

## Pender Island Waste and Resource Management Commission Special Advisory Planning Commission Minutes of a Meeting

**Date:** Friday, January 15, 2016 (10:00 a.m.)

**Location:** St. Peter's Anglican Church  
4418 Bedwell Harbour Road, North Pender Island, BC

**Members Present:** Elizabeth Montague, Chair  
Dale Henning  
Donn Korbin  
Jim Petrie  
Ursula Poepel  
Gordie Duncan  
Michael Sketch  
Davy Rippner  
Ron Underhill  
John Pollard

**Staff Present:** Justin Starke, Island Planner  
Shannon Brayford, Recorder

**Regrets:** Richard Philpot, Deputy Chair

**Others Present:** North Pender Island Trustee Diane Barber  
Five (5) members of the public were present

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

At 10:08 am Chair Montague welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

### 2. ADOPT AGENDA

Recommended to move the approval of the minutes to item 6

**By general consent** the agenda was approved as amended.

### 3. COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY MEMBERS

North Pender Island Trustee **Diane Barber** addressed the Commissioners and remarked that she appreciates the time they have dedicated to the Commission. She asked the Members to set aside their preconceived ideas of how the process will move forward today and work with Member Underhill with an open mind.

**Candice Zell** commented that under the heading “Location” there is a criteria item “central location”. She remarked that she does not agree with this criteria and that industrial properties should not be located centrally.

#### **4. DECISION MAKING PROCESS TO DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING POTENTIAL SITES**

Member Underhill provided an overview of the process and the work completed to date.

Note: A member of the community, Candice Zell, asked if the meeting could be recorded. There was general consensus and she placed an iPhone on the Commissioner’s meeting table.

Member Underhill directed the Member’s attention to the items listed at the last meeting under the heading “Assumptions”. He asked that the Members consider the types of structure that a Waste Transfer Site (WTS) can have including a full service site, a single operator’s site with public drop off, and a single operator site without public access.

Member Henning questioned whether considering single operator structures was making an operational decision.

Chair Montague commented that recycling is implicitly included in the WTS because they are taking and sorting materials. She also noted that the current recycling facility can not accept commercial materials.

Member Korbin noted that facilities on other islands have been able to accept recycling from commercial sources. He further remarked that the location will be important if the public is accessing the site, but less important if access is limited to operators.

A discussion was held regarding recycling and the types of materials that may be accepted.

Noting that there is uncertainty on the future requirements for commercially sourced recycling and that there are zoning requirements for a recycling site, Planner Starke suggested that the Commission set recycling aside.

Member Sketch noted that that a full service WTS would have to, by provincial mandate, facilitate reuse and recycling of materials.

Member Korbin noted that Pender Island has to conform to the Capital Regional District (CRD) Regulations and the Provincial Mandates will come down through them when the time comes.

Member Pollard commented that they are unable to predict the future requirements. He noted that the most significant priority would be a location with enough space to accommodate the potentials.

Candice Zell was acknowledged and remarked that she was concerned that the volume of waste was not being considered.

Member Duncan remarked that a full service facility should not be limited to commercial recycling. A discussion was held regarding whether to include residential recycling as a site function under one of the options.

A member of the community Patrick Brown commented that it would be a large industrial site, a flat grade, and incompatible with a location close to residential or commercial properties. These items were listed under the heading "Criteria".

Member Underhill noted that the mandate of the commission is to focus on WTS siting criteria, but that there was a formal request to the Local Trust Committee (LTC) to have the Commission's mandate expanded to include the question of how the Island should deal with waste in general. He encouraged anyone with comments that exceed the scope of this Commission's meeting to address correspondence to the LTC.

Member Montague noted that if there is public drop off there would be parking and traffic requirements of the site.

A discussion was held regarding whether the site would involve multiple operators or a single operator. It was noted that the number of operators would impact the type of traffic that the site would have to accommodate.

A discussion was held regarding the volume of waste the site should expect to handle. It was noted that the CRD had provided a rough estimate, that there is a 2013 CRD Report that shows the quantity of waste that has come from Pender Island historically, and that Vice Chair Philpot also has resources for such estimates.

Member Sketch noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) has a preference for clustering industrial lands. He requested an additional "Location" criteria item "adjacent industrial density".

Member Henning noted that the current recycling facility is in a state of flux and inclusion of commercially sourced recycling is being considered. Member Rippner noted that the possibility exists and there is opportunity to expand, but that the Pender Island Recycling Society is not doing so at the current time.

A discussion was held regarding the potential types of structure of WTS that may be considered.

