

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO
ELECTORAL AREA SERVICES COMMITTEE
ADDENDUM**

Tuesday, April 10, 2018

1:30 P.M.

RDN Board Chambers

This meeting will be recorded

	Pages
4. DELEGATIONS	
*4.1 Ian Lawrie and Sarah Shipp, re Electoral Area 'A' - Driftwood Road Beach Access Improvements	2
*5. CORRESPONDENCE	
That the following correspondence be received for information:	
*5.1 Daniel and Patricia Johnston, re Electoral Area 'A' – Driftwood Road Beach Access Improvements	3

Delegation: Ian Lawrie & Sarah Shipp, re Parking Proposal at Driftwood Road Beach Access

Summary: Residents were strongly opposed to the development of parking when asked for feedback during a site meeting in November 2017.

Residents were not informed of this new proposal to go ahead with parking despite giving feedback, nor offered to attend a meeting to reaffirm their wishes to NOT have parking.

Apparently a soil berm has been cited as the reason for the proposal. The land owner who placed soil berm to deal with water run-off has not been contacted requesting its removal, or that it was an issue.

Soil berm will be removed Thursday, April 12, 2018.

Emails for residents are available to reaffirm their wishes OPPOSED to parking.

Action Requested: That the Board reject the proposal for the development of a parking area on the Driftwood Rd. allowance and to consider the existing parking available.

From: Daniel Johnston
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 3:28 PM
To: Cramer, Kelsey
Subject: RE: Driftwood Road Beach Access

Kelsey, While I believe it is evident from the below note, I want to be sure that you understand that we are directly impacted by this decision as it impacts access to two beaches directly in front of our property. Further, would you please ensure that we are copied on any further e-mails or notices to impacted or potentially impacted property owners in relation to this matter. Regards, Dan

From: Daniel Johnston
Sent: Monday, April 9, 2018 3:18 PM
To: 'KCramer@rdn.bc.ca' <KCramer@rdn.bc.ca>
Subject: Driftwood Road Beach Access

Kelsey,

We reside at and own 1932 Bostrom Road which is located two lots away from what is known as the Driftwood Road beach access (and also adjacent to the beach access trail off Shasta Road). There was evidently a site meeting last November where residents had an opportunity for input - we do not recall receiving notice of this (but that may be as a result of us being out of the country for the first two weeks of November). We understand from discussions with a neighbor that this matter is advancing and that there is a meeting tomorrow where this issue will be discussed.

We have now had an opportunity to go online and review the Staff Report to the Electoral Area Services Committee dated March 23, 2018. We have the following comments:

- a. We are not supportive of any upgrade or expansion of the Driftwood trail (or the Shasta trail) that would encourage or result in the Driftwood trail (or Shasta Trail) becoming more extensively used – our reasons include:
 - i. Safety both in terms of the impact of greater beach traffic on access to our property (there are many parts of our property that are easily accessible from the beach in a manner that makes them more accessible to property crime) and beach fires (with the concern here being the possibility of such fires creating a risk to neighboring property, particularly as summers are increasingly dry – while the Staff Report notes that the North Cedar Fire Department has no recollection of being called for beach fires here, that does not mean that beach fires do not take place. In our nearly twenty years of living here, until two years ago when beach access became more difficult as a result of development of a 40 acre parcel off of Shasta, beach fires were a common experience, often accompanied by larger groups of people, usually not from the neighborhood, and often carrying on into the late evening) – no campfire signs are not likely to be effective (and as you note in the report, the RDN does not have jurisdiction in relation to the beach area in any event) and based on personal experience, it is very difficult to get anyone to respond in a timely manner to concerns about beach parties or fires on the beach);
 - ii. Adverse impact on the quite enjoyment of our property - see above comments regarding our concerns re beach fires /beach parties – in addition, sound travels on the water, particularly at night, and the RDN does not have the resources to address noise or safety complaints real time (or the jurisdiction to address them if they are coming from the beach area below high water mark) - further, there is the issue of garbage on the beach (which is occasional an issue today) with no apparent plan to address this (unless we have missed this somewhere in the report);

- iii. There is significant, existing, safe access to beaches in the area already most notably the recently improved Shasta trail access, the beaches adjacent to the Cedar boat ramp;
- b. If notwithstanding concerns such as those described above the RDN is inclined to proceed with an expansion/upgrade of the Driftwood trail in a manner results in or encourages greater use, the RDN should not do so unless it can provide property owners that it will dedicate the resources necessary to remedy any such concerns that materialize in real time AND in fact has the jurisdiction to do so – if the RDN does not have the ability to effectively protect local property owners from such impacts (i.e. the jurisdiction and ability to dedicate financial resources on an ongoing basis to respond real time to such concerns as they arise) it should not proceed at all (other than improving the safety of access from the top of the bank to the beach) – note that responding after the fact does nothing to address noise on the beach or fires;
- c. We are supportive of minor improvements to the Driftwood trail directed solely at addressing current safety concerns with physical access from the top of the bank down to the beach (the fact is the trail is there and will be used by neighborhood residents and steps should be taken to ensure that the physical access down to the beach is safe) - this can be should be done without further improvements that would enlarge the trail or otherwise modify it in a manner that would encourage or facilitate greater use;
- d. We are not supportive of the construction of any parking spaces – any parking spaces would simply have the effect of augmenting existing parking space on the roads which in turn would have the impact of increasing use (vs. maintaining current neighborhood access but making it safer) – we note we have a similar view in relation to the construction of any parking spaces for the Shasta trail access as well;
- e. The \$50,000 allocated in the 2018 budget for design and construction of trail improvements suggest a degree of improvement far greater than simply making the existing trail access from the top of the bank to the beach safer (or, alternatively, construction costs that are far greater than what should be reasonably expected in order to accomplish this).

We note that the Staff Report is recommending that up to three parking spaces be designed and constructed in 2019. We have reviewed the summary of the input received as attached to Staff Report and note with one exception, the input received is all either opposed to upgrading the access or supportive of it but only if no parking. Within this context, we would appreciate if you could provide us with the rationale for the Staff Recommendation to proceed with three parking spaces. We are not suggesting there is no rationale for parking spaces, simply that it is not evident from the Staff Report. Best practices for community/stakeholder consultation and engagement dictate that for those elements of a recommendation inconsistent with significant input received, there should be a clear and transparent rationale provided. If this rationale exists, could you forward it. If not, it would be appropriate to postpone discussion of this topic at tomorrow's meeting until such time that you can provide it to those property owners directly impacted by this decision and others in the neighborhood.

To be clear of the three alternatives identified in the Staff Report, while we would prefer Alternative 3, we are supportive of Alternative 2 so long as Alternative 2 is restricted solely to addressing current safety concerns with physical access from the top of the bank down to the beach (i.e. it does not involve any upgrades that would otherwise include greater use of this access trail). We are not supportive of Alternative 1 nor do we see that Alternative 1 is supported by the community consultation that you undertook.

Can you let us know if the meeting tomorrow is open to the public and, if so, please provide us with specifics. Could you also please let us know what steps we need to take to ensure that we are advised of future meetings such as the one held in early November.

If we are not able to attend tomorrow's meeting, or if for some reason it is not open to the public, would you please be sure that our views are conveyed to those in attendance and taken into consideration.

Please feel free to call if you have any questions or if there is anything in the above you wish to discuss.

We look forward to your response.

Regards,

Daniel and Patricia Johnston