

**REPORT OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
held at Edward Milne Community School Theatre  
6218 Sooke Road, Sooke, BC  
September 6, 7 and 8, 2011 at 5:00 p.m.

---

**SUBJECT:** **BYLAW NO. 3755** cited as the "Land Use Bylaw for the Rural Resource Lands, Bylaw No. 1, 2009, Amendment No. 2, 2011"

**BYLAW NO. 3783** cited as "Capital Regional District Marine Trail Holdings Phased Development Agreement Bylaw No. 1, 2011"

**PRESENT:** **Director M. Hicks**, Chair by Resolution of the Capital Regional District Board on Wednesday, June 29, 2011 as continued July 13, 2011  
**CRD Staff:** R. Lapham, Planning and Protective Services General Manager;  
J. Klassen, Local Area Planning Manager; W. Miller, Recording Secretary

**PURPOSE OF THE HEARING:**

**BYLAW NO. 3755**

To amend Bylaw No. 3602, "Land Use Bylaw for the Rural Resource Lands" to create a new Marine Trail Resort (MTR) zone providing for a destination tourist resort complex. The proposed new MTR zone will allow for the following uses: 257 cabins, one resort lodge building, two resort recreation buildings, six caretaker residences and public park.

To remove the following lands from the existing Resource Lands (RL) zone and add them to the MTR zone: District Lot 564, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63203; District Lot 565, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63203; District Lot 566, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63204; District Lot 567, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63204; District Lot 568, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205; District Lot 569, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205 and District Lot 570, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205.

**BYLAW NO. 3783**

Development Agreement with Marine Trail Holdings No. 1 Ltd., Marine Trail Holdings No. 2 Ltd. and Marine Trail Holdings No. 3 Ltd. (the "Developer") in the form attached to the Bylaw with respect to the lands described as: District Lot 564, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63203; District Lot 565, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63203; District Lot 566, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63204; District Lot 567, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63204; District Lot 568, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205; District Lot 569, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205 and District Lot 570, Renfrew District Except Part in Plan VIP63205.

The Developer proposes to develop the lands to create a destination tourist resort complex that fits within the parameters of proposed Bylaw No. 3755 "Land Use Bylaw for the Rural Resource Lands, Bylaw No. 1, 2009, Amendment No. 2, 2011". Bylaw 3755 removes the lands from the Resource Lands (RL) zone and adds them to the Marine Trail Resort (MTR) zone which permits the following uses on the lands and which allocates those uses on the lands in accordance with the development areas A-1 to A-9 and the park land dedications: 257 cabins, one resort lodge building, two resort recreation buildings, six caretaker residences and public park.

The purpose of the Phased Development Agreement applicable to the development on the lands is to secure park land, trails and other amenities that have been offered by the Developer; to address water and septic services, fire protection and emergency services; and to require covenants to protect the conservation area, to restrict use to temporary accommodation, to require bear smart initiatives and pet control, and for fire protection. Under the Agreement, the CRD agrees that Bylaw No. 3755 will not be amended or repealed without the consent of the Developer for the 10 year term of the Agreement. The Agreement may be assigned to a Strata Corporation, to the purchaser of a strata lot or an affiliate of the Developer if such Strata Corporation, purchaser or affiliate agrees to assume the obligations of the Developer. The Agreement may only be assigned to other persons if the CRD consents in writing.

**NOTICE:** Property owners and occupiers were given notice as set out under Section 892 of the *Local Government Act*. Notices were inserted in two (2) consecutive issues of the Sooke Mirror appearing on August 24 and August 31, 2011.

**ATTENDANCE:** There were approximately 400 people in attendance.

The Chair declared the Public Hearing open at 5:05 p.m. and introduced the members of Voting Block A of the CRD Board; CRD Board Chairman, Geoff Young, CRD Board member and Victoria councillor, Philippe Lucas; John Horgan, MLA, Juan de Fuca. The guidelines and procedures of the Public Hearing and Notice of Public Hearing were read to those present and the Chair called for comments from those in attendance.

