



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
SOUTH DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
HELD FRIDAY DECEMBER 5th, 2014 AT 7:30 A.M. IN ROOM 105 OF THE CITY'S
SERVICE & RESOURCE CENTRE @ 411 DUNSMUIR STREET, NANAIMO, B.C.**

PRESENT: Mr. David Witty, Chair Mr. Douglas Hardie (SECA)
 Ms. Ann Kjerulf Mr. Sasha Angus
 Mr. Darren Moss Mr. Doug Kalcsics
 Daniel Pearce (RDN Transit)

ABSENT: Mr. Chris Good (SFN) Mr. Mike Davidson (NPA)

STAFF: Mr. Bruce Anderson, Manager - Planning & Design Section

1. *Call to Order (7:45 a.m.)*

Agenda items as presented.

2. *Minutes*

- A. Kierulf asked for clarification of Item 3, and the reference to video conferencing.
- B. Anderson confirmed this was for the committee to host a speaker via video conference rather than having them attend in person.

Minutes 2014-OCT-24 Adopted.

3. *Process for Charter Preparation*

D. Witty introduced the two processes – charter and management structure – and invited a discussion to begin with the charter development process.

A. Kjerulf suggested we could begin with a speaker presentation via teleconference.

D. Witty noted that a charter would function as more of a stage setting framework while a management structure would be more detailed and complex.

Key questions associated with a charter development for the committee might include how? and who? and when?

A.Kjerulf indicated we could circulate the paper she had prepared on the topic of a charter, the committee could then decide on elements to include and examine what a charter can be. She suggested a working session for the committee as a means to arrive at this.

D. Witty asked if the paper could be posted on the website? He asked committee if we could set a date for a workshop, with a video speaker, so we can start to develop the framework for a charter.

A.Kjerulf indicated she could contact Seattle representatives involved in development of a charter to consider speaking to the committee at the workshop.

D.Kalcsics further discussed the example of Seattle – noting the management model of the Pike Place Market.

D. Hardie offered that the point of making the case for a charter to the general public might be included in this process.

D. Witty confirmed the committee will do the up-front work, then can put drafts on website for public to share ideas and provide feedback.

D. Kalcsics would be interested in how charter is used as a buy-in for stakeholders and whether there are examples of this?

D. Pearce noted it is important for the examples to show the public this is a real opportunity.

D. Hardie confirmed the charter can serve as guardian or steward of the public interest for the waterfront.

A.Kjerulf commented on New Zealand example of a charter that was incorporated into a visual communications piece, including a broad vision and objectives, as one approach to consider.

D.Witty recapped the tasks to prepare for the workshop. A City staff rep could work with Ann on the charter paper and information to prepare for the workshop. Respecting timelines, and with reminder of a June 2015 deadline, he suggested we would target mid-February information to stakeholders.

Committee agreed to next meeting for a working session (2-3 hours) of the committee to be held Friday January 23, 2015 from 9:00 am to noon.

D. Kalcsics noted for the workshop that we start with the broadest concept for research of a charter, and then work on scoping a charter to suit the purposes here.

4. Process for Management Structure Review

D. Witty acknowledged that we have two partners who are not here at the table today, who may be here as observers. This may represent a challenge for the committee's work, but we should continue on and deliver our objectives.

D.Kalcsics commented there is a new City Council.

D. Witty reflected on the process for a management structure, and how the committee might take a broader review approach.

D. Kalcsics concurred that a broadened approach is better, possibly to include the federal level of government, and there is a need to look at alternatives to the approach to the waterfront.

D.Witty suggested a discussion with Port representatives should focus on at least a need for the integration of Port initiatives with other partners on the waterfront. He noted there are good examples of this with airports (e.g., YVR) and ports, working in a community context. It may be worth reviewing some examples of this in communities in Canada.

The SDW Committee can act as an interface between the community and attempt to bring alternatives for consideration as a potential framework.

D.Kalcsics commented that this issue goes beyond traditional land use planning issues, to one of coordinated waterfront initiatives and development in the community.

A. Kjerulf added the need to look at how this interfaces in local government.

D. Moss commented on how to approach this process, noting that at a higher level the process may cause further distance amongst the partners. He wondered if in the interim the committee should see if there is an opportunity to comment to the Port, for example, on initiatives?

D. Hardie would like to find a way to see the Port return to the table, to be genuinely involved in the process.

D. Witty noted there may have been an early misinterpretation of what the Initiative was intended to do. It was not a land use plan. Perhaps go to the Port Board to reinforce this?

D.Pearce concurred that there is value in informing the Port Board of the committees intentions and the work around the charter, and invite them to participate.

S.Angus wondered if a Port board member, rather than staff might wish to be part of the committee?

D.Moss would like to see this as positive discussion by the committee.

D. Kalcsics would also emphasize the benefits of cooperation.

A. Kjerulf agreed it makes sense to go back to the Port Board.

D. Witty respecting the management structure process, then, we might dialogue with the two partners (SFN and NPA).

D. Moss suggested we approach the partners before our working session on the charter, if possible.

D. Witty indicated he and D.Kalcsics would ask to be on the NPA Board meeting agenda in January 2015.

5. Relationship to OCP Review

B. Anderson provided the committee with an introduction to the scope and content of an OCP review. He indicated the review is in progress with some general amendments to go before Council in December.

A. Kjerulf would like to recognize the importance of the OCP as guiding development and that the Initiative project includes some of this guidance for the south downtown waterfront. Question of whether this area is adequately addressed through policy. Could OCP review reflect the Initiative work? She also wondered if there could be an update to the committee on activities underway for the south waterfront.

B. Anderson described the OCP relative to the Initiative work, noting the Downtown Plan as part of the OCP contemplates that an Area Plan for the south downtown waterfront should be undertaken. He note there is a budget proposal to conduct a Master Plan for the City-owned portion of this waterfront area in 2015.

D. Pearce provided that one of the first initiatives will likely be the downtown transit exchange next year, and there is time to do a plan for this area and to ensure the committee has input to the planning process.

D. Witty asked further to the OCP review what is the relationship of the Initiative?

A.Kerjulf presented a motion to the committee respecting including a reference in the OCP policy to the results of the committee's Initiative work:

"That the Committee recommend to Council that OCP policy concerning the development of the south downtown waterfront reflect the Vision and Guiding Principles of the Framing the Future document presented by the South Downtown Waterfront Committee."

Motion Carried

The committee also discussed the need to indicate support for the preparation of the Master Plan for a portion of the south waterfront, and considered the following motion:

"That the South Downtown Waterfront Committee encourages the preparation of a Master Plan for the City-owned lands to ensure a plan is in place to provide direction for the upcoming initiatives in this area of the waterfront."

Motion Carried

The committee requested an update from City staff at a February 2015 meeting to include the areas of real estate, servicing, and transportation.

The committee discussed the Build Canada fund and projects that partners, City and Port, may be submitting. Are there other government funding opportunities to pursue relative to the initiatives identified for the waterfront area?

S. Angus reported out on discussions being undertaken with key organizations in Nanaimo regarding infrastructure and other key projects that may be supported in the community. This is focused on the theme of increasing economic capacity of the city.

6. *Next Meeting Schedule*

The next meeting will be the Charter working session, and is scheduled for 2015-JAN-23 from 9:00 a.m. to noon.

7. *Adjournment*

Meeting Adjourned – 8:50 a.m.