

MARCH 25th, 2014 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - transcribed from the audio recording

Large gathering, many citizens outside in the cold and rain.

Mayor Rowe calls the meeting to order at 18:00 hours. Let the games begin,

Mayor Rowe: Before we move to approve the agenda I just want to make it clear this is a committee meeting of council, its not a public meeting. The subject matter of this particular meeting and subsequent meetings is a very difficult one, very stressful for council and everyone is wrestling with this particular application so, it doesn't help us when people boo and it doesn't help us when people clap. You're here as observers of a council committee meeting and I would ask you to respect that. There will be opportunities for inquiries, they will be one, actually, almost right away then opportunity right after the presentation and discussion by the council. I would emphasis that if there are inquiries that they are inquiries. This is not the occasion for submissions or making your views known. There will be an opportunity for that . The purpose of inquiries at this stage is to clarify things or get information that you feel is unclear. Some of it we may be able to answer and some of it we may not so, we'll just have to see. And, I really apologize to everyone outside. We obviously underestimated the interest in this particular meeting and we'll have to consider perhaps another location for meetings on this, but, having said that, welcome to the Gibsons Public Market that many of you made possible (chuckles) and thank you for that...*Clapping*...and we look forward to many great events and the gentleman, Gerry Zipursky, stand up and acknowledge you as a sort of manager of this building...*much clapping*....So, with that I'll just move on and I'll ask for a motion, then, to approve the agenda.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Q - Thank you, Mayor Rowe. I am **Graham Walker**, South Fletcher. I just was reading something on the town's website concerning inquiries and I thought it would be good to straighten that out now so that I know where I stand, and everybody else. From the Town's website, it says 'citizen involvement in local government is an essential part of the democratic process. There are many ways that you can voice your concerns and become involved. Opportunities are provided at each meeting for members of the public to ask questions OR COMMENT on items contained on the agenda. The word comment is not very clear to me, I understand it should be relevant to the issue at hand, for sure, though, so, maybe we could think about that for tonight? Thank you.

A - Mayor Rowe: Thank you. Okay, so with that, we're gonna move straight to the director of planning, with the submission. Oh, is that an inquiry there? Sorry, we're going to have to watch for that (citizen comes in from outside in order to make an inquiry.)

Q - Andrea Goldsmith: Hi, Andrea Goldsmith, Dougal Road. My question for tonight's topic is "why is the town spending time, staff and resources writing bylaws or new bylaws, new zones or new DPA's for a project that's far from being approved? Why are we investing time and resources into that at this point?"

A - Mayor Rowe: Well, it is part of the process.

Q - Andrea Goldsmith: To write a new zone or new bylaw for something that's far from approved?

A - Mayor Rowe: Well it can't be approved unless it is the subject of a zoning bylaw so people need to see what that would look like.

1.

Q - AG: Okay, thank you. So, my second question is, I'm wondering who is actually writing these new zones, the bylaw, is it Town staff or is it outside consultants or is it the proponents consultant?

A - Mayor Rowe: I'm going to ask the Director of Planning to respond to that.

A - Andre Boel, Director of Planning: Thank you Mr Mayor. In answer to that question it will be a combination of all three. Thank you.

Q - Andrea Goldsmith: Can you please specify who that will be specifically, then?

A - Andre Boel: Not at this point, sorry, no.

Q - Andrea Goldsmith: Okay, so it is the consultant of the proponent is one of those three, thank you.

Mayor Rowe: okay, let's move on then....

Q - Mr Mayor, may I? Frank McElroy. I sense that we are moving to the report from staff and I was going to make a point of order, but it doesn't look like its going to work that way so I have a simple point of order question. I don't think that council can receive the report because it is based upon applications of Klaus Fuerniss Enterprises, Inc. and I had the joy of having Ms. Williams send me copies of all of the applications, none of which are from Klaus Fuerniss Enterprises, Inc., all of which are signed by Art Phillips individually. It raises a whole series of questions, but clearly, the applications that are before the town are not those that are the source of the opinion in the staff reports. So, I would suggest that council not receive the report at this time but wait until it has been adjusted to meet the actual applications that have been made.

A - Mayor Rowe: Thank you for your comments and, points of order are the purview of the council. Okay, we'll move on with the report from the Director of Planning.

REPORTS

5.1 George Hotel and Residences - form and character

Andre Boel, Director of Planning: Thank you Mr Mayor, um, I've prepared a presentation for tonight to summarize the report for you. There are a couple of topics I will cover. The goal of today's presentation and the report in front of you is to give council direction on the proposed form and character to inform the drafting of the zoning bylaw amendment. There are four topics I will cover - I will explain where we are in the process, actually I will use a video for that that was completed last week. I will talk about what the applicant has done in response to the Advisory Planning Commission recommendations. The third item is the result of visualizations, independent visualizations prepared for the town about the proposed massing of the buildings and, finally, I'll talk about the fit with the form and character guidelines of the Official Community Plan's Harbour Area Plan.

Starting with the first item; I will show a short video and you will hear the voice of Odete Pinhot, planning consultant for the town. She couldn't be here today. This video will summarize where we are in the process. (View this video on the Town of Gibsons website or Facebook page - Mayor Rowe points this out for those who are outside and could not see the video.) Moving on to the next part of my presentation, I'm going to speak about the Advisory Planning Commission recommendations from November, 2013, and, maybe to clarify, the APC is a commission of volunteer residents (and non-residents, F.F.) providing council with recommendations regarding the form and character of any development application. So, as is the case with other development applications, once we get something in, an application for form and character, its forwarded to the commission for their advice. Um, in a discussion in November the advisory commission had support for the separation into two buildings. We got the initial application last year in February. It was one large building and the updated design that was presented in November was the two separate buildings that are currently proposed. There's also increased public space and a view corridor between the buildings. Also the waterfront walkway which was already in there and its supported by the commission and the overall concept subject to the suggestions that were made. One item of concern that the commission identified was the height of the hotel building and I'll come back to that topic later in the presentation. With regards to suggestions for improvements, these are a couple of things...these are the things that the commission has mentioned for follow-up. They deal with stepping back of the buildings, specifically looking at the Hotel facade on Gower Point Road. It was felt that was quite imposing um also there was a suggestion to look at the waterfront space and look at the, um, next to the waterfront restaurant, if a viewing platform could be added to the proposal. And, another topic that was raised by the Commission was the style of the project and it was

suggested that it would be explored, if there could be a more historical west-coast feeling to it. So, in the coming slides I've included the same sketches that are also in the staff report and the highlights (circles, squares) where the architect has made changes to the design and, in this case, you can see in the square there this is on the side of Gower Point Road (left in this illustration) and on the top floor there four hotel rooms have been moved away to the other side of the building so that has changed the design on that end, uh, the same spot on the building but looking from the other direction from Windgarden Park. Its the same thing, what you see there is the elevator shaft, lower than it used to be and the same picture from the front....you can see that the top of the building has come down where it faces Gower Point Road and also the architect highlighted here that already in the proposal was the fact that the lower stories, actually mezzanine that lower part, it almost looks like two stories but its a raised lower floor. That is also stepping back so there are several steps on the facade on Gower Point Road for this Hotel building. So, where did those hotel rooms go, then? They moved from level 6 to level P1. P1 on the waterfront is actually the first floor up from where the walkway is, its on top of the waterfront cafe and its where the four hotel rooms are now located. They replaced storage for the conference centre that was located there. Looking further at the waterfront walkway and the changes that were made, on the top you can see the additional view platform that was added next to the restaurant. This viewing platform allows you to look through the harbour to the outside to the open water so to say. (Further design details were noted and can be accessed through the town's website.) These are improvements that have made the waterfront more attractive. And, finally with regard to the APC recommendations....this is where the historical aspect has been addressed or changed. The waterfront restaurant now has smaller window panes, metal cladding and shingles and shutters to give it more of a look similar to some of the other buildings along the waterfront in Gibsons. Where you can see #2 it is proposed to make sure that the pier construction has wood detailing to reflect a maritime character. And, #3 and 4, changes to the waterfront facades, there is a range of different canopies, round, straight. There's also a clock tower added to the design in the middle. Another topic about the waterfront walkway that was explored, in this case by staff because we felt we needed to give clear direction is what materials would we accept as the town? We looked back at the trail and cycle network plan from 2001 that's referenced in the OCP policy, also we looked at the draft Park's master plan from years ago when we took into consideration practical things like is it easy to maintain and what about future replacement? We looked at that together with Dave Newman here, Director of Engineering and, our selected material based on those three documents and insights are granular rock, or something wood or natural concrete. The proposal right now is to use concrete for the walkway so that's one of the three possible materials put forward by those previous plans. There are a couple of other APC recommendations that need to be addressed either later in this presentation or later in the process. For example, the changes to Winegarden Park. They are dependent on the planning process that the town would need to do to see how the park would be changed but its something we would look at after rezoning because there is no use in having a planning process for the park if we don't know if that process will go through or

not. Another topic raised by the APC was public access and that is definitely part of the rezoning process - we are going to ensure that the plaza between the two buildings is publicly accessible and we also have to make arrangements for the waterfront walkway. so, concluding the section on the APC recommendations, the applicant has taken the initiative in November and December to make changes to the design on the basis of those recommendations and **we've** also made, um, the architect has made available packages available to council, its also available on our website and it marks up where the changes were made since the November package.