June Klassen advised that written submissions were received from the following individuals: June Smile, Otter Point; Gary Petersen, Sooke; Eric Burns and Irene Diane Billard, Sooke; Pam and Mike Day, Sooke; Sarah and Thomas Tidwell, Shirley; Helga Maurus, Sooke; Carmen Moore, Victoria; Robert and Susan Ryan, Willis Point; Judy Kozler and David Lawrie, Willis Point; Kathryn Harwood, Willis Point; Pat William; R.W. von Tilly, Sooke; Reverend David Brown and Dorothy Brown, Otter Point.

Arnie Campbell, Otter Point and Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association

- Presenting on behalf of the directors of OPSRRA as supported by 47 members
- Rural Resource Lands are part of the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area and is considered important to adjacent communities of Otter Point and Shirley
- OPSRRA spoke in favour of the Rural Resource Lands Zoning and Land Use Bylaws in 2010 including RRL Land Use Bylaw that defines cabins as temporary accommodation
- Proposal now exceeds what was presented two years ago – accommodation not intended for traveling public
- Proposal will require an increase in services – emergency servicing, search and rescue, policing, bylaw enforcement, land use planning. RRL Land Use Bylaw discourages development that increases demands for services and infrastructure
- Full build out will have a greater population than Shirley and Port Renfrew, drawing on the existing tax base for servicing
- Concerns regarding increased congestion on Highway 14
- Further concerns noted in written submission

Walter Jones, Pacheedaht First Nation

- Pacheedaht never approved sale of lands, logging or development in traditional territory
- Land sales should be stopped until treaty agreed upon by all levels of government
- Land sales continue while treaty in process
- Pacheedaht still the legal land owner

Patty Mason, Victoria

- Registering protest of development – too large
- Noted concerns forwarded from adjacent communities of Otter Point and Shirley
- Noted concerns regarding fire services and water supply
- Regular visitor to the trail for its peace and nature

Brenda Mark, Shirley

- Proposed donation to BC Parks may seem large but questioned amount of land in ravines, creek beds and steep slopes
- Proposed trails and parking lot at DL 567 meaningless as BC parks does not authorize access
- Concern regarding proposal that guests be trained for fire fighting
- Rescue from the trail will still require manpower even if a helipad is provided
- Covenant still allows for tree cutting in view corridors
- Questioned how covenanted areas are to be protected
- Fire insurance requirements will require tree cutting
- No assurance local companies will be used for construction
- Proposed jobs will be temporary and seasonal
- Board Voting Block A has duty to act in interest of the public

John Van Beek, View Royal

- Board Voting Block A inconceivable small to be charged with decision regarding the proposal
- Contravenes Regional Growth Strategy and Rural Resource Lands Official Community Plan
- Concerns regarding impact to wildlife corridors
- If development proceeds, damage cannot be undone
- Decision should rest with full Board

Wendy Morton, Otter Point

- As 37 year resident has seen the logging trucks bound for China
- Rules are being stretched and ignored
- Questioned when will the land be honoured
- Stop the greed and listen to the people

Dave McClimon, Sooke

- Supports application
- Proposal best option for the land compared to resource extraction
- Proposal will result in new jobs and economic growth

Dorothy Field, Victoria

- Resident of Victoria and West Coast Road landowner
- Read from letter from Richard Hughes, past Director for Cobble Hill requesting that the proposal be turned down and that the trail be left intact as found presently and noting that OCP and zoning bylaws should not be minor inconvenience for developers
- Proposal is not a local issue but a regional, provincial and federal issue as adjacent trail is a national treasure
- Lands hold meaning for the local First Nations
- Questioned why proposal is proceeding in view of extreme public opposition
- Spoke to her written letter opposing the proposed development and bylaws noting that the Juan de Fuca Trail is 150 meters wide and that, in proposed places, the proposed development is only 100 meters from the trail
- Trail needs protection forever

