

From: [Vi](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: 4 to 6 council members
Date: February 26, 2021 11:30:06 AM

As stated in The Board of the Qualicum Beach Residents' Association's letter,

we agree with asking to increase the 4 council member to 6.

This sounds very reasonable considering the size of Qualicum Beach.

Thank you for this consideration.

V. Ainsworth
Qualicum Beach

February 26, 2021

Mayor Wiese, Councilors Filmer, Harrison, Westbroek and Town Staff:

Re: the OCP Amendment and Rezoning application for 850 Eaglecrest Drive

We were quite astounded that Councilor Westbroek would question the appraisal on this land at this time. The original appraisal has been floating around for months and was part of the January 13th agenda package. It was done by Cunningham & Rivard Appraisals as a result of the recommendation of that firm by Mr. Sales, Town Planner. This appraisal company has done work for the Town of Qualicum Beach on multiple occasions.

We understand that the reply to the request for the “second look” at the uplift analysis came later, but some of the questions raised by Councilor Westbroek should have been triggered earlier with the documents having been part of the record for some time. It also seems like he is questioning his own Town Planner, unless he didn’t realize that the suggestion to use Cunningham & Rivard had come from that source.

Also we thought that all of these issues were to be finalized and closed as of the public hearing; we don’t understand.

The Todsens have been very cooperative in supplying all that has been asked for or offering an amenity or compensation instead. This late round obstacle seemed unnecessary, in fact quite cruel.

Respectfully,

Bob and Joyce Daman

1203 Pintail Drive

February 26, 2021

Mayor Wiese, Councillors Filmer, Harrison and Westbrook,

RE: the OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 850 Eaglecrest Drive

The discussion during the Feb. 24, 2021 Council meeting did not correlate with some of the details remembered regarding the Community Amenities Contribution (CAC).

The CAC is addressed under Policy Number 3008-11, and the Procedure indicates discussion originates with staff, with reporting on the proposed amenity to council, further that it will be made public prior to the Public Hearing. The proponent has complied with every request made by council and the APC, and to have something introduced just prior to third reading is unconscionable.

Regarding "Amenities", the definition is enhancement to the surrounding area. There was suggestion that the money be applied to the proposed Village Way/Hwy. 19A traffic circle. Safe roads are the responsibility of government, and do not fall into the category of an amenity.

An amenity might have been the contribution of the parkland proposed by the proponent, but set aside as "not wanted" by the town because some maintenance might be required. It seems a "cash grab" is made at every juncture of this proposal and the handling of this proposal has become outrageous.

Marlys Diamond
#516, 120 First Avenue West
Qualicum Beach, B.C. V9K 0B4

From: [Carol Dowe](#)
To: [communications](#); [Brian Wiese](#); [Teunis Westbroek](#); [Robert Filmer](#); [Scott Harrison](#); [Daniel Sailland](#); [Luke Sales](#); [Heather Svensen](#); [REDACTED] **Section 22, FOIPPA**
[REDACTED]
Subject: 6 versus 4 QB Council members needed, and Zoom Coffee Hour and Zoom COW
Date: February 26, 2021 9:19:32 AM

Qualicum Beach Mayor, Council and Staff,
[Please place in Correspondence Log and do not delete, and Return receipt requested]

In the recent Council meeting of Feb. 24, 2021 the motion was made by Councillor Teunis Westbroek and supported by Councillor Robert Fillmer to bring a referendum of 6 Councillors on the By-election ballot. **We fully agree with this proposal. No reason to wait til general election.**

In reviewing the chart of some 22 municipalities in BC, with a population similar to ours, 13 had populations similar to ours or less and have 6 Council members!!

We have a great many concerns in Qualicum Beach that are not being addressed by our Council, and since 4 Council are doing the work of 6, it is time to make this change. (Actually we only have 3 Council now!). We are not even having Zoom Coffee Hour with the Mayor or Zoom COW, Committee of the Whole meetings, which would allow better communication with the public.

Please give high consideration to this important issue.

