

April 9, 2021

Comments on April 7 Council Meeting:

My husband and I were taken aback by the amount of time it took to reach the decision on the outstanding bills at St. Andrews Lodge. The decision had already been made by a council of 5 that any further costs must be born by the Society. "At no cost to the town" was the phrase that pops out. As for Councilor Westbroek's offer to pay out of his own pocket, it makes him look good, but that Lodge has already cost the Town a significant figure!

Thank goodness for Councilor Harrison who seems to keep honesty and facts on the table with all his research. We value him greatly.

It is a bit discouraging to see so much discussion and then to have decisions deadlocked at 2 to 2. We applaud the Mayor Wiese for keeping order when things get passionate and wander off the rails.

Respectfully yours,

Bob and Joyce Daman

1203 Pintail Drive

April 9, 2021

To: Mayor Weise, and Councillors Filmer, Harrison and Westbroek

**Re: April 7, 2021 Council Meeting – Comments on St. Andrews Lodge and LED Lighting**

It was very disappointing to witness the back and forth discussion that ended in defeated motions regarding St. Andrews Lodge. It was very time-consuming and frustrating that some of council are now flip-flopping on the original decision made by a council of five.

Council needs to be reminded of the history of the saving of The Old School House which was brought about by an army of supporting volunteers who did major fundraising in the form of garden parties/art auctions, selling bricks and many, many other fundraising events. The society applied for Heritage Status with the support of the town, and later accessed a funding grant through the Heritage/Ministry for a new roof. Up until then, no money was received from the town. When the grant was received, it was thought the town might pay half, as it was a town building. The town contributed one-third. It wasn't until the last few years when TOSH was recognized as a viable asset that the town spent considerable money on this iconic building. TOSH's success is a lesson to be learned on what can be done by community volunteers who really dig into a project.

The disappointment from the above issue was partly assuaged by my admiration of the presentation and facts presented by Town Engineer, Bob Weir, regarding the LED street lighting issue. While it is important to be aware of the concerns of the residents, it is also vital that such an issue be conducted in a professional, knowledgeable way in partnership and respect for the other entities involved. Mr. Weir's professional judgement should not be put at hazard nor compromised by individuals. Decisions of the town and council need to be made in the best interests of the town overall. Mr. Weir is doing his part, and hopefully council can do theirs

Sincerely,

Marlys Diamond  
516, 120 First Avenue West  
Qualicum Beach, B.C.

**From:** Section 22, FOIPPA  
**To:** [communications](#)  
**Cc:** [Haylee Gould](#)  
**Subject:** Council Mtg. Public Comments  
**Date:** April 9, 2021 10:11:48 AM

---

**Mayor & Council** - the following are my comments regarding the April 7<sup>th</sup> Council meeting:

**Daycare Project** - the daycare delegation presentation raised a number of questions to be considered in advancing this project. There is clearly a daycare need in Qualicum Beach and the project planning is moving forward. That said, a question arises as to whether this planning is being fully coordinated with others.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that at the same time, School District 69 is nearing completion of a two-classroom stand-alone daycare facility to accommodate 43 new licenced daycare spaces next to Arrowview Elementary school. This facility will open shortly while the 'Into the Woods' facility is still its early planning phase.

Looking at the available information on the 'Into the Woods' proposal, there is no mention of the facilities being provided at the Arrowview school or any indication of the level of overall demand for daycare in our area. This raises further questions about planning being fully coordinated with others. More coordination is needed on this important matter.

**Fire Services Review** - was presented as a Consent Agenda item with limited Council or public discussion. Now, the search for a new Chief will commence again. Of course, this may not be the last that we hear of this matter and who knows the Province may have some thoughts on how regional municipal services should be handled in the future given the growth in our area, including the fast-growing RDN Area G, French Creek area which is sandwiched in between Parksville and Qualicum Beach. Maybe this report needs to be the subject of a future Committee of the Whole meeting to better inform the public of the issues and to fully take into account Oceanside area needs for the next 10 to 20 years.

Murielle Pritchard  
663 Windward Way

**From:** Section 22, FOIPPA  
**To:** [communications](#)  
**Cc:** [Haylee Gould](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comments for April 7 / 21 Council Mtg.  
**Date:** April 9, 2021 10:10:41 AM

---

**Mayor & Council** - the following are my comments regarding the April 7<sup>th</sup> Council meeting:

**Street Lights** - the conversion and upgrading of Town streetlights to LED has attracted considerable attention and raised various concerns. Mr. Weir provided a very complete and comprehensive presentation of all the safety and economic factors and benefits involved in this project to improve the illumination of Town roadways.