**Zac Doeding, East Sooke**

- Board Voting Block A is charged with representing all interests
- Proposal best option for the land compared to resource extraction
- Development proposes protecting 85% of the land
- Juan de Fuca Trail provides for accessible wilderness experiences
- Proposal will add one more accessible trail point to the existing three access points
- Majority of Pacheedaht First Nation in favour of proposal
- Pacheedaht has purchased surrounding Tree Farm License 61
- Approval of proposal will provide economic stimulus and will respect wishes of the Pacheedaht

**Gordon O'Connor, Dogwood Initiative**

- Media focus has been on the trail and impact of the proposal on the trail
- This proposal's impact is the tip of the iceberg
- Approval of the proposal will set measure for future land use decisions
- Decision regarding the proposal will determine the area's identity and economic, environmental and social health for decades
- Opposition clear – not supported by OPSRAA, Jordan River Steering Committee, labour unions and anti-poverty groups
- Approval will take away from existing economic tourism industries
- Approval will result in a loss of opportunities and urban sprawl

**Georgina Kirkland, Victoria**

- Opposed to proposal
- Questioned who will buy/live at the resort – access will be restricted to those who can afford it
- Considers the land a common resource

**Robert Gillespie, Saanich**

- Amalgamation of 13 municipalities into the Capital Regional District has resulted in bigger government
- Development being controlled from far away
- Smaller municipalities understand local issues
- Capital Regional District should be broken into smaller zones to address local issues

**Rory Knapp- Fisher, Victoria**

- Proposal's servicing demands not supported by the Rural Resource Lands OCP
- Services needed will include medical, grocery, waste, water, trucking
- Resort users will also have to drive to surrounding communities for servicing
- Concerns for increase in traffic volume including travelling labourers
- For economic benefit, proposal should be considered in Port Renfrew or Shirley
- Urges Board Voting Block A to vote no

**Mehdi Najari, Saanich**

- Denying people the right to speak by holding the Public Hearing in Sooke
- Questioned the right of Board Voting Block A to vote on the proposal
- Process corrupt since the removal the TFL lands
- Development proposed on unceded lands
- Inconsistent with the Regional Growth Strategy
- Vote in interest of the public

**Sarah Cox, Victoria**

- Trail has provided wilderness experiences to generations of children
- Spoke to family member experiences on the trail
- Residents are lucky to have such a park so close
- Urged that the proposal be turned down

**Frank Mitchell, Metchosin**

- Reject proposal as it is illegal as it contravenes the RRL OCP and RGS
- If proposal proceeds, include measures to monitor residency at a cost to the developer
- If proposal is approved and fails, will result in underserviced residential/commercial strip
- Proposal should include penalty to owner/developer to restore land to original state if project fails
- Proposal bylaws need redrafting, review and come back with a sensible proposal
- Urged that the proposal be rejected or revised to allow for a framework to accomplish what is proposed

**John Hasell, Oak Bay**

- Passionately opposed
- Opposed as proposal contradicts the RGS, will result in noise and visual pollution
- Phased development agreement is weak. Final page pertaining to fire protection is blank
- Developer's fire protection plan does not provide solid recommendations, leaving fire protection to the travelling public

**Ken Farquharson, Metchosin**

- Argument of values
- Argued to support creation of the West Coast Trail in the 1970s
- Juan de Fuca Trail just as worthy as the West Coast Trail
- Retain lands as a means of protection and for enjoyment
- Does not support proposal

**Dave Cutts, Nanaimo**

- Spoke to development in the Nanaimo area that, due to public support, resulted in lands not being rezoned to support luxury condos and within a period of two years money was raised to purchase the lands as park

**Robyn Silker, Nanaimo**

- Opposed to proposal
- Will never be able to afford to purchase a cabin as proposed
- Would prefer that lands be used by more people than less

