for the residents of upper Henry Road. She is now trying to sell and her home is now devalued. She stated so much money on Modus and OCP over decades so the money must be a staggering amount, only to know the OCP means nothing and will be overrode at any time to suit any agenda no matter what, no matter who, no matter how much it costs down the road. She stated she feels completely betrayed by the Mayor and 3 councillors and can't sell her home fast enough.
45. Webster Parker, did not state his position on the OCP but spoke about Fuller Lake being a jewel that should be looked after. He noted the sewer containment border is close to the lake and the arena which sits just above the lake has about 23 toilets and showers and sinks, and the golf course has to pump out their septic tanks frequently, so he thinks it is a good idea if sewer was promoted that way. He reminded Council about Quamichan Lake being polluted and noted that Fuller Lake has been shut down more because of bacteria so we should look at fixing all the old septic systems around the lake.
46. Dorothy Baker, was opposed to the OCP. She asked to postpone voting on this OCP because people in the Cowichan Valley have not been made aware of it, have spent the last 2.5 years dodging public health with the pandemic and have not had the time, trying to keep their families safe, trying to keep working, trying to keep food on the table and pay their bills. She

found out about the OCP 2 weeks ago and asked to put it on hold until they have an opportunity to learn more about it. She's lived beside Quamichan Lake for 25 years and nothing is done to fix it. The community expects that you actually do something with these plans, your words need to meet your actions.

47. Careen Unguran, was in support of the OCP and thanked all people involved in preparing the plan. As a volunteer community ambassador involved since 2019 she stated she witnessed the wide range of public opinions incorporated into the document and noted that the OCP is comprehensive and finds new ways to encourage economic growth while respecting the environment and community. Additional housing supply supported through gentle densification allows home owners to develop their own lots by adding carriage homes and suites allowing people to support aging parents or family members and allow rental units to boost incomes which will employ trades people, will increase the supply of living units and will help alleviate the affordable housing issues we see today. Larger scale development is still encouraged through the revisions of UCB that focuses development in areas that have the services and amenities. The revised UCB will protect remaining ecological corridors. They support the policies that incorporate accessibility and inclusion for all community members.
48. Nancy Dower, was in support of the OCP
  - a. The first time she spoke she provided a summary of the changes her father, who turns 99 in November, would have seen in his lifetime, including the adoption of online tools such as Webex and Zoom that were used to connect and contribute to the discussion on the OCP. She noted that in recognition that growth and so called development has brought our world to the brink of climate disaster, we have reached the ecological ceiling discussed in the OCP. The first serious discussion that I remember with my father was about fairness and human nature seeks fairness, affordable housing for all, opportunity for gainful employment, and even social foundation, such as defined by the OCP. She noted that many people in this room are saying the OCP process has been unfair, they need another 6 months, even though hundreds of engaged, caring and thoughtful members of our community have spent hours and hours in the past 3 years to deliver a document for our time. She stated that we do not have 6 months to wait and asked whether it is fair to ignore this participation and listen to last minute rhetoric. She asked that Council look out for the greater good of the many, rather than the short term gain of a few and noted that as the end of Council's term nears do you want this council to be known as the ones that wasted tens of thousands of dollars on a failed OCP or to leave a legacy of a visionary OCP for the next generation? Pass the OCP bylaw 3900.
  - b. The second time she spoke she commented that a significant fraction likely participated in this process online where you did not have to face vitriol in person. She noted that one of her friends came to speak today but left because of the tension in the room, so perhaps some people did not communicate online but others were able to – those who don't have cars or have an illness.
49. Geneviève Singleton & Dave Polster, were in support of the OCP, noting they are both biologists and have reviewed the documents in detail noting it's a visionary work and our responsibility is to not look in a period of election or a period of an OCP document, but to the future generations. She stated the biggest crisis of our time is climate change and this document looks at that but they want to see more emphasis on the Garry Oak ecosystems

and great care taken with all properties with intact Garry Oak ecosystems. She also stated that Mount Richards should be protected, Echo Heights needs a zoning change and remove it from the UCB. She commented about flood plains, University Village and other places, and that there will be a time in the future that has already been evidence in New Orleans that taking dikes out with big huge changes coming ahead. She asked that no more development be added into the flood plains, we have to think of the future. They encouraged council to accept this plan and create a legacy for the future and thanked everyone involved.