So, moving to the second of my three items, this is about the visualizations. In January council asked to come up with eye level illustrations from various vantage points and we retained an architectural consultant, Chris Foyd, selected by the Town, he specializes in visualizations. He drafted six visualizations for us. These visualizations do show the correct mass of the building, the size of it and the height. It doesn't show the proposed colours and the materials so keep that in mind when you see these pictures. *(These visualizations can be seen on the town's website/FB page and the GABC website/FB page. They are noteworthy in that they show massive white buildings on our waterfront - a Huge White Elephant, if you will. The crowd, including project supporters, fell silent when these pictures were shown. No-one can deny this project is contrary to the OCP in form and character after seeing these pictures - except our Planner, Andre Boel!)*

So, moving to the third part of my presentation, this part is about form and character guidelines in the Official Community Plan (coughs, chokes a bit, asks if he is still there?) Let me see, as I outlined in January in my report, there were a lot of design guidelines in the Harbour Area Plan that are already met by the applicant. These are a couple of things that have been met that are spelled out as something that is important so, the guidelines talk about stepping back along pedestrian routes, the building does do that; public access at the centre of the site is something that supports the trail network but also the need to preserve view corridors. There's a new waterfront walkway, a missing link in our current walkway system and green walls and planters have been included to make that look nice. There's also a variation in roof height and roof materials - something else that our design guidelines call for. Parking underground, shadowing on Winegarden Park, yes, there is shadowing - in the summer its about 5% and in December it would be 35%. Now, moving onto the main topic for consideration, I think, based on the additional information we got today, height and massing. Its something that needs to be considered by council carefully, um, the OCP does not outline height limits those are recorded in the zoning bylaw and in this case we are looking at an application to change the zoning bylaw. In the bold text below, uh, I've quoted the intent of the design guidelines from the Harbour Area Plan and it says that the goal or the intent of those guidelines is to foster a design that retains, reinforces and enhances the Gibsons Harbour Area while providing for improvements and change. Well, that's a whole mouthful and a lot of different themes and concepts in there so, on the next slide I have a couple of other topics from the OCP that will help council form, um, yeah, inform your considerations on this topic because it is something that can be looked at from different perspectives. The first bullet here I've quoted part of the Vision statement in the Harbour Area Plan and it talks about facilitating a balanced development that

ensures the ongoing attractiveness and social, economic, cultural and environmental vitality. Well, and, uh, so, the second bullet deals with retaining the village character but also says, this is about urban design, how to move closer to urbanity. So, you can see that council will need to balance what they see in front of them. Does it retain the village scale and character sufficiently? Does it move us close to urbanity? That's a judgement call and probably if you ask everybody in this room you'd probably get as many different answers. So, I'm moving to goals and objectives: there are two objectives that are highlighted that also highlights the balancing act that needs to take place here. There is an objective, 1.1, it talks about compatibility with existing development in the area, existing buildings and structures but also there's 5.2, accommodate additional population. Combine that with the last bullet here and the Harbour Plan does envision that we will grow 700 new residential units in the next 20 years in this area and there are figures that illustrate how that would take place or could take place - they're not prescriptive figures, only suggest what could happen. So, it also talks about the need to balance what we have and what we are moving towards. So, in conclusion, I think it's definitely fair to say that the proposed mass and height presents significant change to the area and that location and councils task here is to look at how it fits with the guidelines and to consider if the guidelines, on balance, support the project or would you reject it? **My professional advice today is that I feel because a lot of these guidelines have been met by the applicant, and I do feel that there is a balance here that merits, that cause me to advise you that it merits support.** So, the next steps for this process: depending on the outcome today your direction on form and character will inform the drafting of the zoning bylaw. The development permit which initially we planned to do right away, on second thought we decided that was premature, we think its better to do that after the rezoning because there are many topics that need to be addressed as part of the rezoning and, as we know, those are reports about the Gibsons aquifer; about the economic benefits to the town of the project and also affordable housing and amenities. So, in summary, I'm coming to the end of my presentation, I showed you a video to show we are still in the early stages of the project and the review process and we are still preparing reports of other aspects of the project and I've showed you the changes that have been made by the applicant in response to APC recommendations and also I've shown you the results of the independent visualizations. With regards to the OCP guidelines and policies, I've shown you reasons for both support and dismissal of the project and, depending on how you consider the compatibility of the existing character. My recommendations are at the front of the staff report, page 1: to receive the report, to endorse the updated form and character, prepare zoning bylaw and prepare the development permit after that. There are also two alternative options for you for consideration, that's either to request revisions to, maybe, tweak the design, address particular concerns you may have as a group and there is an option, too, if you think it's not compatible you could also resolve that tonight. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Rowe: Thank you, Andre, for your work on this and your report. I will now open up to members of council for any questions they have for the Director of Planning or any comments with respect to the report.

2.

Councillor Johnson: Thank you, Mayor Rowe. I had several comments that I wanted to make tonight but I will start with my deepest and what I think is the most significant concern with this proposal and that is I am deeply concerned about moving forward in any way until the environmental and the aquifer study information is on the table. I think to move ahead at this point with the rezoning weakens the position of the Town in future negotiations with the developer and I'm not satisfied with the contributions the developer is making at this time. I truly believe that it is a serious mistake to continue forward with this project until we at least have the reports on the aquifer and the environmental study.

Mayor Rowe: I thank you for that and I guess my comment on that would be that this is just really one more step in the process of considering this application. Really, what staff in part is asking of us is if the form and character that is in front of us was not supported by council there wouldn't be much point in them spending any more time on anything else on this project. That's the sense I'm getting from staff, so, really I would just see this as one step and there's many things ahead of us yet that would have to be resolved as you quite appropriately pointed out, Councillor Johnson, before it might get a stamp of approval.

Councillor Bouman: Thank you, Mayor Rowe. Welcome to the meeting each and every one of you. What I see is an awful lot of people who have a tremendous passion for the town and whatever side of the issue you are on at the moment, I respect that passion. Unfortunately, I have a few things to say that not everybody is going to be too happy with but I hope you'll respect my point of view and I'll respect yours as well. I don't support moving forward with the project at this point, like Councillor Johnson I think protection of the aquifer is the most important thing. We are waiting for technical reports but anyone with a calculator that can add and subtract two digit numbers can figure out from the published information that the upper corners of the foundation of the building are in the aquifer, 15' on one corner and 7' on the other. So, this tells me that what we're looking at is not what we'll be looking at at the end of the day, so it seems to me that it's not very enjoyable to see people polarizing to an extensive degree over something that's obviously not going to happen the way that it looks in the images. I'd like to note that we have two visualizations. We have the independent visualizations and then prior to that we have the people with the Gibsons Alliance of Business and Community had the novel idea of floating a balloon on the end of a 120' string and they superimposed the building from many of the same perspectives that the independents did and it was very interesting to contrast the two sets of images. Where images were made from the same vantage points I note that the two sets of images largely agree. In fact, the independent images were made from the street level, most of them, whereas the ones from the GABC were often made from people's homes. So, from a perspective point of view if you raise your point of view, you make things look a little bit smaller and

if you go from what I'm going to call the worm's eye view things look bigger and, in fact, when you compare the two images you'll see that the independent images show, appear to show a little more mass than the GABC images. I just wanted to point that out because I know there was a lot nasty things said on social media about how the size of the George was being distorted by people that were opposed and when you look at the images side by side you see that's not the case. Of course, I'd like to see us all get along despite our differing points of view so, for those that were making these comments about liars and distortionists and so on and so forth - maybe they'd like to rethink that point of view at some time in the future. Any case, one reason I'm opposed to the staff , I should say I'm surprised at the staff recommendation, um, we had the Harbour Plan process. It had a large degree of public involvement, there's no member of the current staff that was part of that process.