**Tony Gooch, Oak Bay**

- Impact on the park affects all BC residents
- Marine Trail Holdings established to capitalize off the beauty of the trail
- Development will become integrated with the trail
- Look beyond short term – look at proposal's affect 50 – 100 years from now including long term tax burden

**Diane McNally, Victoria**

- Family holds the lands in their hearts
- South Island opposed to proposal
- Opposed to destruction of water and wild lands
- Economic driver as is
- Lack of unanimous support from the Pacheedaht

**Nitya Harris, Langford**

- Proposal goes against RGS and Regional Green/Blue Strategy
- Destroys wildlife corridors and creates urban sprawl, traffic congestion, contributing to global warming
- Save lands for wilderness area, creating Gwaii Haanas of the CRD

Saul Arbes, Victoria – Sea to Sea Greenbelt Society

- Juan de Fuca Trail is dedicated to youth immemorial
- Legitimacy of Voting Block A challenged
- Two legal opinions received confirming proposal is inconsistent with the RGS and inconsistent with the RRL OCP
- Duty and authority of the CRD Board to prove consistency with the RGS
- Return proposal to full Board prior to 3<sup>rd</sup> reading to confirm consistency
- Proposal is a regional issue
- Voting Block A should refer to full Board

Patricia Sloan, Willis Point

- Deny proposal and explore options including expansion of Federal park
- Widespread opposition to the proposal
- Questioned the rush, recommending a 10 year moratorium in the RRL
- Development has not proved water let alone other services
- Questioned fire servicing proposal
- 1000+ additional people at full build out against RRS
- Questioned complicated strata structure
- If approved, will set precedence
- Requested 10 year moratorium and explore options more suitable for the land

Darren Olson, Esquimalt

- New resident from Alberta
- Opposed

Marni Lorimer, Esquimalt

- Originally from Fort McMurry, Alberta and spoke to development changes there
- Opposed to proposal
- Supports wildlife protection

Joan Russow, Oak Bay

- Proposal inappropriate as against RGS and international commitments and obligations
- Nature has intrinsic worth
- Nature wealth is being eroded at unprecedented rate
- Consider rights of future generations and the rights of First Nations
- Deny proposal
- Proposal affects all of BC and the international community

Robert Patterson, Metchosin

- Opposed
- Contradicts RGS
- Would compromise wilderness experience
- Should not be concerned with view corridors but preservation of wildlife corridors
- Inadequate consultation when TFL removed
- Questioned pressure/rush of application
- Questioned proposal's generation of jobs
- Even if development proceeds slowly, approval will tie up the property from other potential options
- Vote no

Alison Acker, Raging Grannies

- Ashamed proposal is being considered
- Juan de Fuca not for sale

**Rod Dobell, Oak Bay**

- Speaking for grandchildren and future generations
- Proposal contradicts RGS
- Proposal is a regional concern
- RGS and OCP should not be disregarded at first proposal
- Full CRD Board's duty to consider and reject

**Freda Nott, Council of Canadians – Victoria Chapter**

- Opposed for reasons as already stated by speakers
- Development should focus in Jordan River and Port Renfrew

**Christine Anderson, Victoria**

- Is a human conflict
- Germaine issues are clear
- Do the right thing and get the land back

**Dick Pearson, Victoria**

- Avid hiker
- Crime to impair the trail
- Destruction of forest leads to increase in Green House Gas, affecting climate change

**Vicky Husband, Jordan River Steering Committee, CRD resident, Otter Point Land Owner**

- Opposes both bylaws
- Decision makers will be held accountable
- No Victoria public meeting
- Regional, provincial, federal and international issue
- Authority and duty to determine consistency with the RGS
- Legal counsel has determined that the proposal is not consistent with the RGS
- Full Board vote
- Massive vacation home proposal
- Letters received are overwhelmingly opposed
- Questioned rush to push application forward
- Original villain is the Province – removal of TFL

