

From: [Ashley Cota](#)
To: [Heather Svensen](#)
Cc: [communications](#)
Subject: Cell tower
Date: July 10, 2020 10:47:48 PM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in regards to the proposed cell phone tower. I disagree with the location of the tower.

Cell towers do not belong anywhere near schools or residential subdivisions. There is more and more research coming out stating the effects EFM have on our children's developing (and adults) brains. We will not put our future generations health at risk just to have better cell reception. I am highly disappointed in Qualicum Beach.

Cell towers do not belong near schools. Find a new location.

Ashley Cota
432 Mill Rd,
Qualicum Beach

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Christina Caleb](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Fwd: Proposed cell tower
Date: July 13, 2020 8:54:36 AM

Please see below, and include in the correspondence log.

Thanks

Christina Caleb
180 Fourth Ave W, Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1S3, Canada

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Christina Caleb** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun., Jul. 12, 2020, 17:04
Subject: Proposed cell tower
To: <hsvensen@qualicumbeach.com>

Hi there

I recently learned of the proposed cell tower near the intersection of Village Way and Island Hwy.

I would like to register my objection to this proposed tower as it is quite close to a church and daycare, as well as Arrow view Elementary School.

While the potential boost in cell signals is needed, I do not feel this is a suitable location. As well, there have been numerous studies outlining the dangers of 5g.

Thank you

Christina Caleb

From: [Charna Macfie](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: July 15 Council meeting - Dogwood and Juniper lots
Date: July 15, 2020 10:09:19 PM

Comments from the gallery for the minutes for July 15 Council Meeting - Dogwood Road and Juniper Drive Town owned lots.

There is strong support from the residents in Qualicum Woods to preserve the two lots located on Dogwood Road and Juniper Drive. They are lovely treed lots that are part of the Town's urban forest that complement the nearby forest of the estate properties along this stretch of highway. I support the Qualicum Woods residents in requesting that Council not to sell these public parcels.

Respectfully,
Charna Macfie
578 Maple St.
Qualicum Beach

From: [Jay Smith](#)
To: [communications](#); [Teunis Westbroek](#); [Brian Wiese](#); [Adam Walker](#); [Robert Filmer](#); [Scott Harrison](#)
Subject: Preserving natural state of land at Dogwood and Juniper
Date: July 16, 2020 11:51:19 AM

I am writing in support of the very powerful, convincing presentation by Pat Jacobson and Bob Grieg yesterday, July 15, on the significance of preserving the natural space of the ancient forest at Dogwood and Juniper. Like many other citizens of our community I am increasingly concerned about the loss of our forest canopy throughout Qualicum Beach. This area is particularly important given its location across from the entrance of Milner Gardens, a crown jewel of QB.

The impact would be negative in so many ways, one of which, if destroyed the gap through the trees would bleed noise throughout the surrounding neighbourhood. I can't imagine the neighbourhood putting up with this and demands would come to put up a noise barrier at considerable cost. What, then, would be the true gain by the town administration?

One wonders how QB could come to this state, that the wishes of 500 residents would simply be thrown aside? How did the finances of the town get in such poor shape that land must be sold at this particular time? Is this what the future holds, the beauty of the town being surrendered to the ill managed coffers of the town administration? That somehow, that our natural assets of the community must be sold to preserve its financial standing? This is all so sad and unnecessary. Is this the best that you can do as mayor and council?

Yours,
Jay Smith, Phd.
587 Spruce St
Qualicum Beach



From: [Michael Lonsdale](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Christleton Park Discussion
Date: July 16, 2020 11:55:46 AM

Hello,

I would like to provide some feedback on Council's discussion regarding Christleton Park at last night's meeting.

It was disappointing to hear that there was a perceived lack of clarity on what the neighborhood association is asking for. I believe it was fairly well detailed within the correspondence sent to Council, including examples from the local area of amenities similar to those being requested by respondents to the survey which the Neighbourhood Association completed. A presentation was made to the Select Committee for Parks and Recreation with Councillor Filmer in attendance and an opportunity for questions to be asked. As Councillor Harrison noted last night, he was in attendance at the Resident's Association and contributed to the extensive discussion on what the members of the association would and would not like to see happen with the park. There were also numerous correspondences regarding this request with each of these Councillors.