**Respectfully,
Dr. Fred and Carol Dowe
Qualicum Beach, BC**

Section 22, FOIPPA
[REDACTED]

Haylee Gould

From: communications
Subject: FW: **Urgent!! Dec. 19 ,2020 letter in QB Correspond. Log, 5G impact on Aviation Equipment

From: Carol Dowe <[REDACTED] Section 22, FOIPPA >

Sent: February 26, 2021 8:04 AM

To: Brian Wiese <BWiese@qualicumbeach.com>; Teunis Westbroek <TWestbroek@qualicumbeach.com>; Robert Filmer <RFilmer@qualicumbeach.com>; Scott Harrison <SHarrison@qualicumbeach.com>; Daniel Sailland <DSailland@qualicumbeach.com>; Bob Weir <bobweir@qualicumbeach.com>; Luke Sales <LSales@qualicumbeach.com>; Heather Svensen <HSvensen@qualicumbeach.com>; [REDACTED] Section 22, FOIPPA

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] communications <communications@qualicumbeach.com>

Subject: Fwd: **Urgent!! Dec. 19 ,2020 letter in QB Correspond. Log, 5G impact on Aviation Equipment

February 26, 2021 [Please acknowledge receipt and do not delete! and place
in Correspondence file]

To: Qualicum Beach, Mayor, Council and Staff

In the recent Council meeting of Wed. Feb. 24, 2021, at 10:00am, you said you didn't have this letter from Transport Canada (see the PDF below), and note the date of the letter I sent you on Jan. 14, 2021, entitled:
Urgent!, Dec. 19, 2020 letter in QB Correspondence Log, 5G Impact on Aviation

The Public needs to be aware of the concerns that Transport Canada has over us.

Please make sure this letter goes into the communications@qualicumbeach.com

Respectfully,

Fred and Carol Dowe
512 Hawthorne Drive
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1A5

Section 22, FOIPPA

[Please place letter in Correspondence File, and
communications@qualicumbeach.com]

Jan. 14, 2021

Mayor and Council, and Staff
Town of Qualicum Beach

Dear Mayor and Council:

This very important letter of Dec. 19, 2020 is
in the Correspondence Log of the Council meeting of Wed. Jan. 13, 2021,
and therefore, we are bringing this to light and to your attention. We
request a reply to topic of 5G impact on Aviation Equipment. [We had
difficulty hearing Mr. Arnold Schwabe, what is his title?
is he right hand to Mr. Wier, Chief Engineer?]

We feel you need to address, immediately, this
very "harmful interference" of the frequency stated in the letter from
Transport Canada....could have **"far-reaching consequences and impacts
to aviation operations", "may lead to catastrophic failures"**.

Please Mayor and Council, protect this community, and stop the cell
tower proposed by Telus that will contain 5G and maybe more!

You have a responsibility to protect us.

Dr. Fred and Carol Dowe
Qualicum Beach, BC

Section 22, FOIPPA

From: [Teresa Hitch](#)
To: [Brian Wiese](#); [Teunis Westbroek](#); [Scott Harrison](#); [Robert Filmer](#); [Daniel Sailland](#); [Heather Svensen](#); [Luke Sales](#); [communications](#)
Subject: AVIATION SAFETY/PROPOSED TELUS CELL TOWER
Date: February 26, 2021 9:28:32 AM

**PLEASE PLACE IN CORRESPONDENCE FILE AND ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT.
PLEASE PLACE IN MEETING LOG.**

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: AVIATION CONCERNS PERTAINING TO THE PROPOSED TELUS CELL TOWER

If you have been reading my letters, you know that I have raised this issue with you, before. Now that Transport Canada has expressed great concern, I hope you will pay serious attention to this issue, and take it very seriously.

The proposed tower/5G presents significant risks to aviation safety. It is now clear that 5G can adversely affect navigation technology. Also, the emissions from cell towers appear to cause heart arrhythmias, heart attacks and strokes. More and more cardiologists are recognizing this contemporary concern.

Should a plane and/or pilot become disabled over Qualicum Beach, residents and property may be seriously impacted, of course. The liability costs will be the Town of Qualicum Beach's responsibility. If insurance does not cover these expenses (and many major insurance companies do not), the property tax-payers may be held liable. (Incidentally, I have already sent you a partial list of major insurers who will not cover this damage.)

Have you heard of the "precautionary principle"? Briefly, it means in this case, that unless we are certain that the tower and its emissions will be completely safe, the tower should not go ahead. Please Google it, for a more detailed explanation.

Please be courageous, intelligent and wise. Investigate this issue better, and look for information that is current, reliable, accurate, and independent of the telecoms. (The information Telus has given you is out of date, and should not be considered for making a non-biased decision. Should you wish more information, that is up to date, please let me know.)

In closing, again, I respectfully ask that you do not allow this tower to be installed.