I think if staff had been part of that process, had seen how people felt, how people worked together to come up with the Harbour Area Plan they would have a little more sensitivity than to come to the conclusion that the largest building on the Sunshine Coast, a building that has nothing in common with any other building on the Sunshine Coast could be placed in an area where a community planning process put a high priority on protecting people's viewscapes which means protecting the value of their properties and protecting the form and character of the town. If we had the answers to the aquifer issues it might put a stop to things as they are right now - that's not the only environmental issue, toxics are a huge issue in the harbour. When I think about toxics I don't really think about the fancy chemical names but I do wonder who gets holding the bag for the expense of cleaning up toxics in the harbour? I certainly want to ensure it's not the taxpayers of the Town. That's just another thing. I may have some more comments later but I'd like to hear from the rest of council for a bit, as I'm sure you would as well, so, thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Rowe: Thank you, Councillor Bouman. Councillor Tretick? (applause from outside the building) Again, please refrain from applause.

Councillor Tretick: Well, unlike the speakers so far I'm thinking about the future, not today. I think the most important issue that we're dealing with with this particular situation is, we have to find a way to have financial sustainability for our community. There are towns in Canada that have ceased to exist because they have not been able to adapt. I don't want to see that happen here. I wish we had crowds like this that came to our budget meetings because you might understand what I'm talking about (murmurings in the crowd) **In principle I believe the hotel on the waterfront will be part of the answer, it won't be the total answer but it will be a move to adapt and that's the key word, adapt.** We have yet to receive reports on the geotechnical review as has been mentioned and also for the financial benefits for the town that will be accrued by this project and I, too, will need those before I make a final decision. But I will not stop the process until we get everything in place! And, that's the issue at hand

right now, we're just moving forward one step at a time and I totally agree with the recommendations.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you, Councillor Tretick. Councillor San Jenko?

Councillor San Jenko: I have a question for staff and one of my comments...I would like to hear from staff with Councillor Johnson's comment about putting everything on hold until we get the next set of reports and I just want to understand from your work plan and from the overall process what that looks like. Obviously this is a small step in the next part of the process and I do hear Mayor Rowe's comment about the fact that if we don't agree with the form and character then we wouldn't be moving forward with some of those future costs and work on staff so I just, from a real common sense point of view of how this huge project moves forward, um, if you could comment on the workload and the plan overall.

Andre Boel, Director of Planning: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, well um, if the process would stop I wouldn't have reason to continue with the reports or if I was expected to continue with the reports on the economic reports and aquifer I still need clarity on the form and character because the form and character also determines what are the economic benefits with the size of the proposal and it might also relate to aquifer aspects and geotechnical aspects because there is a different size of building. So, it would not be very practical from the review process not to have any clarity tonight.

Councillor San Jenko: Yeah, I just, I think my comment at this point is, obviously the part of the APC was with the height and for me the conversation definitely is around the size and height of the building but form and character are part of the conversation, and, a big part and that includes the feel and the experience that when you are in and around the building, enjoying the walkway, the plaza and the open areas, um, I know we're talking a whole lot about height and I agree that it is a big building (chuckle) but I think we also have to have a look at it in its entirety and the experience that it brings to the harbourfront.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Councillor Johnson.

Councillor Johnson: I will comment on form and character, it's important that we do that and I have sat on the OCP committee and I see a whole lot of people from that OCP, that original OCP that was approved in 2005 and the Upper Gibsons Neighbourhood Plan and to that I see one of my friends from the UGNP who, when we had proposed a six story building in upper Gibsons there was shock and horror at the mere suggestion. So, I am truly astonished that this height of a building would be proposed on the waterfront. The use of the building is fine. I have no problem. I think, in fact, it would be very helpful to have another hotel and to have the amenities of having small conferences. I do not believe, however, that there is any justification for the height of the building. The Harbour Area Plan, which I also sat on was created

because the community was so disturbed at the suggestion of a four-story building and at that time we specified stories rather than heights. So, we determined as part of the Harbour Area Planning process that the height in these locations would be 35'. And, that's a very specific and concrete height limitation. This building clearly breaches that to such an extent that, I think is shocking to many of us - how could this ever be considered given that we've spent years working on planning processes that involve the community, large numbers of the community? I remember the HAP when Paul Lebofsky talked about the values the community holds regarding 'grain' and he defined it as a small grain with little buildings dotted around, fairly close together but with lots of green space in between them. When we talked about multiple family buildings and buildings along the waterfront again we talked about breaking up the texture of these buildings so that they would be small, maximum 35' in height and small in breadth and width and there could be more of them so they could be scattered around in this area and I think the community was so pleased with the HAP I remember meeting up at the Legion where Paul Lebofsky was given a standing ovation. He was the planner. It was about having captured the values of the community. I think this proposal goes so directly against those community values that it's very upsetting to people. I'm sorry about the emotional concerns and the extent to which people get upset both for and against the project but I think it's critical to acknowledge this community has spent years planning and we never in our planning process foresaw such a suggestion as is now in front of us. It is a question of massing and height which goes to form and character, it is not a question of use. I am strongly opposed to the massing and height of this building..Two buildings, actually.

Mayor Rowe: Councillor Tretick?

3.

Councillor Tretick: I just want to remind Councillor Johnson that we didn't foresee when we were sitting on the former OCP committee in 2005 I think it was, the serious problems that we are going to face today and in the future. What we looked at was the way things were at the time, not the way they were going to be in the future. If you look at this town 50 and 100 years ago there wasn't a breakwater, there wasn't a marina, there wasn't condos, there wasn't shopping malls but the Town adapted to those changes and I believe there was probably some controversy involved in those changes but I would love to see how many of you would like to take away the malls, the condos, the breakwater, the marina and go back to what it was like back then. The Town adapted to what it had to adapt to. **And, I'm suggesting to you, as taxpayers, if you don't want this kind of change you're gonna see huge tax increases to accommodate things that we cannot get in terms of revenues through increased economic activity and also our tax base.** It's a fact of life and every community in Canada is facing this issue and they're looking for solutions. If you're here on the VOICE AGM when the CEO of the Sunshine Coast Credit Union said that communities our size are competing to find solutions that will help their community move beyond where they're struggling to not be at. And, you know, we have an opportunity and I

agree it's not exactly what we would have anticipated but we have to embrace change and the best way to do it is to be realistic about it and not live for today but think about the future. **What I wouldn't want to see is this town to start to die very slowly because of the height of a building.** (audience: "here, here")...Doesn't make sense. (applause)

Mayor Rowe: Okay, again, please refrain from applause. Councillor Bouman?