It seems to me that there was more than ample opportunity for Council to address any perceived lack of clarity in this request and it is disappointing that instead of proactively seeking clarification or inviting a delegation to appear the direction for staff to investigate further was simply deferred with no 'next steps' established. Perhaps directing staff to engage with the Neighbourhood Association to discuss the requested amenities and then report back to Council with options and costs would have been appropriate?

I was also curious as to the email to Councillor Filmer that was referred to as part of this discussion. The Neighbourhood Association represents a large population which were engaged as part of this; and this request was informed by community polling with a fairly high number of responses received. The results of this polling was reported to Council as well as the Select Committee. I would hope that a single email from a resident does not waylay this conversation for much needed improvements in Christleton Park which are clearly supported by the community at large as well as Council's Strategic Plan and the OCP.

Thank you and I look forward to seeing the next steps Council takes on this item and would be happy to discuss this further,

Michael Lonsdale

July 16, 2020

Dear Mayor Weise and Councilors Filmer, Harrison, Walker & Westbroek,

In listening to the Council Meeting on line last night and again today, we understand what each of you are bringing forward and will work towards gathering the information you have requested, along with hosting a Public Information Meeting.

Something that stood out to us and we would like to have publicly corrected via this gallery comment, is a statement by Adam Walker that says - the applicant said in the APC and to me personally, the neighbour is also looking at developing their property as well.

This is completely untrue, as we have never known this to be the case.

The reference to the neighbouring property during the APC meeting was only due to the green circle that denotes a park on the OCP Map, Schedule 2.7 Park & Ecological Greenways – the only way it could be fully achieved is if both our property and the neighbours was developed, as the green circle covers the three intersecting corners of three separate properties. This must have been put in place in previous OCP's as to what may happen to some of these properties, it is not of our making. Our intent was not to say a development should or would be taking place next door, only if it ever did the park location we are proposing would be beneficial to more homes in the future.

As to speaking to Adam Walker personally about “the neighbour is also looking at developing their property as well,... again, it is completely false. We do not know this to be the case whatsoever, so could not have shared this information with him.

The comment he has made only adds to public misperceptions.

Best Regards,

Rick and Linda Todsen
2075 W. Island Hwy.



From: [REDACTED]
To: [communications](#)
Subject: July 25 Council Meeting Comments
Date: July 16, 2020 4:21:41 PM

I watched the Council Meeting cast onto our TV and appreciated:-

a) Zoom was better than the normal Council Chamber meetings. One can watch the proceedings at a time of one's choosing. I could see facial expressions, and I could hear much better than at the Town Hall. I could also back up and hear things twice if I wanted. (Also it was fun watching Mr. Fillmore eat his lunch at the beginning! Very efficient use of his time.)

b) Very good presentation by Pat Jacobson and Bob Grieg on why NOT to sell those lots opposite Milner Gardens. A lot of work must have gone into preparing for it, and wonderful to see such great citizen input.

Fred Dowe, Qualicum Beach

From: [Haylee Gould](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: FW: Correction to my response to Councillor Harrison
Date: July 17, 2020 8:54:08 AM

From: Bob Greig [REDACTED]
Sent: July 16, 2020 6:33 PM
To: Haylee Gould <HGould@qualicumbeach.com>
Subject: Correction to my response to Councillor Harrison

Hello Haylee , may I correct an error in my response from this morning.. As a result 37% not 43%. Thank you

I would like to enter into the minutes of yesterday's meeting the following response to Councillor Harrison's question

That is a fair challenge Councillor Harrison.

In 2020 , total capital expenditures are forecast at \$10.4 million. Grants for the Airport , Bike Paths Fire Department total 2.7M that's 26% granted funding
The ungranted funding is primarily Equipment upgrades and Drainage systems upgrades and Memorial Phase 3 funded by operations surplus and reserve. Additional unfunded purchases not in plan include the .5M for the waterfront property and the amount spent on the house for parking

In 2021 , grants are forecast to total \$4.6M for \$7.2M in total capital spend . That is 63%. As you indicate , most of the development projects are funded , but only 75% funded. As a result, 37% of funding for equipment replacement , the public works yard , and the 25%portion of the main projects is funded by operations surplus , debt and reserve.