A member of the community, Peter Binner commented that the needs of the community and the types of refuse should be considered in order to decide what type of facility is required. He noted that composting is not being discussed.

Member Underhill remarked that composting has been listed under the heading "Parking Lot". A discussion was held regarding how to include organic waste in the

listed structures for potential WTSs and whether it would be essential for a full service site.

Note: At 11:21 am member of the community Candice Zell removed the phone which was recording the meeting from the Commissioner table and replaced it again less than 1 minute later.

Member Sketch noted the importance of clearly defined language. He suggested that the Commission start with general terms and increase specificity from there. Member Sketch further commented that WTS is too specific when the site will really be managing discarded materials rather than waste.

Member Henning provided a brief overview of the current manner in which organic waste is handled on the island.

Note: At 11:29 am a lunch break was held and the meeting was reconvened at 11:59 am. Community Member Candice Zell replaced her phone as a recording device on the Commissioners' table.

Chair Montague recommended the following additional criteria items to be added to the general list:

- Optimal conditions for public safety
- Close proximity to the ferry
- Proximity to other waste and recycling related facilities
- Traffic patterns ensure optimal public safety

A discussion was held regarding proximity of the WTS to related facilities and the issue of traffic circulation as a location criteria. Both items were added under the heading "Location".

Patrick Brown commented that the site should include room for expansion which was included under the heading "Size".

Member Korbin asked that "consistent with future economic development of the island" be listed under the heading "General Criteria".

Member Duncan asked that "public drop off needs parking" be added under the heading "Location". A discussion was held. Planner Starke noted that parking can be addressed when the property is zoned.

Member Korbin raised the issue of a waste transfer site for South Pender Island. Planner Starke noted that the South Pender Island OCP is explicit that there not be a waste transfer site on South Pender. It was listed under the heading "Assumption" that both South Pender and North Pender sites would be considered.

Member Underhill noted that after creating the criteria there is a possibility that no single piece of land on the island will meet the criteria.

Member Montague noted that the Commission can identify additional sites to those that have already been identified and that non-industrial sites can be considered.

Community member Candice Zell commented that she believes that the WTS should be away from residential and commercial locations. A discussion was held regarding the criteria that currently relate to geographic location and it was noted that several of the criteria are in direct conflict with each other.

Member Korbin recommended that an additional WTS structure option be added that serves as a drop-off site only.

Member Sketch remarked that noise and the site's proximity to those who would be impacted by it should be considered. He noted that under the heading "Location" the item "located remotely" would be better listed as "Not adjacent to commercial and residential sites".

Patrick Brown suggested that the chosen site not be one that would be ideally used for another purpose that is more valuable to the community. This item was added under the heading "Parking Lot".

Member Underhill asked the Commission to consider the goals of today's meeting and establish a direction for the remainder of the meeting. A discussion was held regarding how to structure the remainder of the meeting. Planner Starke recommended categorizing the brainstorm criteria at this meeting and then using that information at a later meeting under a different structured process.

Member Duncan commented that public input throughout the meeting may be hindering the meeting's progress. He referenced the Commission's handbook and noted that Community input is its own agenda item.

Member Sketch commented that consensus may not be required with each criteria item and that the criteria could be captured in a motion with the minutes reflecting dissenting opinions.

Planner Starke noted that community consultation was expected to occur early on in the process. She noted that this would allow the Commissioners to consider the community's preferences in addition to each member's personal opinions.

It was generally agreed to move forward in this meeting by moving items from the general criteria list to the more specific headings.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item "low cost". It was generally agreed to list this item under the heading "Parking Lot".

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item "well and septic services". It was generally agreed to list this item under "Possible Regulations" and also to add "room for required services" under the heading "Size".

A discussion was held regarding ground water. Member Sketch noted that there is a ground water map available and that it should be referenced. "No impact on aquifer" was added under the heading "Environment".

A discussion was held regarding whether to add the item “hydrology” under the heading “Environment”. Members Duncan and Sketch recommended the item be included. Member Underhill noted that the word does not define a criteria. It was generally agreed to include the items “surface run off concerns” and “water table contamination / not a wet site” under the heading “Environment”.

A discussion was held regarding the criteria “avoid land with potential for agriculture”. Member Sketch commented that this criteria is consistent with North Pender Island’s OCP. Planner Starke commented that this criteria may need to be made more specific at a later time.

Note: Community Member Candice Zell removed her recording device from the Commissioners’ table at 1:10 pm.

“Convenient for public” was added under the heading “Location”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “Use an existing WTS”. Member Henning noted that there are several commercial operations under which waste is transferred from that operation to the operator. It was also noted that there are sites that have historically been used under Temporary Use Permits (TUPs). It was generally agreed to not transfer this item to a more specific heading.