50. Cynthia Montgomery, was in support of the OCP and thanked all parties involved in moving this forward thinking document. Come out to vote in October so we can enact the zoning bylaw needed to give enforceability to the OCP. She noted the previous OCP was never supported by a zoning bylaw to put it into actual affect and we are still under the 1997 zoning bylaw. She stated we need this OCP for our local economy and building affordable housing in specified growth areas will help us retain essential workers, those who can't own can rent, those without a car can walk or bike to amenities. Building in areas with existing infrastructure means that we tax payers don't have to fund new sewage, water pipes, lighting, etc. Cities with unrestricted growth including this one are having to raise taxes year after year to pay for new infrastructure so please bring in more focused growth. She stated we have a contingent of ready workers, who would love to work, but can't afford childcare, so the idea to provide some help with childcare could benefit even though it's only, initially for a small number of people, affordable childcare will pay off by providing needed workers in a time of labour shortage while boosting the income of young families.
51. Barry Dunlop, was opposed to the OCP
  - a. The first time he spoke about raising his family and having a small business. He stated there is no such thing as affordable housing. He noted that he only knew about the OCP a couple weeks ago and it is scary, stating a lot of good work was done, with some really good points but, how it is going to affect businesses here and how it's going to affect future generations. He commended that everybody is trying to put this through really fast but time is needed to read it, each page, to digest it in order to make best choice for community. He stated the community feels blindsided, there's a lot of information, it's a big decision, and people are working right now so they can't make it here.
  - b. The second time Mr. Dunlop spoke he stated that trust in government is at an all-time low and he feels strongly that there is a lot of disinformation in the world. He would like more time to look at the whole document and asked that Council slow down the process.
52. Evelyn, was opposed to the OCP.
  - a. The first time she spoke she had a lot of questions and stated that the new OCP is a farce. She spoke about agenda 2030 and agenda 2025 and 2021 and the WEF (world economic forum) and asked why are you working as an unregistered foreign agent on behalf of a foreign corporation such as the WEF and the WHO.
  - b. The second time she spoke she added that she is opposed to the OCP to the day I die and relayed that friends David and Janell Currie are also opposed to the OCP, however, they had to leave the public hearing early and they would like it to be noted.

53. Brian Edgar, was opposed to the OCP and stated that sustainability, resilience, green energy, innovative, inclusive, smart, diverse, equity and impart are important concepts we can probably all agree on, that looking after the land, the water and the air, that give life supporting conditions to live healthy and prosperous lives that are considerate of those that came before us and those to whom we will one day pass the responsibility and care of this world, is a critical and monumental task. He thanked everyone for showing up, showing leadership and celebrated the work done in good faith. He noted the buzzwords mentioned above are all found in North Cowichan's proposed OCP and are also found in templates provided by the world economic forum, who is publically partnered with the UN. He asked that everyone educate themselves on the actual working definition of those terms.
54. Sandy McPherson, was in support of the OCP and stated she is grateful to everyone for showing up for your community. She stated that this OCP isn't about sides and the introduction to the OCP is one heart one mind, we need to act locally together. She noted members of the OCP advisory committee and the neighbourhood ambassadors consisted of residents with a broad range of expertise and views and then staff and the consultants Modus applied their expertise to pull together all the community input. The stakeholder groups represented over 5,000 people alone, plus all the other surveys and everything else that was out there. She noted the zoning bylaw was outdated which was supposed to be updated to be in line with the 2011 OCP and there are many other plans waiting on the OCP being passed: the transportation plan, a biodiversity plan, an update on the agricultural plan and others. She ended by saying this is a sound plan, a respectful plan and I urge you on August 17 to vote in favour of this plan.
55. Klaus Flemming was opposed to the OCP noting he just found out a couple weeks ago which is short notice for everybody and asked to hold off until after the fall elections so people can actually review it. The pandemic has changed people's circumstances and got in the way of staying informed, people haven't had access to computers and aren't aware of things. He also noted that it looks like a cut and paste from the New World Order set out with an agenda to govern all countries lands and people under one global governance and control.
56. Rick Sanders was opposed to the OCP stating there are a lot of people who are not familiar with this OCP and to give everybody more time to have a good look at it because if it's a template that copies 49 other cities. He thanked everyone for their hard work but says no to the OCP.
57. Kate had some concerns about the OCP.
  - a. The first time she spoke she stated that she just heard about OCP a week ago by word of mouth and hasn't had time to read the plan in its entirety. She skimmed through pertinent chapters, appreciates some of the development and environmental approaches set forth, but is a little disturbed by what is not included in this plan; first the installation of cell towers and 5G towers in rural residential areas; second is the registering of wells which is interesting and it is not in there noting these are local issues that will have serious impact on local communities in exactly the same way unsustainable logging practices have. She would like to see some amendments regarding these topics and believes we need more time to understand what we're voting on.
  - b. The second time she wanted to state that Lorrain Hepton is in opposition of the OCP and could not be here.