Sincerely,
Teresa Hitch

From: [Barrie Nault](#)
To: [communications](#)
Cc: [Section 22, FOIPPA](#)
Subject: Development Permit 3022 Island Highway West
Date: February 25, 2021 8:07:23 PM

Dear Town Council of Qualicum Beach,

In the Town Council meeting on February 24, 2021, multiple councillors stated that both the developer and council were committed to the adherence to the Official Community Plan (OCP). We are pleased with the forthcoming due diligence on this adherence.

We want to aid the process going forward by pointing out the following:

a. The proposed development is situated on the Hazardous Lands Development Permit Area, Development Permit Area H1 in the OCP. No accommodation for the guidelines that govern Area H1 were included in the proposal, the council discussion or the memo from Planning.

b. Similarly the development is situated on the Ecological Development Permit Area G7, Shore Cliffs, in the OCP. This is also part of the Uplands Habitat Greenway in the OCP. No accommodation for guidelines that govern Development Permit Area G7 or the Uplands Habitat Greenway were included in the proposal, the council discussion or the memo from Planning.

c. Several guidelines (2-5) from the Form and Character Development Permit Area, C11 - Highway Bluff Commercial - were not completely addressed in the proposed development or the Planning memo: the design is not stepped - it is horizontal against the slope using the building as a retaining wall and the waterfront side is virtually not stepped; the components are massive - 3 large 6-story buildings; the buildings are close to identical; the height and setback variances are conditional on design and safe use of the property.

Rather than bring these OCP guidelines up at different points in time, our view is that they should be addressed at the outset to avoid wasting time and money on the part of the Town and the developer.

Warm regards,

Victoria Mitchell and Barrie Nault, 441 Crescent Road West, Qualicum Beach

From: [RORY POLSON](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Fwd: Comment on Feb 24/21 Council meeting
Date: February 26, 2021 1:12:06 PM

I am re-sending my email from this morning. I had forgotten to add my personal info, and that has now been included. Tx

From: "rorypolson" Section 22, FOIPPA
To: "Email" <communications@qualicumbeach.com>
Cc: Section 22, FOIPPA
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 9:27:24 AM
Subject: Comment on Feb 24/21 Council meeting

3022 Island Highway West--Record of apparent inconsistencies:

During the meeting, Councilors Westbroek and Harrison made positive comments regarding the developer. Councillor Westbroek advised that this developer intends to only build in accordance with 'current rules', something that 'fits the OCP'. Councillor Harrison advised that this developer will be 'colouring within the lines'. Yet, when one reviews the memo prepared by the Planning Dept for this meeting, this project requires variances for its massive height (approx double) as well as some setbacks. How can those variances be reconciled with the concept of the developer playing within the existing rules?

The question of whether the developer's proposal 'fits' the OCP might otherwise be somewhat more difficult to assess due to the subjective or interpretive nature of some of the requirements listed in C-11 of Schedule 1. However, the Crystal Terraces project may represent a standard against which subsequent proposals should be assessed, as that project was approved, and thereby offers some evidence of what is required to satisfy the intent and purpose of C-11. The Crystal Terraces developer invested much more effort in complying with C-11, and arguably put together a project worthy of this prestigious section of waterfront property in a community that values its uniqueness. It is difficult to perceive how the limited efforts made by the current developer satisfies the requirement that its project fits the OCP.

Rory Polson
451 Crescent Road West

Mayor & Council - the following are my comments regarding the February 24th Council meeting:

There were a number of puzzling things said during this meeting that left some people scratching their heads and definitely require clarification:

- **Town Branding Project** - Kim Burden of the Chamber made a very interesting presentation on the need to rebrand the Town's image. This is a good and timely initiative and very much in tune with expected changes to come in the post-pandemic era where more people will be putting greater value on safe places to visit, live and work. The problem in this for Qualicum Beach is the lack of housing to meet the coming demand, the limited tourist accommodation for visitors and no real strategy to address either of these issues. There's a lot of work to be done here.
- **850 Eaglecrest Dr.** - Councillor Westbroek questioned the land lift appraisal for this project, proposed a deferral and another appraisal. What is surprising here is that the Director of Planning didn't point out that the appraiser Cunningham & Rivard has worked for the Town many times and recommended them to conduct the land lift analysis. This needs to be clarified to avoid the public being given inaccurate information.
- **Eaglecrest Golf Course** - Councillor Westbroek's comments regarding his meeting with the golf course owner were quite surprising and rather disappointing to many Eaglecrest home owners. The Town seems to have blindly accepted the change from an 18 to a 9 Hole golf course, despite having previously said that 'A covenant for an 18-hole golf course, in perpetuity, is to be registered in title'. Then more recently, the Mayor saying that the Town 'Fully supports and encourages the continued operation of Eaglecrest Golf Course as an 18-hole golf course' and will work to 'renew the lease agreements and keep the 18-hole course in operation'. Have the residents of Eaglecrest been abandoned here?