Note: At 1:14 pm Candice Zell placed the recording device back onto the Commissioner’s table.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “close to ferry for trucks”. Member Sketch noted that large diesel trucks contribute to green house gas emissions and that the OCP provides a mandate to minimize green house gas emissions. It was generally agreed to place this item under the heading “Location”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “odour”. Planner Starke noted that this could be addressed under the headings “Possible Regulations” and “Size”. A discussion was held regarding the ways in which odour can be addressed by regulations, including the role of the CRD in this. It was generally agreed to add “buildings to control noise and odour” under the heading “Possible Regulations”. “Odour / Noise” were listed under the heading “Size”. Member Underhill noted that although odour and noise are important considerations, they are not useful criteria for choosing a site. “Odour / Noise” were listed under the heading “Size” and also as a sub-item to the item “Not adjacent to commercial and residential properties” under the heading “Location”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “minimal size” and the item “establish minimum size” was added under the heading “Size”. At Planner Starke’s recommendation “room for traffic and parking within the site” was also added under the heading “Size”.

The item “Criteria meet expert review” was added under the heading “Parking Lot”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “risk from toxic spill”. Member Underhill suggested this be added under the heading “possible regulations”

and noted that it was not something that could be used as a siting criteria. Several members noted that the OCP prohibits the storing of toxic waste. Member Henning noted that there are regulations regarding the storage of materials that have toxic implications.

The item “control possibility for toxic impacts to environment” was added under the heading “Possible Regulations”.

At Member Henning’s suggestion, “Require concrete pad and capture all effluent with sump pump and holding tank” was added under the heading “Possible Regulation”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “property values”. Member Korbin noted that a site that creates a negative impact on the adjacent properties’ values would not be well received by the community. The item “not affect property values” was added as a sub-item to the item “located remotely” under the heading “Location”.

Member Henning commented that he had discussed the issue with real estate agents on the island specifically related to the Burdett application. He noted that the response he had been given was that it would not create a negative impact on the adjacent property values.

The following general criteria items were listed under their respective headings::

- "Fire protection plan' under the heading “Possible Regulations”.
- “Not in or adjacent to a sensitive Eco-system” under the heading “Environment”.
- “Control light pollution” under the heading “Possible Regulations”.
- “Vectors” under the heading “Possible Regulations”.
- “Ownership public or private?” under the heading “Parking Lot”.
- “Impact on marine / riparian” under the heading “Environment”.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “flat”. It was generally agreed to add the criteria item “flat site preferable” under the heading “Location”. A discussion was held regarding the possible regulations for maximum grade and Member Duncan noted that such regulations exist and can be referenced.

A discussion was held regarding the general criteria item “support future economic development”. Member Korbin noted that this criteria item encompasses protection of potential and existing uses of adjacent lands. Chair Montague noted that this is consistent with the existing OCP.

Note: At 1:59 pm Member Henning left the meeting. Candice Zell removed her recording device from the Commissioners’ table.

It was generally agreed to add “Support future economic development” under the heading “Location”.

A discussion was held regarding the criteria “minimize impacts to adjacent natural amenities”. This item was added under the heading “Environment” and it was noted that this term should be refined at a later time.

A discussion was held regarding the process for refining the criteria at the next meeting.

## **5. MINUTES OF JANUARY 4, 2016 FOR ADOPTION**

Member Sketch noted that Member Henning was no longer present at this meeting, but that the minutes of the last meeting did not include Member Henning’s comment that the CRD had said that the cheapest way to deal with discarded materials was to throw it all in a green bag. Member Sketch noted that the CRD could not afford additional landfills and had wanted to clarify the statement with Member Henning.

Member Petrie commented that it would be appropriate to continue the discussion when Member Henning is present.

A discussion was held between Member Sketch and Member Korbin regarding whether there are diverging opinions on the Commission regarding the goals for reducing waste. Member Korbin noted that personal opinions on the matter would not play too significant a role in the Commission’s work.

**By general consent**, the minutes of January 4, 2016 were adopted as presented.

## **6. NEXT STEPS**

Planner Starke recommended that the next meeting’s proposed agenda include a discussion to plan public consultation sessions.

## **7. NEXT MEETING**

Chair Montague noted that the next meeting is scheduled to be held on South Pender Island at Fire Hall #3.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

**By general consent**, the meeting was adjourned at 2:28 pm.

---

Elizabeth Montague, Chair

Certified Correct:

---

Shannon Brayford, Recorder