The point being , absolute dollars are of concern here. The general reserve has been drawn down by some \$7M for the purchase of St. Andrews \$3.5M and more as well as Memorial Phase 3 (\$3.8M). These are entirely discretionary purchases that we are being asked to pay for (in part) with residential treed lots.

If there is to be a continuing policy to acquire oceanfront properties and expensive roundabouts without a special reserve , then we end back in the same place.

From: [Carol Dowe](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Pat Jacobsen/Bob Greig presentation
Date: July 17, 2020 6:28:50 AM

July 17, 2020

Good Morning Qualicum Beach Council and Staff!

We appreciated the Zoom meeting, was easier to hear than in the actual meetings held, where some Council speak very rapidly.

The presentation by Pat Jacobsen and Bob Greig shows incredible preparation and participation by them on behalf of the neighbours who care about the Juniper/Dogwood lots. We hope Council will exercise wisdom in allowing these lots to stand as a permanent buffer from noise, gas smell of Island Highway and provide natural environment for all to enjoy. There were many lots in Qualicum Woods that were indicated as "park" that have been sold off over some 30 years, and these are just about the last 2. Please save them.

Pls. confirm receipt of this letter.

Carol Dowe
512 Hawthorne Dr., QB

From: [Tim](#)
To: [communications](#)
Cc: [Haylee Gould](#)
Subject: Council Mtg. - Gallery/ Public Comments - July 15, 2020
Date: July 17, 2020 8:10:05 AM

Mayor & Council - I would like to comment on a several items addressed in yesterday's Council meeting:

- **The Meeting** - it was encouraging to see that yesterday's meeting was more positive in tone and even had several almost jovial moments - keep it up, it's catching.
- **Zoning Amendment: 103 Railway Street** - this project provides appealing design that will start to rejuvenate Railway St. and provide a good connection to the Village core. It will be good to actually see shovels in the ground somewhere.
- **850 Eaglecrest Dr. Project** - it was surprising that Council decided to require the applicant to hold a public information before second reading. A check of the timing on recent similar applications indicates that the norm is to schedule the public information meeting after second reading. Why the change now?
- **2019 - 2022 Corporate Strategic Plan Update** - with all the disruption that has occurred so far this year, it's good to hear that Council is going to regroup in a separate workshop session to review the Town's Strategic Plan. The CAO's presentation definitely showed changes from the original Strat. Plan. The workshop will be a good opportunity for Council to brainstorm all of the current issues and develop a plan of what can realistically be accomplished over the next 2 years, given all the internal and external factors that need to be taken into account. Careful planning can not be done effectively on a street corner.

Regards, Tim Pritchard
663 Windward Way, QB.

From: [John Wood](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Comments from the gallery - July 15th council meeting
Date: July 17, 2020 9:11:30 AM

Good morning Mayor and Council,

Below are my brief comments on the listed agenda items:

- 6 (2)(a) – tree planting. It's a great idea to plant trees there, and I'm glad Council saw the wisdom in letting staff look after the work.
- 7 (4)(c) – Telus cell tower application. There is already a lot of misinformation and untruths out in public from the opponents to this tower. My fervent hope is that the Telus report on public engagement will successfully winnow the wheat from the chaff, and that this project will proceed for the safety and communications security of town residents who currently do not have reliable cell service.
- 8 (1) – 103 Railway Street. It is good to see this project moving ahead, it will add substantial presence to the downtown core. The designers have done a very good job in making sure that the building will fit in with the form and character of our town.
- 8 (3) – 545 Nenzel Road. This is a wonderful proposal for affordable rental housing in a rural setting.

John Wood
466 Troon Close
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1C9



From: [Douglas MacKay-Dunn](#)
To: [communications](#)
Cc: [QBRA](#)
Subject: The need to save Our Iconic Green Corridor
Date: July 17, 2020 9:40:19 AM

The green corridor

Just as we must pursue, save and protect the Estate lands, the East entrance to our town through the beautifully treed green **ICONIC** corridor is just as important. It serves as a transition from the “Clear-Cut Moon Scape” of Parksville and the RDN.