Tim Pritchard
663 Windward Way

From: [Todd and Joanne](#)
To: [communications](#)
Cc: [Brian Wiese](#); [QBCouncil](#); [Section 22](#)
Subject: Comments for the 24 February 2021 Council Meeting
Date: February 26, 2021 12:03:31 AM
Attachments: [SLPB-002-20-Transport-Canada-Civil-Aviation-comments 5G.pdf](#)

Mayor, Council, and Mr. Schwabe,

I want to thank Councillor Westbroek for bringing the issues of aviation safety we had highlighted in previous correspondence to Council during the meeting of 24 February, 2021.

I wish to thank Mr. Schwabe for providing Council with an explanation of Transport Canada's concerns about the potential for catastrophic failures resulting from cellular equipment interference to aviation equipment, up to and including multiple fatalities.

I do, however, want to express concerns about certain discussions Council had on the safety issues.

Councillor Harrison seemed preoccupied with the issue of frequency spectrum sales, that this is an issue of Federal jurisdiction, and we should be addressing our concerns to area MP Gord Johns.

I fear these comments may become a distraction to Council in addressing aviation safety concerns.

At no time did we mention spectrum sales.

We were asking Council, as managers of the airport, to address identified safety concerns, an area which does fall within the jurisdiction of the Town.

Councillor Westbroek mentioned he did not have Transport Canada's report. For your convenience, I have included the report attached to this correspondence.

Although we appreciate that Mr. Schwabe advised Council the equipment interference issues are a matter the Town has to consider for the potential impact it could have on aviation safety, he didn't mention what steps the Town will be taking.

Will the Town be looking to implement the mitigation steps recommended by Transport Canada?

Will the Town ask telecommunication companies what steps they have taken to address the potential their cellular equipment has to impact aviation safety?

Will the Town take into consideration the impact the newly approved Telus tower, to be located within a short distance of the airport, may have on aviation safety?

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these concerns.

Todd Provost
Vice President and Chair
Qualicum Woods Residents Association

Section 22, FOIPPA

October 13, 2020

Chantal Davis
Director of Spectrum Regulatory Best Practices
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada
235 Queen Street (6th Floor, East Tower)
Ottawa ON K1A OH5

SUBJECT: Consultation on the Technical and Policy Framework for the 3650-4200 MHz Band and Changes to the Frequency Allocation of the 3500-3650 MHz Band

Dear Ms. Davis,

The aim of this letter is to provide comments on the consultation document directly impacting Aviation in Canada. In order to do so, Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) will focus on questions 51 and 55f.

In the frequency band 4200-4400 MHz, allocated under 4.10 of the Radio Regulations which is reserved for use by airborne radio altimeters and wireless avionics intra-communications (WAIC) Radio, radio altimeters are a critical element in aircraft automatic landing systems and also serves as an active sensor in ground proximity warning systems (GPWS) that is operational during all phases of flight. WAIC provides aircraft safety communications between points on an airframe. Interference from terrestrial 5G fixed stations has the potential to affect the safety and operations of both of these systems if not mitigated and safeguarded.

ITU-R WRC 15 C0000/MSW-E , Chapter II – Article 4, Assignment and use of frequencies, paragraph 4.10 indicate that: Member States recognize that the safety aspects of radio navigation and other safety services require special measures to ensure their freedom from harmful interference; it is necessary therefore to take this factor into account in the assignment and use of safety of life frequencies.

The Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA) Assessment of C-Band Mobile Telecommunications Interference Impact on Low Range Radar Altimeter Operations (RTCA Paper No.274-20/PMC-2073) is clearly demonstrating that 5G base stations present a major risk of harmful interference to radar altimeters across all aircraft types, with far-reaching consequences and impacts to aviation operations. In the worst case, the safe interference limit is exceeded by the 5G fundamental emissions in the 3.7–3.98 GHz band and for the 5G spurious emissions in the 4.2–4.4 GHz band. The potential impacts to aviation operations in

Canada, may lead to catastrophic failures, Controlled Flight into the Terrain (CFIT) and multiple fatalities.