**Marnie Dobell, Victoria**

- 30,000 annual visitors to the trail will not return if land is damaged
- 30,000 annual visitors are the economic driver
- Very few comments received supporting
- Huge provincial/national issue
- LUC A has been sent the legal and public message
- Refer to full Board

**Janet Gray, Metchosin**

- Think beyond children's grandchildren to make the right decision
- Against any development adjacent to the trail
- Proceeding while treaties are still in negotiation
- Should be striving to sustain all life on Vancouver Island
- Precedence setting
- Leadership is needed

**Karen Egger, Victoria**

- Inappropriate development
- More concrete information is needed
- Development plan for the area is required to serve the future, to be sustainable beyond monetary gain

- Refer to full Board

Judith Henderson, Duncan

- Retain coastal wilderness for present and future residents
- Concern for wildlife, habituation of bears/cougars and increased shooting of wildlife due to habituation

Ryan King, Langford

- Trained fire fighter and has reviewed developer's report
- Fire fighting training is intensive
- Resort residents will not have the experience needed to fight fires
- Questioned consistency with the RGS
- Development will not be sustainable in the long term

Regina Ternus, Gordon Head

- Contravenes RGS and RRL OCP
- Reflect sad political time that proposal is being considered
- Development will be a burden on the tax payer
- Questioned LUC A's motivation to continue in view of public opposition
- Vote no

Amber Ternus, Gordon Head

- Trail is accessible to all ages of users
- Trail will be impacted by noise – car alarms, cell phones, traffic
- Working families have not been able to fit meeting attendance into busy schedules to speak out
- Locals care about this issue

Stacy Jones, Pacheedaht First Nation

- From bloodline of hereditary chief
- Brought other hereditary bloodline members to witness public outcry
- Development falls within defined Pacheedaht traditional territory
- Lands and resources are unceded
- Membership not approached regarding proposal
- Requested meeting in Port Renfrew
- Concerned regarding fire
- Duty to present and protect traditional territory for subsistence
- Aboriginal rights protected by the constitution
- Protect lands for future Pacheedaht generations

William Jones, Pacheedaht First Nation

- Federal government will not listen to the opinions of the Pacheedaht membership beyond what is communicated through the band council resulting in a closed system
- Was not aware that band council approved the proposal
- Deny the proposal
- Contradicts RGS
- Consider compact development rather than sprawling
- Cited legal cases where band decisions without membership consultation have been successfully challenged

Herman Surkis, Langford

- Fundamentally opposed
- Questioned guarantee that covenants will do as promised
- Concerns regarding agreement enforcement should the lands be sold
- Spoke to tax burden associated with the uncompleted Langford overpass and tax burden associated with the proposal

**Rose Henry, Coast Salish**

- Spoke to need for community consultation and inclusiveness
- Speaking for her community and the spirits of her people
- Listen to the solutions and wishes of the community

**Doreen Gee, Victoria**

- As regular trail user, strongly opposed
- Proposal is ugly and outlandish
- Lands should remain as is
- Highest use will be by those who come for the lands' beauty and natural state
- Precedence setting for global companies seeking development opportunities
- Full Board vote so whole region can be heard

**Erich Nahser-Ringer, Victoria**

- Speaking for Katina Farthing who was unable to stay and who wishes that the lands remain accessible for all children, present and future
- Not antidevelopment but supportive of developments that are inspiring
- Does not support the development

**Kludane Buser-Rivet, Saanich**

- Regular user of the trail since youth
- Development will only profit a handful
- Reject proposal
- Proposed buildings and amenities do not belong on the trail

**Leon Buser-Rivet, Saanich – 12 years old**

- Completely opposed
- Would say no himself if offered 1 million dollars
- View alone is worth 1 million dollars
- Questioned who would trade land for vacation homes and profit
- Maintain as is for years to come