Councillor Bouman: Thank you, Mayor Rowe. Listening to the comments 'round the table I feel compelled to say a few broadly based things about the town. The two main pillars of this community, the two industries that built this town were fishing and logging and both have collapsed. The fish are gone. Even thirty years ago the number of people that came to the town because there were fish here was huge. And they spent like, well, drunken sailors (chuckle, crowd laughter) and they caught lots of fish and fishermen overwintered here. That was a huge part of our heritage and its gone. Now, its a little different in the forest industry, there's still lots of logging going on but the money doesn't stop here any more. The number of people in the town that make a living in logging has gone radically down so, this is happening in lots of communities and its just about destroyed lots of communities all around the province but it hasn't destroyed this town. This town has survived because of its character and because of its people. The people are resourceful, innovative, entrepreneurial, creative in just about every way, highly educated. It makes us a little different, it means we are more stable than most of the communities around the Straight of Georgia and I think I don't go for doomsday talk about the town - this town's going to survive. Now, when we talk about the economic straights of municipalities in Canada, there isn't a municipality in Canada that is truly sustainable. The new ways that we measure sustainability is becoming more and more obvious when municipalities start accounting for all their infrastructure and the cost of maintaining the infrastructure - every community is far behind the eight-ball including this community except we're not nearly as far behind the eight-ball as some communities. We've been in the budgeting process, its certainly been a wake-up call. I'm not saying we don't have problems, I am trying to say we can't solve all our problems by taxation because somebody else has already picked the taxpayers pockets pretty bare before the town comes along. So, we do have to develop but that brings me back to form, character, scale and viewscapes. These things all fit together, you can't protect one without the other. That viewscape, it doesn't just belong to the people on the hillside, it belongs to everybody. Its a major asset that the town has that attracts people to this town that don't have to live in this town but can live in the town because they can live anywhere they want. So, in most communities you take the big buildings and put them at the top of the hill where they don't devalue anyone's property. I don't think I'd be among those who would be horrified to see a six story building in upper Gibsons. But, I do think the form and character is a key part of how we are going to survive as a community, how we're going to continue to be a highly desirable place to live. I don't think we should sell out to something that we don't all somewhat agree on. I remember the night of the Harbour Area Plan public hearing, there was a large group

of people, not dissimilar to tonight. There was a lot of tension in the room. A lot of people were looking at the plan, a lot of people had comments about the plan, not a single speaker struck a blow against the Harbour Area Plan. Not a single person got up and said “this should be rejected because it doesn’t do (something).” Essentially we agreed on the Harbour Area Plan as charting a course for the future. People were tense, they were uneasy but, somehow we all agreed. So, from my point of view that Harbour Area Plan is a big part of how we should proceed into the future and, of course, the plan does allow a hotel, four stories. It has an economic evaluation of a four story hotel which found that it would be economically valuable. Four stories, ten stories, whatever, there are still those geotechnical concerns that have to be dealt with but in principle I have no objection to a four story hotel. I think the current plan is dividing us and even if I supported it, and I see the divisions in the community I’d know that we need something better, we deserve something a little better, something that we can all agree on a little more and so for this reason I’m not in support of this staff recommendation to accept the form and character. Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you, councillor Bouman. [comment from the audience inspires Mayor Rowe to say ‘yeah, thanks.’] I’ll just make a couple of comments with respect to the height because councillor Johnson raised the question of the justification for the height, at the moment the justification that’s been presented to council is based on information provided by the proponents..its about the size that’s required to operate as, I’ll say, a convention hotel type location so, that’s where that’s come about and certainly it’s gone up from the, in height from the first rendition which would have been a solid building across, right across Wynn Road. So that’s part of the trade off that the proponent is bringing forward by splitting the buildings in order to keep the view and the public area down through Wynn Road. I think it’s also important to bear in mind that in the introduction of our Official Community Plan it very clearly states an Official Community Plan is not intended to be a static document, it’s a living document and should respond to changing circumstances. Things do change. The Official Community Plan was started ten years ago. The Harbour Area Plan was started five years ago and as councillor Bouman pointed out was endorsed by this council in 2001. But, clearly, there is also significant support in the community for this proposed project which indicates that what may have been perceived in the plan five years ago might not fit today, so **I’m keeping an open mind on that** at this point but there are still a lot of hurdles ahead of us, Councillor Bouman has referred to some of them. I don’t know how deep that building...I’m going to rely on engineers to come back and tell us what can be done and what can’t be done and, maybe it can’t. At this point I don’t have that information, we’ll see. The other thing, too, to bear in mind about the Official Community Plan because a lot of focus has just been on the height, you can find in an Official Community Plan a statement to support absolutely any position you want. There is a multitude of conflicting statements in the plan, so you can support anything that you want. You gotta look at the general principles and the principles that are set out in the Harbour Area Plan are to make the waterfront fully accessible, to ensure that there is environmentally responsible and sustainable planning, support and enhance cultural

and social activity in the harbour area and ensure the economic vitality of the harbour area. So those are principles that have to be considered when one's looking at a project of this nature. Councillor San Jenko.

Councillor San Jenko: At an earlier meeting I talked just a little bit about being involved with the Sunshine Coast Tourism Meetings and Retreats committee a few years ago when we were fortunate enough to get over \$175,000 to do marketing around meetings and retreats on the Sunshine Coast. So, I just want to say a few comments about the business of bringing meetings and retreats to the coast which I do feel is a viable business. Part of the reason I believe that we're looking at this area and not upper Gibsons for this building is because of the type of business that we're looking...that the proponent would be looking at. I believe that how these plans are outlined, my understanding from looking at them is to make it a destination that is marketable and in competition with other meeting and retreat centers. So, I just wanted to make the point that it feels like sometimes our conversation gets a bit stuck in the fact that we're looking at this big hotel that wants to be by the water. I view it a little bit differently because I'll be honest I'm a little bit of a visionary, I'm a bit of an entrepreneur, and I do have some experience in meetings and retreats from my volunteer role. This, this is an opportunity that we have before us to have a look at. It is the way it is for a specific reason, I believe, um, as an entrepreneur that operates out of a space, a very small space, mind you, I know that you operate out of a space as big as, just as big as you need to to make sure that you can operate profitably and I don't believe it would be any bigger as a big business person as it absolutely needed to be in order to fulfill the vision that you have so, sorry if that was long-winded but this is about attracting the business of meetings and retreats to the sunshine coast in addition to being a conversation about a large hotel on the waterfront that's going to obstruct views. [audience member: "Well said, well said"]

Councillor Tretick: Yeah, well, I think I'm gonna, based on my comments and my point of view I'm going to move the recommendation as staff presented.

Mayor Rowe: I'm going to suggest that we separate the recommendations, right, Councillor Johnson? [chuckles] Good idea?

Councillor Tretick: Okay, I'll move that we receive the report.

Mayor Rowe: Yes, let's start with that one. [LAJ - chuckles, yes]

Audience member: Point of order...

Mayor Rowe: Uh, no, this is a council meeting its not for the public... Okay, so that's your motion and is that a second for that and to receive the report Councillor San Jenko, okay, any further discussion on that then? All in favour? Okay, that's carried. Alright, second recommendation there, that council endorse the updated form and character for the George Hotel and Residences and that the updated design be used to inform the

drafting of a zoning amendment bylaw. So, that's moved. Do we have a seconder? Seconded by Councillor San Jenko. Further discussion? Councillor Johnson.

Councillor Johnson: Thank you, Mayor Rowe. The updated design that has been provided for this recommendation is one of those things that concerns me in that we have no way of knowing at this time how much of this is actually feasible given the lack of information regarding the aquifer and the geotechnical hazards on the site and I also would say that some of the concerns that we have not discussed I think need to be addressed, and they are not addressed, this includes the use of the Town's water lease in front of Winegarden Park, it includes, apparently, the regrading of Winegarden Park because there are zero setbacks in this proposal and the regrading of that section of Winegarden Park will mean that all of the existing trees will disappear. Now, trees do regrow but I am deeply concerned about using a public park as basically a front yard for a private condominium, [interjection from the public "side yard"] yeah, or side yard, but that park is used extensively by the community. I am concerned that the community use of that park will cause the people living in the condominium concern and it will cause other problems, we know we've had these problems around the sound system and music and things the community enjoys and neighbours might get a little bit tired of. And, so, we will be imposing a neighbourhood adjacent to a heavily used public park. We will be removing many of the features of that park that could allow a bit of privacy. We will be recreating the conflict between view and trees, as we know many people in Gibsons are opposed to trees because they block views and [chuckles] so, we're setting ourselves up for an ongoing dispute on that side of the project. We're also blocking the water access and public use of the water in front of a public park and that concerns me deeply. We're blocking [comment from the public "that's not true"] I'm sorry, there's a marina proposed in front of the park and that is part of this proposal. There's also no sideyard setback on the south side, on the hotel side so that it is impacting future development along what are now known as the Shoal Bay lands so that, no matter how you look at this project it is not a good neighbour to adjacent properties in either case. So, these are some of the reasons that I am really concerned and I am opposed to this.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Councillor Bouman.