When accounting for the 6 dB International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) safety margin, the results presented in the RCTA report reveals a major risk of harmful interference to radar altimeters on commercial transport airplanes; business, regional, and general aviation airplanes; and both transport and general aviation helicopters, caused by 5G telecommunications systems in the 3.7–3.98 GHz band. Further, this risk cannot be adequately mitigated by the aviation industry acting alone.

Even a technical solution which may be viable for retrofit installations, if one even exists, will take several years to properly validate and deploy across all affected civil aircraft operating in the Canada or worldwide. Therefore, it is critical that the performance of radar altimeters which are currently in service across tens of thousands of civil aircraft, be fully understood and the risks and operational impacts due to interference be appreciated. Given the planned timeline for deployment of 5G systems in the 3.7–3.98 GHz band, these radar altimeters will be exposed to such risks and operational impacts if proper mitigations are not put in place. The interference can come from the source (antenna, satellite), the end users on board the aircraft or end users on the ground. Here are some aviation Specific Interference Scenarios that in the worst case may lead to CFIT:

- 1) an aircraft conducting a precision instrument approach procedure, more so for CAT I/II/III procedures,
- 2) a medical evacuation helicopter landing at elevated heliports at urban hospitals,
- 3) low level military operation or search and rescue operations (more so at night or in low visibility weather conditions),
- 4) Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) operating commercially with radar altimeter requirements, and
- 5) Loss of situational awareness due to erroneous or unexpected behavior of: Terrain Awareness Warning Systems (TAWS), Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance Systems (TCAS) and Airborne Collision Avoidance Systems (ACAS), Wind Shear detection systems, flight control systems, and autoland systems (including auto-throttle and automated landing flare and rollout).

Question Q51

Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED) is seeking comments on its proposal to not implement any technical requirements for the coexistence between flexible use operation in the 3650-3980 MHz band and radio navigation operations in the 4200-4400 MHz band, noting the 220 MHz frequency separation between the bands of operation. If this is not sufficient for coexistence, what other measures would be appropriate?

Response to Q51

ISED will need to implement technical requirements to ensure freedom from harmful interference to onboard aircraft essential equipment operating in the 4200-4400 MHz band. Safety measure and mitigations to be considered but not limited to:

- Proper base station geographical safety separation distance to airport or aviation operation (air ambulance): Up to 35 km away from CAT I/II/III precision approach procedures to ensure the ICAO 6 dB safety margin is respected.
- Limits on the output power of terrestrial base station.
- Band-stop filter beyond 3.98 GHz.
- Ensure operating bandwidth that would reduce that potential interference and remain within the 3.7-3.98 GHz.
- Base station Advance Antenna System (AAS) designs for operational limitations to scan angle ranges.
- May want to consider reducing the upper limits of the operating band below 3.98 GHz in some geographical areas.

Question 55 f

ISED is seeking comments on what elements from sections 7 to 10 of this consultation would still apply or need to change if ISED were to implement the Telesat proposal, in particular:

f) technical considerations for coexistence between FSS and aeronautical radio navigation systems.

Response to Q55 f

Based on the findings of the RCTA report, Telesat phase I to operate in the 3700-3820 MHz band should have minimal interference to aviation, but in some cases, safeguards may be required to respect the ICAO 6 dB safety margin. Telesat phase II to operate up to 4.1 GHz would represent a significantly higher risk of harmful interference to radar altimeter and WAIC, which could not be mitigated to respect the ICAO 6 dB safety margin. This would significantly increase the potential for impacts to aviation operations in Canada and leading to catastrophic failures and multiple fatalities. Please see response to Q51 to ISED, consider the potential mitigation factors and reduce the proposed operational bandwidth to or below 3.98 GHz.

Conclusion

There are liability concerns with 5G implementation and ISED needs to consider the seriousness of harmful interference to aircraft onboard radar altimeter equipment that may be caused by 5G telecommunications systems in the 3.7–3.98 GHz band implementation in Canada with the potential loss of lives if an Aviation accident would occur due to 5G interference with Radar Altimeter or WAIC. ISED needs to establish appropriate safety

measures to respect the ICAO 6 dB safety margin, by implementing specific technical requirements and mitigation measures. Frequency band selection should not be swayed by economic reasons or harmonization with the USA, rather human safety should be the priority. ISED should also consider reducing the 5G operational bandwidth in some geographical areas near airports to increase the frequency guard band with the aviation frequency band in order to ensure aviation safety.