A green Qualicum beach is the reason most of us moved here. - away from over development.

Please keep Qualicum Beach, Qualicum Beach!

Doug MacKay-Dunn

2617 Island Highway West



From: [Carol Dowe](#)
To: [communications](#); [Brian Wiese](#); [Robert Filmer](#); [Adam Walker](#); [Scott Harrison](#); [Teunis Westbroek](#); [Heather Svensen](#); [Luke Sales](#); [Fred Dowe](#); [Carol Dowe](#)
Subject: Asking and Encouraging is not harassment(Opposition to Cell Tower group)
Date: July 17, 2020 11:15:49 AM

July 17, 2020

To Qualicum Beach Mayor and Council:

Councilman Filmer's comments criticizing those of us opposing the cell tower at Village Way and 18th tee of Eaglecrest, are "being pressured and harassed" is unfounded.

We have been writing letters **asking and encouraging** people to write to Mayor and Council if they oppose the cell tower, and have been very respectful. This is a long stretch to pressure and harassment. Councilor Filmer's statements are unfounded, and in turn is disrespectful to our group. I would note our opposition is also working to obtain support in a similar fashion. They and Telus are the ones doing subtle harassment in repeating their proposal for a cell tower in the same half year and in the same locations. Their last proposal was withdrawn and Telus simply turned around and repeated their submission, taking advantage of the covid 19 pandemic, when we cannot have public consultations and hearings, as they did the first time. Evidently, the other side has gotten to Councilor Filmer.

I notice Councilor Filmer said he was knocking on doors as he was running for City Council, not to mention his signs were displayed throughout the community.

I would point out that Telus proposing another cell tower site from 130 feet to 147 feet in height, in virtually the same location as this Spring of 2020 is harassment!

This same location is in the middle of 3 schools, churches and residents close by. There are already 3 large cell towers in Qualicum Beach and Rogers provides good service reception in Eaglecrest. We tested 12 locations there, and had no problem with reception.

We ask you to be fair and think about all of the citizens' concerns of our area appealing to you to stop any further cell towers at or near this location.

Respectfully,

Carol and Fred Dowe

Concerned Citizens opposed to cell tower at Village Way
and 18th Tee Eaglecrest

512 Hawthorne Dr.

Qualicum Beach V9K 1A5



Anne Skipsey
383 Crescent Road West
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1J5

July 17, 2020

Dear Mayor & Council,

Re: Comments from the Public – July 15th Regular Council Meeting

I would like to provide comment on several items from your July 15th, 2020 Regular Council Meeting starting with a thank you. Thank you for extending the timeframe for the public to submit comments. I was unable to watch all of the Council meeting live and was then not able to access the recording until sometime in the afternoon on July 16th, 2020. Perhaps the motion should have been to extend the time for comments for an additional 24 hours past the time the video of the meeting becomes available for public viewing? So I have yet to be able to view the entire meeting so will only comment on the portions of the meeting I prioritized.

Delegation –

I hope you will give serious consideration to the comments and suggestions by the delegation. Selling public land is short-sighted and not a long-term solution to meet financial shortfalls. It is also short-sighted as we are in the midst of a climate crisis. We need to start acting like we are.

545 Nenzel Road –

When the original proposal came before the previous Council in 2018, the question was asked whether one of the units could be built to be fully accessible? Council recognized rental properties are difficult to find in Qualicum Beach but as a member of Access Oceanside, I understand it is exponentially difficult to find a rental property if you are confined to a wheelchair. Will you be sensitive to this issue and be champions for accessibility?

I have concern this proposed development is happening outside of the Urban Containment Boundary (didn't find mention of this in the report?). And, I understand water connections have already been put through to service this development. I commend Council for its decision to not allow subdividing the property. Although the applicant has deservedly earned a reputation as a quality builder, he has also been known to change his mind. His development that was approved on First Avenue was drastically different than what was built. Also, a separate rental unit was permitted at the rear of that development, however, in short time this rental unit was sold off and I believe no longer provides much needed rental accommodation. As you were debating whether to include rental restrictions, I would suggest it is better to err on the side of caution and specify the rental conditions.