Councillor Bouman: Thank you, Mayor Rowe. Well, just looking down the road at some point we're going to come to a public hearing, it might be a long ways down the road by the time we have it all together but what I like to see in a public hearing, just being an average human being is: I don't want to see a lot of controversy, I don't want to see a lot of yelling and screaming. I'd like to see council recognize the contentious issues well before a public hearing and resolve them so that when we get to that formal, legal point it's not a big community fight. Councillor Johnson has raised some particulars and as we go along people are going to get a lot more familiar with the particulars so again, what it comes down to for me is send the developer back and ask him to come up with something that will garner a whole lot higher level of public support than the project currently does. I wouldn't dispute that that's a task. But that's what

needs to happen for our community to move forward together, to see a proposal with a lot more public support and a lot less impact to public lands and resources, so on and so forth. So, I continue to be opposed.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Any further comment? Councillor San Jenko.

Councillor San Jenko: I'd just like to make a note that we are requesting, or considering a draft development permit and, just to speak to a couple of Councillor, uh, Johnson's comments, um, I don't know if I agree about some of the comments around the park and I actually look at it as enhancing public access in many ways. I think if people are purchasing a condo beside a park they're going to have a really good look around and see what it is they're buying into and find out about the activities that happen in that park and hopefully that the music and the culture and the art carry on to the plaza and the public space in and around their building so the potential purchasers need to take a really good look around, not just in the park, but everywhere if it's the way that I see it in the plans.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. We've heard from everybody so I'll call the question. All in favour then? Opposed? That's carried with Councillor Johnson and Councillor Bouman opposed. One further recommendation and that is that council request staff to draft a development permit for form and character for council's consideration and the important part of this is that is after successful completion of proposed zoning amendment so that's not going to happen unless the zoning amendment ultimately gets the nod from council. So, is there a mover of that recommendation? Councillor Tretick. Second? Councillor San Jenko. Any further discussion on this one? It's really not going to be effectively doing anything for a while, so...I'll call the question then, all in favour? And opposed? Okay, so that's carried, Councillor Johnson and Councillor Bouman opposed. Okay, we have an opportunity now for inquiries. I'll go from one side to the other and I have to emphasize - please keep it at questions as opposed to comments. We'll see how council's feeling about the time limit. We may want to restrict this but we'll sort of see how it goes. So, start over here and if you'd state your name please...

Q - Brian Sadler, Bayview Hts Road: Mr. Mayor, I have a very short question. My understanding is what you have just discussed and voted on is simply a matter of moving forward with planning staff and that if you had not approved those recommendations then the whole process would have stopped dead in its tracks and we would never have got the subsequent three reports. Is that a clear understanding of the process?

A - Mayor Rowe: I'm going to ask the Director of Planning to respond to that because I think there might be sort of a 'maybe' answer to that.

A - Andre Boel: Yeah, its a bit of speculation but if there would have been suggestions for minor changes we probably would have proceeded with investigations if they had been not support for it then we would have stopped the other investigations, yes.

Q - Brain Sadler: Thank you. The reason I ask that question is because a lot of the arguments against implied that we were still waiting for more information when, in fact, we wouldn't have got it. Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: thank you, over on this side?

Q - Dorothy Riddle, Gibsons resident: I have a two part question. One is, my understanding from the last time the visualizations were discussed in council was that we were going to get something that would address the issue of human scale not just perspectives from far away. And I'm wondering if council would be willing to direct staff to produce a visualization of somebody standing, for example, in front of the post office or in front of the museum with the entire building there so that we get a feeling of that scale. I think that would help. That's the first part of my question. The second part is that the Director of Planning gave a number of points that would support council moving forward with the form and character but cited only one of fourteen points in the HAP with regard to the waterfront where village scale and character are stipulated as being essential and of important value. I have not seen anywhere in the Director of Planning report a definition of village scale and character. He said casually that there might be many different views on it but, I believe that in the planning community there is consensus about what that means. I've checked with some people I know that are planners and, once you go over about 35' you're beyond what one would consider a village scale. We are not an urban area. We are a small town and that is an important value. I think it would be helpful to all of us if the Director of Planning could be asked to give in the next report a commonly accepted definition of what village scale and character actually consists of, its a multiplicity of dimensions. So, those are my two requests.

Mayor Rowe: Thank you. Over to the microphone here - this gentleman.

Q - Steve Dieter: My name's Steve Dieter. I am suddenly a taxpayer in the Town of Gibsons because I own a shack that floats. Go figure. I think, I can't prove, but I think it might have something to do with the specter of building something over the water surface area. So, looking at that as a potential tax benefit, I'm questioning a restaurant built over the water, our recreational water lease which is intended for boats and I'm also concerned that there are hundreds, about 600 boats in our harbour and I've been really hoping that this property would be considering something to do with services for the boaters instead of eradicating them altogether and just having a gas pump. I'd like to see something for the boaters in this place to replace the place that was for boaters in this place!

A - Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. I'll just comment on one thing, I think the restaurant is actually within the foreshore lease that's owned by the proponent, it's not within the town's. [acknowledged by Stever Dieter, "okay"] Over to this side.

Q - Graham Walker: Thank you very much, Graham Walker, resident of Gibsons. I'm a nearby neighbour and one of those people in the neighbourhood as the Mayor is, who are directly affected by the viewscape - to a major extent on my property - but I'm not speaking just for myself or as a NIMBY because we all care about the village and would like to see a visionary project move forward that truly worked for the Town. I'm also a business person with a lot of experience. So, a bit smaller vision. My question is, you know, we have invested in our properties and stayed there and we all participated in the Harbour Plan on the reassurances that view protection was a primary principle. I'd just like to make one quick quote and I will get to my question really quickly. The Notwithstanding Clause, there's a final sentence which clarifies the primary importance of view protection. Quote 'note that as stated in the zoning bylaw, section 8.8 of part 8 of the bylaw, view protection takes precedence.' There are many references to view

protection in the OCP and the Harbour Plan and we really have stayed and invested in our community on that basis that we knew change was coming but it was always something that was within reason, not so dominant. So, we are concerned about loss of property values, enjoyment of property, not just for the views but for our love of the town. And finally there are other missing things in our community. The traffic report makes no mention of traffic on South Fletcher, Winn Road or Abbs which is strange...we haven't mentioned traffic. I think there's 17 surface parking places appearing to be replaced with paid parking so in all we have neighbourhood concerns we would like to address in something beyond just a short presentation. So, my question is, would we be able to provide our own view analysis, photos and images to be included as part of the analysis which we feel is incomplete. Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thanks Graham. [No answer to Graham's question]. Over this side. Oh, sorry, Director of Planning, you have a response?

A - Andre Boel: There's one thing I'd like to clarify about the quote that Mr Walker just had about the view protection taking precedence. If you look at the OCP it specifically references 808, which is now renumbered to 500 but that view protection is about single family zoned properties so it doesn't apply to commercial or industrial properties. I just wanted to make that point.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Back over here.

Q - Hello, I'm Francesa Ryan, resident of Gibsons and my question is concerning efficiency and trust concerning this project and the character that you're asking about. Our vision of character for our town, as well as our vision for the future and our livelihood, our well-being, our wealth as a community and all individuals in it depends upon us having trust in carrying forward a vision that we love and that we loved five years ago and ten years ago and that we love today. and, trusting that we would be able to maintain our wealth, our well-being and all that and find projects that fit together, not that we need to discard one or the other. So I would ask of all you councillors if you could please through this whole process really listen to each other and really do your best to hear and to bring together the points that people care about and to find a way to move forward that will support what we care about. Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Back over here.

Q - Ah, yes, I'm Jody Schick, I live in Gibsons. My question is about what the process would look like from now on if one of the future studies deems that the design that we're looking at today the form and character, is seen as not compatible with the aquifer study or one of these other things. What are the steps now for revising that from the proponent's standpoint. Would they have to resubmit the entire development package? Clear enough to you?

Mayor Rowe: The, um, pause, I don't know if I can answer that one. I'm going to have to go to the Director of Planning. Sorry.

A - Andre Boel: Thank you, Mr Mayor. Well, it depends on what the outcome is of those additional studies. If it's something that can be tweaked with a small change that would probably be done. If it's something major, well, the question would be "what to do?" I can't answer that in advance.

Q - Jody Schick: But, are they able to adapt the massing at this point? My question is you've decided that massing, form and character are okay by moving forward this motion that was presented towards you. If it's deemed incompatible with any of the [studies] that you will receive in the future, are they able to adapt this in any meaningful way? Or do they have to resubmit and start from ground zero again?