Should you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact Francis Mercier at (343) 550-4226 or email francis.mercier@tc.gc.ca

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Sincennes', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert Sincennes, P.Eng.
Director, Standards
Civil Aviation

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

February 26, 2021

Mayor & Council
Town of Qualicum Beach
201 – 660 Primrose St
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1J5

Dear Mayor and Council,

After viewing the Council Meeting of **February 24th**, I am submitting the following comments:

Applaud Opportunity For Dialogue Between Council & Community

I was pleased to hear confirmation the Town will be moving toward creating opportunities for the community to once again be able to dialogue with Council. We look forward to this!

Defeated Motion re: Community Opinion Question on Council Size

It was disappointing, but not surprising, Councillor Westbroek's motion to have a community opinion question related to Council size on the ballot during the by-election failed. It is very disappointing two members of Council are not willing to even ask for citizen input. In the QBRA's The Issue (Fall 2019) this matter was raised with regard to Council's wage increases: if we are paying for a seven person why can't we have a larger, more representative Council?

Mayor Wiese's comment that "bigger isn't always better" can be applied to many other decisions facing the town; recommended reading: *"Better not Bigger: How to Take Control of Urban Growth and Improve Your Community"* by Eben Fodor.

No Need to Throw Away the Tree Bylaw

Why would a comprehensive land-use review of the Estate Lands negate the current tree bylaw for Milner Gardens and other neighbouring Estate properties? Could this not end up strengthening the bylaw instead?

New Street Lights

Thank you to Councillor Westbroek for not dismissing citizen concerns regarding the new streetlights. Judging by the amount of conversation on social media, many citizens feel very strongly about this issue.

Tree & Vegetation Management Plan & Bylaws and The Town of Qualicum Beach Climate Change Adaptation Plan

There are many citizens, myself included, that are looking forward to these items coming forward!

Sincerely,
Anne Skipsey

From: [Howard Watts](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Comments following Council Meeting February 24
Date: February 25, 2021 2:22:23 PM

After following the Council Meeting of February 24 I wish to record the following comments:

During councillors' discussion of the development application for 3022 Island Highway West it was stated that this application appeared to adhere to the guidelines which are written in the OCP ... the builder's plans appear to "colour within the lines" as stated by Councillor Harrison.

There are specific ways in which the 3022 development design strays from the intent and the directions stated in the OCP.

From the OCP: "The Island Highway No. 19A generates high traffic loads along the beach, the Town's prime recreational asset. The highway corridor is severely constrained by both the beach and upland bluff areas and by existing commercial establishments along the beach."

My concern is that highway 19A at the beach is a very busy thoroughfare and this development which is planned for the south side of the road will not allow for setbacks that are essential for a heavy traffic area and allow for safe pedestrian sidewalks.

From the OCP: "Buildings should be a maximum of three storeys in height. However, the Town may consider taller buildings on a case-by-case basis with consideration to factors such as topography, solar access, compatibility with adjacent uses, neighbourhood impact, views and community amenities."

My concern is that the OCP contains clear statements that height of buildings should be in keeping with those in the neighbourhood. Current estimates of the height of this cluster of buildings reveal that it is too high.

As stated during the meeting discussion the construction will lead to "new experiences while walking or driving through the Qualicum Beach waterfront".

H Norman Watts
431 Crescent Rd West Unit#102
Qualicum Beach BC
9K 2K2

Sent from my iPad

From: [Debby Wetmore](#)
To: [communications](#)
Subject: Qualicum Beach - Increase in Council Size
Date: February 26, 2021 10:19:34 AM

Dear Mayor Wiese and Councillors Westbroek, Harrison and Filmer,

I am in full agreement with the February 16 letter from Qualicum Beach Residents' Association supporting a larger Council for Qualicum Beach. We live in a particularly environmentally sensitive area that adds to the complexity of all decision making particularly when it comes to development. Also technological innovation is bringing many new opportunities (more electric cars for example) and many threats (5G technology and it's proven detrimental impact on airport/airline communication safety). To sort through these complex issues a Council of 4 is just not enough. As the February 16 letter clearly indicates, all but one other Town of comparable size has 6 councillors and for good reason.

I strongly support an initiative that results in an increase in the Council size as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Debby Wetmore
Hollywood Road, Qualicum Beach