

RE:	South Highlands Local Area Plan – Task Force Members Email
Email from:	Terri Wood
To:	Evan Peterson, Jennifer Kay, Laura Beckett, Bob McMinn, Kim Vincent, Scott Richardson, Rick Lester, Marcie McLean, Leslie Anderson, Lexie LeGrande-Biegun, Liz Condon, Regine Klein, Loranne Hilton, Sonia Santarossa
Date Received:	September 10, 2021

Good afternoon everyone,

I sent the comments below to Evan last week and would like to share them with the group. I would also like to comment on specific items from Scott’s email yesterday to everyone. Under Bullet #2 he commented:

As I understand it the Project Team proposes to make this survey available to anyone. But the people who will have to live with and pay for the results are Highlanders. For elections, “Highlanders” are defined as Land owners and Residents and I see no reason to deviate from this for the purposes of defining the future of the community. After all this is a LOCAL area plan. I also do not see merit in segregating South from North, East or West Highlanders. This project has cost the community an enormous amount of tax revenue and I therefore believe it even more appropriate that the criteria of Land Owners and Residents be followed.

If it is helpful, I will move a motion that:

- the Survey be made available exclusively to Highlands Residents and Land Owners.

... and I would request that this motion, if seconded, be put to a vote prior to the end of the meeting.

Considering the enormous amount of tax revenue that this project has cost the community and the tax contribution that the tenants of MIP have made to the community, I feel that we would be remiss in excluding them from participating in the survey. This LOCAL area plan may have lasting impacts for people who would pay taxes in the community and would be excluded from participating in this survey if Scott’s suggestion is accepted. If I were a tenant paying taxes and had no say in the local area plan even though I have contributed to the cost of the project I would be mighty unhappy and I am sure you would be too if the shoe was on the other foot.

The second item I have issue with is item #3, paragraph 2

3. Gateway Options 1 & 2 – Early Direction #6 – Pages 7 – 12 / 18

This is one of the areas where I recognize considerable work to date to reflect previous input. However I remain concerned that the language and approach of describing the options still includes a pro development paradigm that precludes the reader from being presented with the two options in an unbiased way. For instance, the rationale for Option 1 is not fully or fairly presented and the benefit associated with option 1 is negated both within it (“in principle”) as well as in the

description of the challenges for option 1 and yet again under the benefits described for option 2.

In addition, there are inaccuracies in how these are described, for instance it is not the intent of Option 1 to prevent a property with GB2 from putting up a residence. Also, there is the implication that a landowner who proceeds with a development that the whole community opposed, should be rewarded by being encouraged to 'up zone', as if it might otherwise be 'hard done by' after extracting tens of millions of dollars of rock from the ground. In this way, it assumes landowners motivated more by the chance to earn a buck than by the chance to showcase itself as an environmental leader on the national scale. I have attached a rewording of the description of Option 1, as well as suggested 'edits' to Option 2 and the voting segments for consideration. I do not presume to have captured the optimum balance in how to present these two options and therefore welcome further suggestions and 'word smithing' of alternative descriptions.

Referring to paragraph 2 specifically, do we know what the future intent is of the landowner with regards to the development of this property? Do they have plans for a sustainable development at the closing of the mine? Are they planning on attracting businesses that produce green technologies to their land? Could the landowner be encouraged to show itself as an environmental leader. We don't know what the future may hold with any certainty and we are limiting ourselves in the future if we don't open our minds and imagine the possibilities of what may be instead of focusing on the what is now.

Thanks,
Terri

From: Terri Wood
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 4:58 PM
To: 'Evan Peterson'
Subject: New draft survey

Evan,

As I am unable to attend the upcoming SHLAP meeting I hope I am not out of line in providing my thoughts on the new draft survey. While I appreciate that you have spent many hours crafting the new survey to reflect feedback from multiple sources, I am wondering why the option to leave the Commercial Industrial Gateway as currently outlined in the OCP is not an option on the survey.

I feel that we are going through this process with the assumption that the land use designations for these properties have to change rather than looking at the best potential use. The best

potential use for these lands may be that they remain the same or it may not. We have given people the option to have the properties rewild over time, change to a new commercial gateway designation, but we have neglected to give them the option for the properties to retain their current land use as described in the OCP. The current land use in the OCP allows for green economy based industries and could be expanded on to accomplish the Highlands goals. Developments could be encouraged under the current OCP to seek out opportunities to attract greener businesses to these lands.

From personal experience I can say that completing the checklist for DP #6 and DP #4 encourages applicants to find greener solutions for their developments and these could be expanded upon to encourage developments to attract or include greener solutions for things such as disposal fields, landscaping, bike and vehicle charging stations etc. Given this, I feel that it would be appropriate to include an option for survey respondents to be asked if they would like the GFL, CRD, OKI and MIP properties to remain unchanged from their current land use as described in the OCP.

A suggestion would be to add a question to the effect of "Should the Commercial Industrial Gateway land use remain unchanged from the current descriptions in the OCP?"

If this could be included in the survey I would be in favour of the survey, otherwise if there is a vote my vote would have be no to the current survey. I feel that we will get better results from the survey if we present all options to the respondents.

Thanks in advance,
Terri