**Rosemary Jorna, Otter Point**

- Against both bylaws
- Proposal intent goes against RGS, RRL OCP and public wish
- Trail created under commonwealth nature legacy initiative for youth of BC
- Future economic stability is dependent on ability to maintain and attract a highly skilled workforce
- Easy accessibility to wild lands is what draws young skilled workforce back to the region
- Resort vacation opportunities can be found anywhere else in Canada
- Proposal does not offer protection and noted particular concern for cabins and amenities proposed above Bear Beach
- Resort's public access to the trail to Bear Beach will be directed through existing campsites
- Only public amenity is the access proposed at Bear Beach
- Proposal will affect wilderness experience

**Sid Jorna, Otter Point**

- Concern regarding proposal's claim that project will not be visible from the trail
- Concern regarding proposal's claim that the development will save the land from resource extraction, noting that land is surrounding by Crown Land and TFL lands
- Government has demonstrated that it is willing to dispense of TFL lands
- Once rezoned, land will be unavailable for park
- Once RGS is breached, easy for other developments to follow
- Claim of community benefit is flawed – job revenue, off site building, no agreement with the Pacheedaht

- Public is overwhelming opposed
- Not consistent with RGS

Annie Banks, Victoria

- Opposed to occupation of unceded indigenous lands
- Development unjust to Pacheedaht
- Proposal must be stopped

Sven Biggs, Wilderness Committee

- Members are opposed
- 3<sup>rd</sup> most visited park
- Visitors have been left out of the discussion
- Land is the economic value

Kevin Neish, Port Renfrew

- Opposed
- Unnecessary sprawl
- Port Renfrew and Jordan River needs this type of development to bring in a tax base, to bring in community volunteers, to bring children to the schools
- Development along the trail should not be considered
- Owns mineral rights to proposed development area

Ronald Spector, Victoria

- Opposed
- Voices of 350+ speakers tonight represent the larger voice
- Listen to the reasoned voices and say no

Anne Hanson, Victoria

- Read from writing from Wade Davis, Massey Lectures, noting ability of companies with no history or connection to the land to transform lands forever without public compensation when lands belong to everyone

Paul Rasmussen, Oak Bay

- Overwhelming public opposition
- Election official job is do as the public wants
- If approved, message to the public would be that the public voice does not count
- Reject proposal

Felix Giannelia, Victoria

- Spoke to lands in Langford destroyed by development
- Questioned whether proposal lands will remain open/accessible to the public
- Stayed in similar resort – not wilderness
- Proposal cannot proceed under current bylaws – proposal is illegal
- Public has spoken clearly
- There has been over a year of opposition

June Klassen advised that written submissions were received from the following individuals: Chida Henny; Sheila and Pater Paul, Shawnigan Lake; Mary Lynch; Hugh Waller and Graciela Orlando, Sooke; John Derksen, Sooke; George Butcher, Sooke; Carley Coccola; Skye Augustine; Melanie Siebert, Victoria; Nicole Dillman, Victoria; Jack Thoruburgh, North Saanich; Ann Nolte, Victoria; Lynne Milnes and Joseph Blake, Victoria; Diana Smith and Dorothy Elias, Vancouver; Heather Fox, Victoria; Margo Farr, Victoria; Rhonda Batchelor Lillard, Saanich; Loria Waters, Sannichton; Annette Barclay; Erin Evangeline Sanderson, Victoria

Courtney Robinson, Victoria

- Stating opposition for the public record

Marion Cumming, Victoria

- Listen to the voice of the people
- Acknowledge legal ownership, right of indigenous peoples
- Majority of Pacheedaht opposed
- Pacheedaht should not have had to purchase lands surrounding the proposal – it is Pacheedaht land
- Requests 10 year moratorium

Anne So, Victoria

- Grew up in Toronto – Juan de Fuca is amazing
- Taught in Port Renfrew for three years
- Had concern with Highway 14 when commuting to Port Renfrew to teach
- Has concern with proposal due to condition of the highway