A - Mayor Rowe: Well, I don't think they'd have to start from ground zero. I guess it would be a process of coming back with a revision that would be back through all of this as well.. Well, so.....I guess that's probably the best we can answer. Yes?

Thank you, Mr Mayor. The staff report....

Mayor Rowe: Sorry, could you just state your name again....

Q - Yes, its Frank McElroy, I spoke earlier and I made a point of order that was not a mere formality. I'll restate it: the applications that were considered and included in the staff report are not the applications that are before the council. I think that there's a fundamental flaw there. You'll have to solve that problem but it's important to have that on the record because I'm sure that people will use that in the future. The staff report makes a recommendation stated over and over again based upon a balancing act. It's my observation that there is no balancing formula here. There is a zoning bylaw and that is a foundation, that's the baseline and in order for council to depart from zoning bylaw it has to make affirmative findings. The idea that it's a game of what's heavy and what's not is really a wrong concept. My question, and it comes from an electronic message I got today from a Vancouver Real Estate Broker who made a comment that has been posted on the editorial page from the 21st in the Coast Reporter. He made a reference to, well, if it doesn't happen i.e. the Hotel it'll just be Condos down there. So, my question is, assuming the zoning change is adopted what will council do if the project does not go forward and changes into a purely residential development which is not anything which is contemplated under the applications?

A - Mayor Rowe: Thank you. I think, and Director of Planning you can jump in on this one if you want, the zoning bylaw which we haven't seen yet would be very specific that it would only permit this particular development. It wouldn't be just any old thing so...is that fair enough? Okay, thank you. Anyone on this one?

Q - Sheila Weaver, Gibsons resident: I have several questions but I think they're quite brief. One is that somebody told me, a friend told me that other small towns have gone this route of having a major Hotel and Convention centre set up and then found that the, uh, promises that were made, the assurances of all the income that was going to come in to the town didn't pan out and I'm wondering if the Town of Gibsons has done any research, has investigated any of these other small towns of equivalent size that have had the experience of putting up a convention centre and hotel and how well it worked out for them, how successful it was for them. I note there's somebody who's proposing a hotel and, I think, convention centre at the Golfing course in Sechelt and I haven't noticed so far any controversy in the local papers about that nor did I see any at all about getting this market building going. So, there seems to be a difference here in projects that are readily accepted and enthusiastically accepted by the community and this one that has turned out to be so controversial and needs resolving in some way that is more comfortable to the community as a whole as well as providing for the needs that you express that I respect. I haven't noticed anything in the media about the sewage capacity, handling capacity. If I go for a walk past there it's very obvious to me what's going on and I'm wondering if the sewage plant has the capacity for this many more users and, if not, who pays for the upgrade? A couple of years ago there was a severe drought on the coast and Gibsons along with the rest of the coast was heavily restricted in water use and I'm wondering what happens when city people come to high-end hotel and convention centre used to using as much water as they want and Gibsons and the whole Sunshine Coast is seriously concerned about the quantity of water in the case of another drought. I'm also wondering whether the fire department has the capacity to deal with any emergency in a building at this height and, if not, who pays for that? So, those are my main....

A - Mayor Rowe: Yeah, you should be on our planning staff because those are their main...they're looking at all of these. I am going to ask the Director of Engineering to respond generally to your question about sewage capacity and water.

A - Dave Newman, Director of Engineering: In regards to the sewer capacity, the short answer is yes, there is capacity. If there was any issue with capacity or upgrade of components that were required to accommodate this development the developer would be required to upgrade those unless they were funds specifically designated previously for an upgrade. Same with the aquifer, the study we had recently completed indicates the preliminary findings that there is adequate water for the full build-out of the town which is conceived to be around 10,000 people for the whole of the town and 7,500 of that being supplied by the aquifer. So, we're certainly nowhere near 7,500 people with this hotel. We have a population of 4,500 throughout the town. With any sizable development we will be monitoring the aquifer as well to update the model as we go to make sure we can continue to have the required forecasted volume of water.

Q - Sheila Weaver: Can I ask one more question? (Mayor Rowe: Sure) Um, now it's gone out of my head - oh! Discussion tonight has focussed mostly on the hotel and the height and I'm wondering would it be feasible to change this overall development into the hotel and scrap the condominiums then the hotel would be in the two separate buildings. It could be much lower in height and much less of an impingement on the town and the waterfront.

A - Mayor Rowe: I certainly can't answer that (chuckles) but I'm sure somebody's taking a note, so, thank you. The next gentleman?

Q - Andre Sobelewski, I live in Gibsons. I have a question for Andre. What I'd like you to do is to try to explain for us a little bit about how you arrive at the decisions about what's acceptable and what's not. You've indicated yourself that there's a lot of conflicting aspects in either the Harbour Plan or the Community Plan regarding, for example, village character and height, etc. And, I recall when the Shoal Bay proposal was before us I had a discussion with Chris Marshall, your predecessor from a couple of times ago and he was negotiating with the developers architect and the negotiations had to do with height, massing and density and so forth and Chris told me that he felt like he had a sense of the community when he was standing alone in that room negotiating with the developer. He felt like he understood the community and that he had enough weight from that he could come from a position in negotiating certain trade-offs on behalf of the town and the final design reflected essentially his sense of what the community was after. I played soccer with Chris, he was part of the community for a while. Now, you are a relative newcomer here, so I'd like to know what do you draw from to inform your judgement in making these trade-offs and deciding what's acceptable, what heights are still okay in preserving village character and is compatible with elements of the Harbour Plan of other parts of the OCP?

A - Wayne Rowe: Sure, and, actually he doesn't decide anything. He simply gives his professional opinion and then we look at what (**Andre Sobelewski** interrupts - So did Chris, and I'm asking what did Andre, how does he arrive at that position so he can make a recommendation?) He's making his report to council, we received his report, so ...(**Andre Sobelewski** - Do you answer on his behalf?) Yes I do, yes I do, next question.

Q - Bet Cecil from Gibsons: Two fairly quick questions, without a speech this time. It's my understanding that we're being asked to change the zoning to accommodate this project because of its purported benefits. Should the proposal be rejected because of the aquifer or whatever does the zoning still stay changed? Therefore it changes the value of that chunk of property and so forth and so on.

A - Mayor Rowe: The expectation is the zoning will not take place unless all the conditions are met so I wouldn't be....(Bet Cecil: Okay, thank you, that answers my question.)

Q - Bet Cecil: the second question: it looks to me from my reading of the maps, it looks to me that in that area we are expecting sea level rise. Am I correct in that and it seems to if I were that would be a consideration.

A - Dave Newman: Yes, its taking into account sea level rise. The design is required to take into account sea level rise.

Mayor Rowe: Thank you, gentleman over here?

Q - Thank you, Mayor Rowe. My name is **Kenji**. I have a quick question. A few council meetings ago Doctor Riddle distributed a report. You can correct me if I'm wrong, I think she was part of the Committee of Economic Development for the town and the report was about the benefit of having this George Hotel in Gibsons. The question is, if you have taken into consideration the report into this process of making decision.

A - Mayor Rowe: Right, I missed the first part, was that the report by, uh...(Kenji: Dr Riddle)...yes, okay. Yeah, all of council has that and as the Director of Planning has indicated tonight we're still waiting for a further report on the economic benefits that are being conducted both by town staff and by a land economist was it we've retained? So, there will another report on that topic. Thank you.

Q - Kenji : Thank you. One more quick question? Statement? Can we all take a deep breath? And smile? (happy, breathy sighs from staff and council) And just relax. Maybe we can work together better. (thanks from Mayor) Thank you. (Mayor Rowe, CO Selina Williams - thanks, Kenji)

Q - My name is **Katherine**, I'm a resident of Gibsons. And, leading on from what Kenji was saying I was also aware of the report submitted by Dr Riddle and considering that she took the time to make this report and was not paid by anyone with the wealth of experience, many years this was her profession and she has high credentials in this area, I'm wondering, I guess, what kind of assurances the townspeople of Gibsons have that the reports coming through in favour of the proponent's proposal are equally unbiased? Because, I'm just wondering where the funding for the various reports is coming from? Because I want to be assured of the clarity and integrity of the information that council's receiving so that we can all feel as though this is a clear and integral process.

A - Mayor Rowe: Yeah, I'm gonna ask that our Chief Administrative Officer to respond to that question about the reports that we might be expecting because council hasn't seen anything yet. In fact, you have everything we have (**Katherine:** I guess I'm just looking for information on who's paying for the various reports because that gives different weighting to the veracity of those reports because, if someone's

paying...(Mayor Rowe: Sure, let him...) then they have a vested interest...(let him respond...)

A - Emanuel Machado, Chief Administrative Officer: Mr Mayor, the town charges a fee to process an application as we've done in this case and when we find that the work required to review an application goes above our capacity to review then we ask the proponent to pay for added studies but it's the town that sets the terms of those studies and reviews them and, so, that's essentially the same principle that we've applied in this case.

Q - Katherine: Okay, so, in the case of, for example, there's a lot of concern about the safety and the integrity of the aquifer. If there is, for example, um, some pressure, or compromise potential to the aquifer and there is then an engineer and technical advisor coming forth to say it will be fine based on x,y and z who would be the final person to say, to sign off on what is a safe threshold for the safety of a natural asset?

A - Manny Machado, CAO: Most communities ask for a geotechnical report to be submitted in an application. In light of the sensitivities which we are very aware, of the value of the aquifer, the town has set forward a development application that council will be receiving as well that sets a very high standard - we're not aware of a higher standard of requirements to be met which requires an independent opinion on top of the professional reports were submitted. We've gone even further than that and have asked one of the most respected hydrogeologists in Canada which also produced and is very familiar with the aquifer to provide a third level of review on the original proposal so it's based on the information we will receive from all those professionals then the Director of Planning will submit all that information to council for consideration.

Q - Katherine: Okay, so just to restate for everyone here that this is going to be an independent consultation, an independent verification of the safety? (muttering from the crowd.) Correct?

A - Manny Machado: That's correct.

Q - Good evening Mayor Rowe and honourable council.....(Mayor Rowe: you need to state your name (chuckle, I know Joe) Oh! **Joe Peters**, I live in Gibsons. I have something that does trouble me. We had the Olympics here awhile back, remember? And we had the athlete's village in Vancouver? It was supposed to be self-sufficient and fully occupied and a benefit to the City of Vancouver and you know what happened? The Mayor had to step in with council and buy the thing to keep it afloat. Now, Councillor Tretick, you talk about the future. Yes, many of us who would like a revision to The George are also hoping for some benefit to the town but not in its present design. So, my question is, if The George proceeds and it fails in the future who's on the hook to pick up the mess? Thank you.

No answer.

Q - My name is **James Graham**, I live in Gibsons. I just have a couple of questions. I'll try to make them short. One of the recommendations of the supporters of the motions that were passed today was that the form and character needed to be upscaled to fit within the criteria that 100 rooms was the minimum requirement to make the proponents hotel a success. Is that correct?

A - Mayor Rowe: Not in those terms, I don't think. The motion simply was that council endorse the updated form and character so the update is a result of the changes made flowing out of the recommendations coming out of the Advisory Planning Commission and that the updated design be used to inform the drafting of a zoning amendment bylaw. So, that was the resolution. I think what you may be referring to is a comment I made about justification of the height and the justification has been given to us by the proponent's consultants was that they needed x number of rooms, something in excess of 100 rooms to warrant the type of facility that they're proposing. So, I'm not sure if they tied exactly together but that's.....

Q - James Graham: But that's why the proponent needs a building as big as it is?

A - Mayor Rowe: That's what I understand, yes.

Q - James Graham: Is the proponents economic study the only one that's been presented so far?

A - Mayor Rowe: Uh, the only one....economic study...I guess it was about one page or something that I saw. I'll turn that over to the CAO to respond.

A - Manny Machado, CAO: At the start of the application we don't require an economic study. What the proponent has made a case for justification of why they want a zoning change and in that there are economic benefits that they've laid out. At the direction of council we're looking at what the economic benefits to the town are overall, including amenities and servicing requirements but we haven't completed that work just yet.

Q - James Graham: But have you accepted the proponents argument that it needs a minimum of 100 rooms?

A - Manny Machado: That's not a question we asked of the applicant. I think the financial and economic analysis that we will bring forward to council I guess indirectly will answer that question. But that's not a sort of a yes or no question.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, did you have another question?

Q - James Graham: Well, yeah, 'cause I read Dorothy Riddle's report and she comes to the conclusion that is quite different, that 100 rooms is not necessary and so I know that you've stated earlier to other Dorothy Riddle questioners or speakers about the subject that you've read the report and my question is: she does not agree that 100 rooms is necessary. Will you agree with that?

A - Mayor Rowe: What I'll say is, I don't see her putting forty million dollars into a building so (loud laughing and clapping) the person that's prepared to do that (continued clapping, others shouting - No clapping!) Yeah, keep that down. So, that's all I'll say on that (more inaudible, angry commenting) She's not the one that's putting the money into the project. (more noise from the audience.)

Q - James Graham: But, do you agree that she has the qualifications? That she...

A - Mayor Rowe: No, I don't! (more loud comments from the audience)

Q - James Graham: You don't accept her qualifications?

A - Mayor Rowe: She's a Doctor of clinical psychology. (woman in audience giggles loudly)

Q - James Graham: She's not a management consultant?

A - Mayor Rowe: Anyway, let's not get into that. We will have our own reports (more muttering from the audience)

Q - James Graham: So, my question is, do you not accept her report and her conclusions?

A - Mayor Rowe: I'm not going to answer that. We will have a report that will come to us. We will deal with that at the time.

Q - James Graham: Why can't you answer that yes or no? (gasps from the audience)

A - Mayor Rowe: Not going to. (lengthy pause, heavy breathing from Mayor Rowe, much muttering from the crowd.) Next speaker.

Q - Hi! I'm George Grafton. I love Gibsons every bit as much as anyone that spoke here tonight but I'm part of the silent majority and, like, Councillor Bouman spoke about support for, we have a lack of support for the George. Well, I'm sorry Councillor Bouman but you're totally wrong. I live in a democratic society. We voted you in to handle the affairs of this city. We, as the silent majority expect you to do so and all these other people can have their opinions but it doesn't make them, um, right and it doesn't make them so that (sneering voice) 'they love Gibsons better than us' and, so, I ask you to follow the majority view 'cause that's what a democratic government is supposed to do and if you want a show of force (raising voice) with regards to turnout,

we'll do it. (women's voices: Okay! Right!) So, thank you. [see attachment re: George Grafton]

Mayor Rowe: Over here.

Q - My name is **Janet**, I live in Gibsons....

Mayor Rowe: Hang on there, one moment (crowd noise)...Councillor Bouman would like to respond....

A - Councillor Bouman: Well, I appreciate those comments but I'd just like to say I don't think a 50/50 split is good enough for this community and if we have to compromise a little bit to get something that would get a much higher percentage of support I'd like to see it happen. 50/50 - that's division, conflict, I think we deserve better. (loud comments - wish I could hear them)

Mayor Rowe: So, back over to this microphone here. (crowd is noisy)

Janet: I'd like to wait 'til I'm listened to, please.

Mayor Rowe: Yes, can you state your name please?

Q - Janet: I did. Janet. I live in Gibsons. And I'm very distressed about how people are behaving. Mayor Rowe, you were the one who I've watched, has said clapping is not allowed, cheering is not allowed and I have witnessed pro-George people cheering and clapping and never being told to stop and I just heard somebody call a person who asked a very sincere question "a bully" So, I just want to know if the rules apply to both sides? Are we going to all behave in a way that we're listening to each other? Thank you. (crowd is finally quiet)

A - Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you. Back over to this side. (No answer)

Q - My name is Rick Ruth. I apologize for clapping. I came late, I didn't hear the rule, I'm sorry (laughter) Quick question is something of this magnitude going to be brought forward as a referendum in the future? (audience - yeah! yeah!) It's appropriate, I'm just wondering to resolve the issue once and for all (women's voices, continuously muttering)

A - Mayor Rowe: There'll be a referendum in November. (laughter) (loud commenting) Okay.

Q - Rick Ruth: A quick question. Does council remember how many referendums it took to get a rec centre into Gibsons? And the opposition it took to get a rec centre? And this council remember the opposition to fast food, Tim Horton's and Wendy's and

the opposition to London Drugs so, just something I want to make sure council remembers.

Mayor Rowe: Alright, thank you.

I have a really basic question, I'm not going to....

Mayor Rowe: Would you just state your name...

Q - Yeah, Bev Burgoyne, resident and taxpayer of Gibsons. I would like to know if the next public forum is going to be held in the Elphinstone Gym or somewhere where everybody can come in and listen because at the start of this evening there were many, many people who stood outside and, so, that's my question.

A - Mayor Rowe: Thank you, Bev, and yes, we obviously underestimated the space and we'll look at a larger venue for future meetings.

Q - Suzanne Senger: So, The George site is subject to three development permit areas. I was perusing the local government act last night and realized wow! the DPA's take precedent over everything! And, there are a whole bunch of guidelines in the development permit areas for what needs to be done before you can move forward with something like this so I'm wondering, well I'd just like to hear staff comment on why those issues haven't been addressed before going down this path when you're supposed to do that?

A - (someone talking in the background, rather loudly, but cannot make out the words - "you didn't mention the.....")

Andre Boel, Director of Planning: (still loud commenting from a man in the background) Development permits are something that you apply for in preparation for construction so it's not necessarily something that you consider before rezoning. That's the short answer. Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: The gentleman there.

Q - Hi, my name's Richard Joseph. I live in the white house right beside the Marina I've been there for twenty five years. First of all I'd like to say Mayor Rowe, I think you're a good Mayor and I feel sorry for all that crap you have to put up with but, anyways, I think we need the work on the Sunshine Coast to build this place. There's too many people that don't got work and they need work. And, finally, you know, we've got how many condos going up - they don't supply work after they're built. I'm in construction, you build it, that's it. This place is not only buildin' it, three years of work, then it's gonna hire how many people from the Sunshine Coast? We need that, all kinds of contractors here need the work, you know, we need it badly and, like I say, everybody says about the view being blocked off - bull-oney! I've walked all along the

...I've been here, like I say, my whole life and that view ain't blockin' nobody except if you're in the post office! (laughter from the George crowd) You know, I just hear this CRAP and I feel sorry for that developer 'cause if I was him I'd just pull out and leave and, uh, let it be a dump like it is. All you got is a whole bunch of rotten houses there that are full of black mould.

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you, Mr Joseph. (more laughter from the crowd and loud exclaiming.) One more question.....(A fight can be heard - Mr Joseph, loudly "don't ever grab me like that again!....don't ever grab me again! If you want to talk to me, talk to me, don't grab me!) Okay....let's.....yes.....let's maintain order.

Q - Hi, my name is **Deborah Geoffrion**, I live in Area F but I own property and a business in Gibsons and I've been watching this whole process and it seems to me that all the eggs are being put in one basket for a lot of things and I'm just wondering why, what makes you think that one hotel with its businesses inside the hotel, competing directly with a whole bunch of businesses in Gibsons would somehow create so much more business instead of actually sucking the business that's already here. Like, what makes you think that that forty million dollars is not actually going to detract from so many other businesses.

A - Mayor Rowe: Well, I think probably we do feel it would be complimentary to businesses we have here and the types of businesses that will be in there, is not, they're very specific hotel-type proposals, spas and so on.

Deborah Geoffrion: Okay, so spas, a yoga studio, a gym, a restaurants, a bar, retail. Okay, now how many more people do you think is actually going to come to a hotel because its a hotel, really and when you consider other venues out there in Vancouver and on the Island who can compete with conventions - really, do you really believe that's all of a sudden going to increase the business here because there's a hotel? And realistically its more like a Walmart syndrome where its going to be one huge hotel that is going to actually draw business from the existing businesses here. You know, we don't have (woman shouts from the audience) recreation in the winter....

Mayor Rowe: Okay, thank you for your view, your point and I'm sure there's others that share your viewpoint and there's others that don't so, thank you.

Deborah Geoffrion: Okay, but I'd just like to know what the rationale is that you think a whole bunch of people, more, double actually! to fill those rooms, how' that gonna.....

Mayor Rowe: You know, the proponent is the one that hires the people to advise him as to whether or not this is a viable, um, enterprise. That's a business decision for him to make.

Deborah Geoffrion: Okay, so there is going to be an economic study is there not?

Mayor Rowe: Yes there will be further studies coming forward so watch for those please.

Deborah Geoffrion: Thank you.

Mayor Rowe: One more question.

Q - Andrea Goldsmith, Dougal Road: My question is for the Director of Planning and I'm wondering how can you come to the conclusion that this project fits the form and character when it's clearly higher than pretty much three times higher than the agreed upon 35' height limit that was agreed upon in the whole Harbour Area Plan procedure, how can you...how do you reach that conclusion that it fits?

Mayor Rowe to Andre Boel: Do you want to answer that?

A - Andre Boel: Yeah, I'm afraid I'm repeating myself here but the Official Community Plan does not specify a height limit. [Andrea Goldsmith interjects: The Harbour Area Plan] It doesn't. Its the zoning bylaw and that's the process that's being followed in the proposed change to the zoning bylaw. Thank you.

Andrea Goldsmith: but the zoning bylaw reflects what was agreed to in the Harbour Area Plan as we heard Councillor Johnson talk about that whole process. It was a 35' height that the community agreed to?

Mayor Rowe: Well, no, anyway, its been answered a couple of times. Okay, one more, lets....

Q - Um, Francesa Ryan. Just to build upon what was just said, the character of the town is not just set by bylaws and OCPs and such. It actually has to do with what the town looks like today around us and anyone supporting this project, I would like to ask you, could you not see from the pictures put up there earlier tonight that that provided complete change to the view, to the character of our town? Absolute change to the character by a HUGE amount. Not just the height. It completely changed the look and [audience member: what's your question?] that was my question to all of you. Can you not see that that completely changes it? It does not fit the view of so many people who come to the coast regularly as tourists, as summer visitors who support all our local businesses, who love the, so often repeated, the quaint look of the town, the village character. All of this, you know....it's not about the OCPs and whatnot its about how it actually looks. So, do you want to answer that question again, because I don't think you actually answered her question properly.

Mayor Rowe: So, thank you and this is the thing that council has to wrestle with. There are different views on that. Other people here feel differently that you do and this

is the types of things that each of us up here at this table has got to struggle with and come to our own conscience and our own answers eventually so, that's where it'll go. Yes.

Q - Sheila Weaver again: There was a question over here a little while ago, a comment about the Olympic village and the fact that Vancouver City had to take it over because it went bankrupt or whatever, I'm not sure exactly, so I'm wondering if any developer is going to put forth a rosy picture of how many people are going to occupy those hotel rooms and the condos and all the rest of it and I have a little problem with being persuaded that this is going to happen right through the winter as well as in the summer and there some kind of back-up plan if in the event.....

A - Mayor Rowe: The difference with the Olympic Village and the City of Vancouver actually guaranteed the loans on that, that's why they had to take it over. The town of Gibsons is not putting any money into this, we're not being asked to, we don't intend to, we're not giving tax breaks, none of this. This is a developer that's going to have to pay the full freight of this going forward.

Sheila Weaver: So if it happens not to pan out the way he's assuring you that it will, then what, besides the fact that you will lose..[Mayor Rowe interrupts: Yes, I guess he'll lose 20 million dollars. Anyway. I can't answer that, sorry, that's all I can really say on it. There's one more lady behind you there.

Q - Hi, Deborah Geoffrion again: The other question I had, and maybe I don't understand the process exactly so, just for clarity I'd like to know: how come you're not coming at this with a little bit more of a backbone in negotiating? (loud protesting from the audience) what you want.

A - Mayor Rowe: You know (exasperated sigh) we're not even, we're not even there yet, okay, negotiations are yet to come. There's no negotiations at all if there's no will to move forward with the project, there's nothing to negotiate with.

Deborah Geoffrion: Okay, because the position I'm seeing is 'the town is dying', which is totally ridiculous and this is what we have to work with and this is it but there's so many good ideas that have been coming forward in the community and I'm just wondering how that process can look at some of those?

A - Mayor Rowe: Well, I don't think I can say much more. I want to thank everybody for being very well behaved this, tonight. I know that there was some comment that maybe we weren't but actually I've been at other meetings where its been a lot more unruly so, thank you so much I'll ask for a motion to adjourn, please (chuckling) Councillor Bouman, Councillor Tretick, all in favour? (very loud applause) Carried.