58. Malcolm Brierley was in support of the OCP, noting he is on the executive board of the Duncan Community Lodge, currently in negotiations with Rowing Canada for bringing them to the valley and giving them a permanent home. He stated he is in favour of 2022 OCP and doesn't feel that Scala developments should be allowed any exemptions from the draft UCB.
59. Joyce Behnsen was opposed to the OCP.
- a. The first time she spoke about the environmental approach taking over the basic priorities of a municipal council which is to provide water, sewage, roads, garbage, public safety, police and fire, and that the priority, as indicated in this OCP, is the hiring of environmental staff. She noted that the focus has moved away from planning and policing to this environmental approach. The OCP is mentioned in the council meeting agenda tomorrow, and there's specific changes in the OCP referred to tomorrow's agenda. She asked where's the focus if it's been so strong in environment, why do we still have Parrot Feather which seems to be growing more in the Somenos Marsh. She asked why is there a public meeting tomorrow at the Crofton Community Center to do with the Chemainus watershed flood plan. What happened to 2013 Bonsal Creek watershed \$140,000 study with many, many meetings. Where is the action with all this planning, direction, talk and hiring and spending, spending in the climate action energy plan. Half a percent tax for 9 years now.
  - b. The second time Ms. Behnsen spoke to the municipalities approach to affordable housing using past examples from a 2016 proposal for a multi-family development which didn't see support from the public, coming back to Committee of the Whole with increased units. She stated this is an example of bad planning by local government to address affordable housing and it isn't working.
60. Andrea Hudson was in opposition of the OCP
- a. The first time she spoke about being a business owner for the past 9 years which shut down during the covid mandates. She feels that this OCP has come from the top down, working with a lot of different organizations, societies, and stakeholder groups. She indicated there was no transparency on how much this OCP has actually cost tax payers and many were completely overwhelmed with trying to survive or die in our businesses and we're still cleaning up the mess. People haven't had time to breath let alone read a ridiculously word solid typed script in the OCP. We haven't had enough time or transparency to show us really where the money has come from to put this together and how much is actually impacted us as citizens of this community.
  - b. The second time she spoke she stated concerns of not integrating the City of Duncan into the plan, concerns with added regulation and centralized control which will lessen the opportunities of a better quality of life for suffering local businesses.
  - c. The third time she spoke she talked about how the Motorsport circuit has affected her and the residents in that area. She stated we have been dealing with a lot in the past two years, she understands that this has been a lot of work for the municipality but just rushing this through now after hearing people in person and their concerns with no option for a question & answer period.
61. Ingrid, was in opposition of the OCP.
- a. The first time she spoke she said she kept tally on who's for and against and the people who want to wait and who are not for the OCP, exceed today. She asked what

percentage of the population really knows about this whole process if only 4% of the people registered online for comments, 500 emails out of a population of 32 thousand – this does not seem like a lot. She noted that covid happened, people with technical difficulties, scheduling the public hearing in the middle of the week in the middle of the day, is it any wonder that people haven't shown up? She asked what is the hurry, if you've put in 3 years and this thing is going to last for 20 plus years, what is another 6 months?

- b. The second time she spoke she said that she understood she couldn't get questions answered but wanted to know the process for taking all the information and making a discussion. The Mayor and staff explained the process following the public hearing.
62. Helen Dunlop was opposed to the OCP. She stated she only found about this less than 3 weeks ago and felt, side swiped, it came out of the blue. Her concern is that the OCP is a one size fits all, we need to step back and dissect this, considering it is going to be with us for 10 to 20 years is a concern. She read the executive summary and noted that it does not directly impact how land may be used, but subsequent bylaws and regulations must be consistent with the OCP, which means we will be saddled with this with no ability to change it through bylaws. She stated we have time, this isn't a global solution, charity begins at home and we need to think local, we need to custom design anything we do for our people here in the Cowichan Valley. She thank Council for their service.
63. Cam Campbell was in support of the OCP, noting it required a tremendous amount of work from all involved. He stated he'd argue this plan is very much a true community plan, grounded in a broad range of perspectives because of the large outreach that occurred and the array of community based knowledge and expertise that went into it, both professional and lay expertise, noting that local knowledge is so critical to develop into these kinds of plans. He noted that despite the pandemic and the challenges it posed, North Cowichan overcame the constraints of the pandemic by offering multiple ways to engage at multiple points along the way and the Municipality bent over backwards, the consultants bent over backwards to reach out to the community in as many ways as possible and the response was telling and enthusiastic from the community. He also noted that people do fall through the cracks and some don't know about it. He noted the OCP looks at values, principles, visions, and a growth management strategy. The community provided input, that input was incorporated into the plan which meets most of the needs of people on either side of the aisle. He ended by saying it has been a 3 year process, it's not as if this plan has been rushed through, it has been a very deliberate and engaged process, so I would say just in closing please consider adoption August 17.
64. Sheila Paul was opposed to the OCP.
- a. The first time she spoke she submitted 2 letters on behalf of other people, Mr. & Ms. Davis and Ms. Joyce Potma who are also opposed to the OCP. She advised she is taking notes that she will submit at end of hearing. She was unable to take part in the Zoom yesterday and has spent days pouring over the 800 pages that make up the draft to the updated OCP. She had concerns about timing the OCP during the summer and some people still work. She noted the cost to live in the Cowichan Valley is far too high but is most concerned with the adverse direction this OCP will take the citizens of North Cowichan and beyond causes much despair. She noted she can't pour through 800 pages like some people and has many questions.

- b. The second time she spoke to the Mayor interrupting people at today's meeting as not appropriate. She also referenced the Community Safety Plan from the OCP draft on page 72 saying it reeks of control not safety. She has concerns about moving to 5G and facial recognition.
  - c. The third time she spoke she clarified that she added names in her letter of people she agreed with. She wanted to take this OCP and do a search on each and every one of those buzzwords that were mentioned and see just how many times they appear. Then go to the previous OCP 2011 and check how many of those buzzwords are in the previous document or in other OCPs that are incorporated into those 800 pages. She thanked staff and council for their time and effort because at the end of the day she knows we are trying to do better, trying to build a better future, and trying to educate each other.
65. Penny Lahan, was in support of the OCP and thanked everyone for the 3 years of work put into the OCP. She has read it and is pleased with its broad holistic view of the various elements involved in making a community livable; focusing on more than just planning and zoning, and that this OCP considers them within a framework that includes environmental, social justice, food security, climate change and a regenerative local economy. Since the previous OCP we are so much more aware of the challenges we face and that to continue with business as usual would be to bury our heads in the sand. Growth is welcome and development is needed, but it needs to be smart well thought out development, not a hodgepodge of approval for individual subdivisions scattered around the valley far from commercial hubs. She noted we cannot continue down the pathway towards increasing sprawl, it is destructive to the environment and has significant tax payer costs involved in maintaining infrastructure such as roads, water, sewer etc. We don't have to look far to see other Municipalities regretting following that antiquated pathway. This OCP envisions development around focused growth centers to minimize sprawl and to create vibrant more walkable communities. The draft OCP is visionary, adopting this OCP will surely be seen by other municipalities in BC as a forward thinking model which they'll be inspired to emulate. She urged Council to adopt the draft OCP in its current form.
66. Mark Dodd, has great concern about the OCP noting it is slick, a cut and paste, and thought public input needs to be thoroughly considered. The Cowichan Valley is a very, very special place and more people need to come out and look at this document properly. Asked that Council put it on hold and let the people of valley speak.
67. Sheri, was opposed to the OCP for a multitude of reasons that she couldn't address in 3 minutes. She wanted to know when they could ask questions and was confused about where we are in the process. She feels the OCP is a cookie cutter taken from the world economic forum plan. She hoped Council have managed to find that information so that you can take that into consideration when they vote.
68. Petra Fleming, was opposed to the OCP.
- a. The first time she spoke she noted the executive summary is missing page 1. She had concerns about the United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) being referenced in the document adding that making reference to this cut and paste document shows we are part of something bigger - it is referenced on the introduction page. She noted that UNDRIP essentially provides that Indigenous People among others own the land and resources and have the right to self-government and their own distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural

institutions and educational systems and that the Federal government shall foot the bill. There are many other references to this document.