Bobby Arbess, Victoria

- Proposed bylaws are ill-motivated and unnecessary
- Tragedy of commons if proposal proceeds as facilitated by the presented bylaws
- Bad idea
- Asked that Voting Block A declare its interest as it is not acting in the public's interest

Stephen Portman, Victoria

- As an anti-poverty advocate, against development being made a priority on basis of infrastructure required
- Resort will be for wealthy people who do not live here
- Public officials can do great things

John Luton, Victoria councillor

- Victoria is a partner in the region
- Officials obligated to keep an open mind and consider public input
- RGS speaks to concentrated development with accessible servicing and infrastructure
- This development will invite further development
- Future development should be concentrated in urban areas, protecting blue/green spaces
- As a regional partner, CRD Parks has a levy for land purchase
- Protect the RGS and build complete communities

Falk Herwig, Victoria

- Unanimous public opposition from broad section of individuals from all walks of life
- Stopping busy lives to speak out
- Development is not sustainable
- Development will have broader negative impact beyond the JdFEA

Ana Simeon, Victoria – Sierra Club

- Arranges youth/adults trips to the trail
- Concern regarding enforcement and monitoring
- Work towards a liveable region
- Consistency with the RGS should be examined

Tony Roberts, Saanich

- Retired planner
- Last time to speak out was to the Silver Spray application
- Both applications exploit adjoining public parks/trails
- Proposal is sprawl in the extreme

- Contradicts the RGS
- Since first CRD plan in 1959, sprawl has not been supported
- Dangerous precedence

Mike Divell, Victoria

- Opposed
- Wilderness draws visitors from all over
- Local economic driver is tourism, why consider compromising
- Community consultation is the key
- Look at alternative

Yotam Wolfe, Jerusalem

- Envious of accessible open space, forests, and beaches
- Would not travel half the world to stay in cabins
- Respects acknowledgement by residents of First Nation rights and meeting conduct – hopes it is not lip service

Ender Ilkay, Developer – Marine Trail Holdings

- Hears the passion for the trail and the environment
- Believes there is a misconception that turning down the application will save the lands
- Spoke to land's purchase application process, noting changes made to the proposal as a result of public consultation including the Advisory Planning Commissions, Pacheedhaht and community groups
- Noted that the lands were purchased with no zoning but a decision was made to wait for public consultation and input
- Current zoning allows for resource extraction and requesting zoning to permit a resort
- Proposal includes a 150m buffer from the trail and only 15% of the land being development
- Proposal is the more environmentally friendly option
- Open to further input/consultation

Eric Nordal, Victoria

- Lands were given away
- Concern for access by future generations
- Overwhelming opposition

At 10:05 p.m. the Chair adjourned the Public Hearing, advising that the resumption of the Public Hearing would commence at 5:00 p.m. on September 7, 2011 at Edward Milne Community School.

The Chair resumed the Public Hearing on September 7, 2011 at 5:05 p.m.

**PRESENT:** **Director M. Hicks**, Chair by Resolution of the Capital Regional District Board on Wednesday, June 29, 2011 as continued July 13, 2011  
**CRD Staff:** R. Lapham, Planning and Protective Services General Manager;  
J. Klassen, Local Area Planning Manager; W. Miller, Recording Secretary

**ATTENDANCE:** There were approximately 200 people in attendance.

The Chair introduced the members of Voting Block A of the CRD Board and John Horgan, MLA, Juan de Fuca. The guidelines and procedures of the Public Hearing and Notice of Public Hearing were read to those present and the Chair called for comments from those in attendance.

June Klassen advised that written submissions were received from the following individuals: Jeff Bateman, Sooke; Carolyn Bateman, Sooke; Joanne Manley, Victoria; Beverley Mitchell, Saanich/East Sooke; Mark Ziegler, Sooke; Bernadette Gicas, Metchosin; Andrew Moore, Sooke; BC

Landowners Association; