

## Village of Pemberton

# Boundary Extension Public Meeting

7:00 PM; Tuesday, July 8, 2008 @ SLRD Meeting Room

**Attendance:** Approximately 40 people, plus press, staff; Village Mayor Study and Councillors Helmer, MacKenzie, and Blundell; and Electoral Area C Director Gimse.

**Presentation:** The consultant (John Steil from Stantec Consulting) made a PowerPoint presentation on the following topics: background on the Local Government Act, Provincial boundary extension criteria, the process, rationale for extension, sub-regional growth study, potential expansion areas, landowner and agency consultation, and other implications regarding planning and taxation. The presentation is available on the Village's website as of July 10, 2008. ([www.pemberton.ca](http://www.pemberton.ca))

### Discussion/Comments/Questions and Answers

1. **Comment:** Question about approval process. Revelstoke had 90 % voted against annexations, but got annexed anyway. This process is not fair, legal, and transparent and I have no confidence in it. Boundary extension isn't taking farmland into account. There will be no farm investment if they will be taxed on all they have. No farm land should be annexed unless 3<sup>rd</sup> party, like a nature conservative trust, looks after it. Keep farmland here – need to feed people, need to be able to grow our own food.

**Response:** Ordinarily, the Province does not normally put lands into a Village if there is a lot of objection - unless they feel there is overriding public interest. It does happen, but it's not the norm. Ultimate approval is given by Cabinet (Lieutenant Governor in Council). Issues about farmland – no proposal to change zoning, simply dealing with boundary adjustment. Future changes can always be considered, some land within the area is in the ALR and their restrictions will continue to apply.

2. **Comment:** Curious as to why all properties in white (those generally between the Village east towards the river) are not included? Everyone should be given the same opportunity to be considered. Others haven't been asked or approached to join the Village. If it is truly a boundary extension to gain extra funds for village why is not everyone being involved? If do one side of highway should do other side. It doesn't make sense. It's worth looking at other lands.

**Response:** One of the reasons for the public meeting was so Council could hear various viewpoints.

3. **Comment:** Live in Pemberton North – 2/3 acre – ever since lived here, thought we eventually you will be incorporate into village and maybe be rezoned for smaller lots. Concern b/c we can't subdivide – would affect neighbourhood in Pemberton North.

**Response:** Lands would still be in the ALR. Subdivision not likely approved by the Village just because land is in the Village. Essentially was to deal with requests to be in the Village and where village responsible for the road but not

the properties. Where providing services, should bring them in so there is equity. Ministry of Transportation has recommended including other lands, but they would want to give away roads so they don't have to deal with them anymore.

4. **Comment:** Have been fighting with ALR for years, can not be taken out of ALR, so it's useless for me to be in the Village. If I can get out of ALR, I do not want into the Village, if I can then great, be part of Village.

5. **Comment:** Consultation process – property give to First Nation was taken from woodlot license with no consultation. There's not much to like, not brought in any part. Finger goes around part of our (Ivey Lake) neighbourhood with no consultation with anyone in the area. Why would we want to be brought in and have congested development all around us? We were never asked our opinion; don't see how it is open and fair at all.

**Response:** Can't speak for province on their negotiations with Lil'wat, other areas are fighting with province on other issues. Couple of things: in terms of planning, two processes are ongoing with RD: 1. Regional Growth Strategy and 2. OCP for Electoral Area C. Both have significant components of consultation and opportunities to participate in planning for the area. Suggest you should talk to SLRD about those aspects. The Sub Regional Growth study identified the hillside as the best potential development area around Pemberton. The study results are included in the draft OCP and draft RGS. There will be a planning process to resolve issues; good planning takes into account ways to transition uses etc.

6. **Comment:** is the Pemberton Valley Diking District paid by Pemberton Taxpayers?

**Response:** Yes, paid by people in the area, but not included on the tax notice.

7. **Comment:** If this is first stroke of brush, takes 2 – 3 years, trying to get this through quickly - is that why keeping small?. Why not do whole area all in one sweep? Is there a phase 2 plan? What are the time frames?