850 Eaglecrest Drive/2075 Island Highway –

I would like to comment that it is a mistake to not consider this property to be part of the Estate Properties and somehow exempt it as such.

During the discussion, Councillor Westbroek made mention that services were “beefed up” for The Cottages at Eaglecrest (444 Country Club Drive) in anticipation of this development coming forward. As a member of the last Council, this is news to me! I have absolutely no recollection of a public discussion on this decision. Perhaps as Mayor, Mr. Westbroek was privy to additional conversations and decisions? In fact, my recollection is that Council was concerned about how the stormwater for The Cottages would be dealt with and therefore at the Regular Council meeting of February 22, 2016, requested additional information and a technical memorandum from Koers Engineering helped inform Council’s decision. (A copy of this report can be found on page 64 of the Regular Council Meeting Minutes of March 14, 2016). It was the understanding of Council that stormwater would be dealt with onsite (in storage containers and within landscaping).

Here is an excerpt from that Koers technical engineering report (page 69): “The downstream infrastructure can support this development, with the condition that post development peak flows do not exceed pre-development peak flows and that the appropriate amount of storage and the appropriate amount of controls are installed.” Was this done? Piping stormwater and flushing it over an unstable bank and into the ocean is not a sustainable solution nor best practice. Qualicum Beach can do better.

I also feel it is very poor form for Councillor Westbroek to suggest the Urban Containment Boundary would have aligned with the town boundary had one former Councillor been aware on what they were voting on. To second guess the outcome of that vote is misleading the public, especially as the Councillor in question does not have an opportunity to clarify or defend their vote.

Back to watching the rest of the meeting now.

Anne Skipsey

From: [PAT JACOBSON](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Public Comments Re: Qualicum Beach Council Meeting July 15, 2020
Date: July 17, 2020 11:56:25 AM

Dear Mayor & Councillors:

I offer my comments on the following agenda items:

Christleton Park - In regards to your decision to do a feasibility study for significant improvements to Christleton Park in Qualicum Woods with a view to including it in the 2021 Capital Plan, I think this is an excellent step forward. This will address an underserved need for more child-oriented facilities in Town. There are noticeably more young families around, particularly in this area. This park can also serve as a family gathering place, and is easily accessible from other parts of Town.

Planting Between Hemsworth and Palm Drive - With respect to the agenda item advising that this strip "will be utilized for tree planting to offset vegetation removal from the School Connector Trail construction". I find this very lacking in detail, both as to why this location was chosen and what it is meant to accomplish. I do understand that this suggestion was put forth to, and approved by, the "Environment and Sustainability Committee" at their meeting of June 4th, 2020.

I have the following questions:

1. What the logic was behind this decision, as the audio version of the minutes of that committee meeting are still not available?
2. What is going to be planted, and how in any way could it compensate for the quantity and age of trees taken out for the Connector Trail? Is this just one proposed step in a larger plan?
3. Was the impacted neighbourhood consulted? Hemsworth is a narrow street at that point and the grassy strip alongside is heavily used by citizens as a path, and as a dog walking area.

I thank you, in advance, for your response.

Pat Jacobson
606 Sumac Drive,
Qualicum Woods, V9K 1A8
[REDACTED]

Subject:

July 15, 2020 Council Meeting Comments

From: Esther/Lance Christopher/Nater <[REDACTED]>

Date: July 17, 2020 at 10:06:21 AM PDT

To: communications <communications@qualicumbeach.com>

Subject: July 15, 2020 Council Meeting Comments

Mr. Mayor and Councillors,

I am compelled to express my thoughts regarding the discussions and decisions reached during the subject meeting. Very important comments were touched on that did not necessarily reach a logical conclusion. Let's begin with the Todsens development proposal. During the APC meeting, which resulted in a 3-2 favourable vote, one member commented that the proposal would look better than what currently exists. During your meeting, Mr. Sales was asked what is the state of the property. His answer was that the land had been essentially cleared about 5 years ago. Council never did ask who or why that woodland was cleared. My recollection was the land was cleared by the property owner and it was done in anticipation of some development. Council commented that infrastructure to accommodate the Cottages development was "oversized" to accommodate a future development on this property. All of this anticipation and accommodation was taken while this property was outside the Urban Containment Boundary and well before any development was presented to the public. Good planning or putting the cart before the horse?