Any process to address individual resident's concerns and preferences over streetlight locations or illumination levels needs to ensure that the needs of adjacent neighbours and the surrounding community are fully considered and given priority over individual preferences.

**St. Andrews Lodge Project** - this project has surprisingly become the latest Qualicum Beach hot-button issue. Right from the start it raised questions and concerns being probably the largest land acquisition by the Town in the last 10 or 20 years, if not ever. The purchase was done quite quickly, there was limited public involvement and it required a significant amount of Town reserves to be dedicated to finance the transaction. This in turn has led to a major portion of all Town lands having to be put on sale to replace the reserve drawdown. Now, the question of what is to be done with this property is leading to considerable controversy on Council which all reflects a lack of coordinated planning both physical and financial. Again better coordination and communication is needed.

Tim Pritchard  
663 Windward Way

**From:** [Susan Sigurdson](#)  
**To:** [communications](#)  
**Subject:** street lights  
**Date:** April 7, 2021 10:19:20 PM

---

Don't be compelled by the voice of fear – use your intelligence, save time and money.

**Safety/Liability** – switching to a 3000K LED in residential areas is still brighter than the old HPS lights. This is a NON-issue - anyone can see the logic of that!!

The town could not be sued for an accident/incident that took place under street lighting that is equal to or brighter than the old lighting. Hydro recommends 4000K for industrial because the studies are already done!

**Removal of street light from pole I.D.#2427 4920 217 438 on Larch Dr.**

- A) A poll including the signatures of the entire street and two affected residents from the adjoining street was submitted to Daniel Sailland and Bob Weir on Feb.10<sup>th</sup> – agreeing to the removal of this street light.
- B) The town could not possibly be sued for an accident/incident taking place after the removal of this light. The removal of this light would leave only 2 consecutive poles on Larch Dr. without lights. There are instances all over town, in residential areas, where there are no street lights on 2, 3 or even more consecutive poles. I found over a dozen such streets without even trying. Use this light somewhere it's needed. With that one light removed our street would still have more lighting on it than many other residential streets - so clearly could not possibly be deemed unsafe. It's not rocket science!
- C) Removal of this light is not for personal or aesthetic reasons – it's so we can sleep at night - a **legitimate safety/health issue!!** We do not need an Illumination Engineer to tell us whether or not we're sleeping! **Health issues ensued from the inability to sleep with this light shining in our bedrooms is a liability concern!**

Susan Sigurdson

707 Larch Dr.,

Qualicum Beach

**From:** [John Wood](#)  
**To:** [communications](#)  
**Cc:** [Brian Wiese](#); [Robert Filmer](#); [Scott Harrison](#); [Teunis Westbroek](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on April 7th council meeting  
**Date:** April 9, 2021 11:42:52 AM

---

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: Heritage Register, St. Andrews Lodge

The grandstanding move by Councillor Westbroek to pay the cost of the heritage consultant out of his own pocket was out of order. He should have been called on it.

If Councillor Westbroek wishes to make a donation to the town, and if that donation is in the amount of the heritage consultant cost, that is his personal choice. That is the open and transparent way to do it, and it follows the town's published donation guideline.

The comments by Councillor Filmer related to the key and the lease on the building were, to quote Councillor Westbroek, "apples and oranges".

Cheers, John

April 9, 2021

Good Morning Mayor Weise, Councilors Filmer, Harrison and Westbroek,

RE: Comments from Council Meeting of April 7, 2021  
for St. Andrews Lodge seeking Heritage status.

While we support the endeavors of the society trying to save the St. Andrew's Lodge building, we have a concern that arose during the council meeting and are not clear on if it has been addressed.

Should the review that will be conducted on the Lodge to obtain Heritage status be favourable, would the Town then always have to keep up the maintenance and ongoing costs should the Society fail to be successful with their well intentioned desire to improve, use and care for the building over the years?

It is just a question that I don't believe was asked during the meeting and again while we are hopeful that this project will be successful, the potential for long term and undefined continuing costs to the Town may not be in the best interest of the general public and even for those that wanted to keep the building, but only if there were not a high level of costs involved.

Just something that came to my mind as you move forward on the Heritage status process.

Best Regards,

Linda Todsén