**Response:** No real thought to a phase 2 – talked about restructure study – broader type that includes larger electoral area – wards, etc. No one is advancing it, just an idea at this point. Study for governance of that nature often take several years – much more complicated, more people involved, more at stake in terms of governance.

8. **Comment:** If have another piece of property to have included into the area – who to talk to? What time frame to get back? Drop dead date?

**Response:** Encourage you, if you have ideas, to please contact us as soon as possible.

9. **Comment:** The property as it sits now in SLRD – explain differences how it is governed, who are decision makers on land use now and if brought into the Village – who is decision maker.

**Response:** Regional Board makes zoning decisions in the area now; Village Council makes decisions on village property.

10. **Comment:** Of the example of taxes would change from \$2400 to \$3400 – was that Lil'wat properties? What is the approximate assessed value?
- Response:** It is a residentially assessed parcel up the hill – assessed at: \$636,000
11. **Comment:** if that property was to be developed into several properties assessed at \$100,000 each how would that affect VOP revenue?
- Response:** have not done that calculation, but there would be more revenue, but also would be additional costs to Village due to servicing, etc.
12. **Comment:** How much area would be acquired– what are reference points?
- Response:** Haven't calculated acreage – with crown land, it's a large area. Can point out details on the map after
13. **Comment:** Generally like idea and part about maintaining zoning/OCP – keeps no development in flood plain and ALR, etc. Have not accomplished anything with this plan in terms of connecting the area and making it more contiguous – like to see more study of filling in the holes.
- Response:** in some areas starting to fill in gaps. Most areas will not get services – little in way of services VOP required to give them: bylaw, general enforcement. Don't see dramatic increases in costs at this stage. If future development, there is a process of planning and DCCs.
14. **Comment:** High density development with no sewer?
- Response:** no development plans at this point – don't service until development.
15. **Comment:** This is a dysfunctional plan on steroids. What are the underlying principles for why you are looking at this, failing to see any initial reasons for doing, this is not obvious. Missing the point and the value annexing the farm land into the Village.
- Response:** there are a variety of reasons: equity, fair share, balanced assessment, zoning & planning control, future potential development – municipality's structures to deal with planning and development in a different way than RD's are.
16. **Comment:** I'm all for boundary extension – more so for total amalgamation of Area C into the Village. Lacking selling the idea, explained the process, what good is it if you can't convert land. Go long way if came up with what are the benefits – people won't mind so much if understood where \$\$ going and what benefits to Council will be down the road. I understand why doing what this from Council perspective – wouldn't it be nice to have more in?
- Mayor:** Not the consultant's job to sell this; his job to do assessment and conform to legislation. Council decides to move forward if they agree. Originally all properties were included, so did not pursue. If interest in being part of village and getting services – then talk to the consultant and express interest.

17. **Comment:** Agree with last speaker – use MOT suggested boundaries – go for increase in tax base. I am concerned – looking at map why not take it all in? Good first step, it is a process, but should be expanded to bring in everyone.
18. **Susie Gimse, Electoral Area C Director:** Listening to information - would love to challenge and debate – but not healthy or productive. Need for clarity.
- SLRD response: asking province for funding to hire a consultant and do analysis to determine the impacts. Request for funding from province was secondary. SLRD will proceed with study regardless of funding. Province came up with \$\$\$ to do Sub-Regional Plan. Once we have info will share with public and VOP and provincial government.
  - Restructure Study – I’ll be up front – clear that I’m open to study this. I was opposed to boundary expansion. Consistently been an issue between the two jurisdictions. Clearly told by Village Council that restructure boundaries was not priority. Seems like there is urgency to process. The existing OCP and zoning will continue, but only for a period of time as the Village can change it. Know that process was paid for by developer – assuming expectation that boundary expansion will occur, then rezoning will take place and development will take place.
  - Fragmented services? With respect to local services – and how SLRD provides. Premise is that if you receive a service you pay for it. Done in consultation with both jurisdictions. SLRD will ensure local taxation information is well explained and correct.
  - Moving Forward – biggest issue is governance – one community with two jurisdictions – cause for significant and unnecessary conflict. Area C and Village elected to represent a constituency and in doing that at times objectives conflict. This proposal is seen as more divisive in the community - does not take down boundaries, creates new boundaries (old village and new village). Need to do larger restructure study and look at what is best for community as a whole first before piecemeal expansion to accommodate one development.
19. **Comment:** I echo Director’s thoughts. Any discussion about SLRD and Village amalgamating and what would be the benefit for the communities – what would that mean as a community?

**Response:** those types of questions – take three to five years to figure out – do not have the answers to that now.

**Jordan:** Not speaking on behalf of Council only informally discussed restructure – this boundary expansion should be relatively easily – appeared that something straightforward and be done with – go toward to creating a meaningful map. It does not solve all problems, but it does provide significant change in taxation revenues that currently go to Victoria that would stay in the Village. Speaking personally – fully supportive of restructure study the minute this is finished. Like to see expansion happen quickly and move forward to restructure. How do you take all these constituencies and amalgamate them in Village – example Pemberton Meadows vs. Village centre? Look around at other areas that would all need some sort of legitimate representation. Council

made it clear that they wanted to minimize agricultural land in extension. Seems to be the sense that if land comes in to the Village it is sub dividable – this is simply not the case. It will stay in the ALR. Council decided it's simpler to leave it out.

20. **Comment:** What is your definition of Agricultural? Are you proposing to change the agriculture?

**Response:** There is no plan to change use. The land remains in the ALR. There are other ways we might work to even enhance agriculture.

21. **Comment:** I'm lead to believe that this is not the first map proposed.

**Mayor:** This is the first map proposed by the Village.

22. **Comment:** This is a start; support it to get something started. Hear the same thing over and over again. Why wait until this happens until we move forward? The will is there - close it in and why wait, encourage moving forward sooner than later.

**Mayor:** There is no reason, assuming Council approves this, that it could not be submitted in a month or two. If go to restructure process...

**Response:** the province will only consider one proposal at time.

23. **Susie Gimse, Electoral Area C Director:** Provincial dialogue with province – what is the response and who talking to? You earlier indicated that properties supported expansion and showed Lil'wat supported the proposal – looking for clarification – when owners provided support was that the first time they were contact and prior to the Village passing the motion to support expansion? Was there discussion and letters from them after the map was amended?

**Response:** Lil'wat Nation has not formally endorsed expansion – agreed through Lil'wat properties to support the option moving forward. Yes, we have started discussions with the Ministry of Community Development. Original discussions with Derek Trimmer – Director, Local Government Structure, changes in that department – now have a contact that has been assigned – talked with them about utility taxation, etc. Normal process is for us to give them info after consultation. Discussions at the staff level have been held. I'm not involved in any discussions at the political level? Regarding clarification of Lil'wat – we have letters on file from property owners to get discussion going, correspondence with Daniel Sailland. The administrators are going to reactivate the previous committee set to deal with boundary issues. We have talked to all landowners since this current map was done. There were earlier maps that the landowners were proposing. This is the map council resolved to put forward.

24. **Comment:** Not critical of map as it is - is it not a mute point if there is going to be a restructure anyway – why spend time and money on this? I'm in favour of restructure.

**Mayor:** If a restructure takes 5 years – potentially million \$\$ that will stay in the community.

25. **Comment:** Who is paying for the study?

- Mayor:** Three developers are paying – Ravens Crest, Biro and Transfer lands.
26. **Comment:** Is there a development proposal put forward?
- Mayor:** not with the Village. It is now within the SLRD. A process has been discussed.
27. **Comment:** Are they paying for this process with the hope to move a development forward?
- Mayor:** If boundary expansion is successful, the existing zoning stays in place. Any future rezoning would come forward and Council would make decisions.
28. **Comment:** Are boundaries set out as they are so developers can benefit?
- Mayor:** Proposals could be moving through the SLRD – decisions would be made at the SLRD board. They could move forward now with 2.5 acres. You could refer to draft Area C OCP to see the proposed SLRD policies. It's important to recognize that the Village Council will make a decision on whether to proceed on boundary expansion or not.
29. **Comment:** Is it a conflict of interest to have developer pay for consultants? Are you selling zoning?
- Mayor:** We looked at that – it's fairly common practice to proceed this way.
30. **Comment:** Of those that didn't want to come in – why did they not want to come in – taxes, representation?
31. **Comment:** Owner of one of the X – like governance model of SLRD – current model – taxes go up about 65% for more restrictions.
- Response:** there were several reasons; some suggested that there was nothing to gain from additional taxes.
32. **Comment:** Add that I did not feel that we had enough information to make a valid decision.
33. **Comment:** The \$40,000 increase in taxes without Rutherford – that number does not add up quickly. Is Rutherford okay with paying taxes to Village?
- Response:** Yes, provided their not going to pay more taxes. The taxes that Rutherford pays now to provincial rural taxes and SLRD service area is approaching \$200,000/year.
34. **Susie Gimse, Electoral Area C Director:** Encourage everyone to go to RGS meeting. The Sub Regional Growth Study speaks to these lands. Did go through process that looked at once everything is built out in Village where would community go/grow – looked at land constraints in area – removed potential lands for development for future growth – 5 , 10, 15, 20 years down the road. Board looked at it and identified hillside as lands suitable for future growth once the Village hits build out. Important that community shows up to these meetings and provide input. Rutherford - \$185,000 also included local service taxes – does that \$500, 000 + include local services taxes. Rutherford supports if mill rate is set – what will that mill rate be set at?

**Response:** They support being included – I think the specific wording was with no increase to the mill rate. How you compare all those things – look at what they now pay \$185,000 – roughly what they pay rural and local service tax?

35. **Susie Gimse, Electoral Area C Director:** Amenity payments of \$40,000/year from Rutherford Power are in a reserve, with in excess of \$600,000 from payments from Rutherford and Miller. This money is earmarked for purchase of old high school lands with intent to keep the playing fields. This would benefit the community as a whole.

36. **Comment:** Only provide information with information you are given – what about lands in Soo Valley. To say no development plans when there are is bizarre.

**Mayor:** Soo will be dealt with when it comes forward. Ivey Lake area – refer to Area C OCP.

37. **Councillor Helmer:** Council may be confusing things – 1. boundary extension, and 2. hillside development. Need to have more discussion. The two notions are married in some people's minds.

38. **Greg Bikadi, Lil'wat Properties:** At this point, Lil'wat does not have any comprehensive plans for development. Being included in the extension is an option. As process unfolds it is still an option. Our plans are not defined.

39. **Comment:** You mention that hillside might go ahead in SLRD. What would Village be losing in terms of DCCs, etc?

**Response:** hard to answer at this time without a plan.

40. **Comment:** On the slide with checks and X's – of those check marks how many are properties owned by people funding the study. Would it not have been appropriate to make that clear that funding is from other sources?

**Response:** The properties, as discussed – shows on map,

41. **Comment:** Would there be consideration of hiking/biking trails around Mosquito/Ivey Lake?

**Response:** It's been pointed out that these are important to the community and any future planning would address this issue.

Being no further questions, the consultant thanked everyone for their interest and attendance. Cards were available with his contact information and he encouraged people to contact him directly. There were some individual queries and comments after the formal meeting was adjourned.

The foregoing is considered to be an accurate record of items discussed at the public meeting. They were prepared by the consultant based on notes taken at the meeting by Village staff. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the Consultant immediately.

John Steil, FCIP  
Stantec Consulting

(604) 696-8209 or at john.steil@stantec.com