- b. The second time she spoke she referenced UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights to Indigenous Peoples) in its chapters and bills C15 and Bill 41, pointing to the UN directing local life and stating that UNDRIP is useless, dangerous and diverse and all Canadians regardless of heritage and descent should be treated equally under the law.

The Mayor recessed the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:09 p.m.

69. Candace Wright, was opposed to the OCP. She only just discovered the OCP in this last month and is insulted she was not aware and is just now being awakened to it is unjust, unfair and unkind. She asked that another meeting be held when people are more informed on this agenda. She feels very strongly that we are being rushed into this. She appreciates the work done but wanted to really have a word in the OCP. If there is not an option to amend then please consider holding off on passing this until after the elections in the autumn.
70. Colin Mullet, had concerns about the OCP and restrictions on growth and development. He noted that throughout the pandemic he supported small businesses, he cut rent for his tenants so he's been supporting small businesses and affordable housing. He is glad to see these things addressed in the OCP especially part five. He noted an error on page 103 - it references five people. 2.4 frameworks references that we are outliving by 5 times but references 1.75 on the website. He noted the visual maps at the back of this binder are also inaccurate/ineligible so please take a quick look at that, because I was just trying to figure out the maps and couldn't read a word. He agrees that green jobs fit our identity as a local value. He also noted he had plans for a 150,000 square foot facility that would employ 200 people in the valley but the deal fell through because the housing is unaffordable in North Cowichan. He fears that the new OCP will make it more burdensome for developers and business people to come to the valley with the green jobs they have.
71. Unknown speaker had concerns about the democratic process.
72. Jenny Gray, had concerns about the worldwide agenda and noted that it seems very innocent and appealing but it leads to bigger things that are not appealing like replacing cars with bike lanes and then more comes down the road.
73. Brenda Bernhardt, was opposed to the OCP in its entirety stating concerns about the process and a desire to postpone it to allow more time for due diligence.
74. Dan Wright, was opposed to the OCP stating there is a bigger agenda out there and there is no sense.
75. Karen, was opposed to the OCP and relayed her desire for Council to do their homework with the information that has been provided by the public.
76. Cheryl, was opposed to the OCP stating she wouldn't use it to wipe her bum with and that Council should do their homework and will be held accountable for what they do today.

The Mayor called for a second time and the following members of the public spoke:

77. Rob, was opposed to the OCP stating that neither he nor his friend group knew about the OCP until recently and he would like for any decisions to be put off until more people learn about the document. He is opposed to further restrictions.

78. Jackie, was opposed to the OCP stating she agrees with other speakers today about the state of the world and hopes Council will open their eyes and read the material that doesn't seem to hit mainstream media. She agrees with the Mayor that he is restricted by the things that governments mandate and believes this is an agenda, and as a retired nurse she is ashamed that people lost their jobs.
79. Matt Dupland, spoke about an issue he had with the current OCP that had painted his acreage as sensitive ecosystem, causing him a lot of time and money for studies. He stated he is bound but lots are not confined by this which shows the kind of cracks that property owners will fall into and have to pay to get out if this OCP goes through.
80. Robert Monroe, was opposed to the OCP stating it was brought to his attention a couple months ago and he didn't realize anything about it. The document takes a long time to read so he doesn't want it to be passed right now. Put it off to a later date.
81. Shannon Goulay, was opposed to the OCP and spoke about the 21 acre farm she owns where she hosts weddings, grows vegetables and raises her daughter. She stated that her property was rezoned without her knowledge, prohibiting a campground on her property. She had concerns about chemtrails noting their possible link to why berries aren't growing and the trees and fish are dying. She continued that new requirements coming out from governments concerns her. She ended by stating that the OCP is not well thought out and that it is a template from the world economic forum.
82. Bob Jeffries, was opposed to the OCP and would like Council to hold off for six months before going back to vote on it again.

Mayor Siebring called for a third and final time and no one else wanted to speak.

## **8. CLOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

IT WAS MOVED AND SECONDED:

THAT the public hearing be adjourned at 6:19 p.m. to reconvene on Tuesday, July 19th at 2:00 PM at Mellor Hall, within the Cowichan Exhibition Grounds, located 7380 Trans-Canada Highway.

CARRIED

The public hearing closed at 9:13 p.m. on Tuesday, July 19, 2022.

---

Certified by Corporate Officer

---

Signed by Mayor