Council pointed out the "iconic" meaning of the Estate Properties and cautioned that nothing should be done until the next OCP review. Council was reminded of a long standing bylaw protecting trees and vegetation on the Estate Properties, but that protection excludes what is now the Todsens property. No one has been able to offer a clear explanation why that is the case. An opinion was raised that a comprehensive plan for the future of the Estate Properties should be established, as a priority, in "fairness" to the developer. In conclusion, Council did not move to 2nd reading, but did ask for a lift analysis and traffic study prior to a public hearing - to be held by the proponent. What is council's priority? Expediency for the developer or protection, and restoration of woodland?

How can Council appreciate the "iconic" value of the Estate Properties to our Town and next discuss proceeding with the Todsens proposal which is part of the Estate Properties and outside the UBC? I recall assurances made by several councillors during the RDN discussions in late 2018 that Qualicum Beach was certainly capable of making its own land use decisions without RDN involvement. It was said the Town would continue to utilize the UCB to prevent sprawl and limit servicing expectations. In early 2019, when asked directly what indentions existed to modify the UCB, two council members replied with "nothing" or "no changes are anticipated". One and a half years later, after several changes to the UCB, after assurances during the RDN discussion, and adoption of the OCP, here we are discussing this proposal. So our inexperienced council and our highly experienced staff have led us to this point - I call it "never, never-land

Next we have the Nenzel Road project. Several council members expressed their satisfaction with this development with the usual terms of rental inventory, land use, density etc. None of these attributes were mentioned in discussing the Todsens project, I suspect because that project does not satisfy any of these objectives. But I digress. The significance of this proposal is the

request to subdivide the property to 1. protect two existing homes and property and 2. to facilitate financing using collateral of the subdivided land. While one councillor argued this request was not the same as what was previously granted to Pheasant Glen, it seems to me to be very similar, just bigger stakes. Mr. Sailland explained at some length how this is a common practice used by developers to help finance projects. One council member questioned if it was appropriate to consider proponent financing methods when discussing subdividing properties. Another councillor expressed concern that by agreeing to this request, a precedent becomes established that could lead to the erosion of and development of the 5 acre properties that comprise a meaningful portion of our Town.

This is a critical issue that I believe council does not value enough. Establishing precedents can have a very long lasting impact. That is why extreme caution should be taken to avoid what one may think is a one-off decision as an effort to accommodate that becomes an unintended future consequence. In my opinion, council does not seem to give this matter sufficient weight in their discussions.

A council member suggested a moratorium on 5G cell towers. I do not recall Telus ever stating what level of service the proposed tower will initially provide. I do appreciate the health concerns expressed by many and the proposed location options near the elementary school and church. I also understand that the cell service from Telus in Eaglecrest is not acceptable. It is both a safety and convenience issue. But the 19A, Village Way intersection is an important entrance to our Town. The thought of a 150 foot monopole standing near this Town entrance is hard to imagine.

Perhaps Telus would fund a new sign to replace the current town, signage. It could read, "Welcome to Qualicum Beach! Enjoy our beauty AND our radiation. Or perhaps Council should insist that Telus disguise or camouflage the tower. I have seen this done quite well in the U.S. - at a considerable cost to the service provider.

To summarize, I believe that individually you each touched on some very important points. Collectively, in my opinion, you missed the mark. The Todsens property is either in the Estate Properties or it is not. I believe it is within the Estate Properties, it is outside the Urban Containment Boundary and should be governed accordingly. The precedent raised in subdividing the Nenzel Road property should be reconsidered for both the precedent relative to other five acre properties and if it is appropriate for council to make land use decisions to accommodate developer financing needs and/or wants.

Sincerely, Lance Nater
996 Royal Dornoch Drive

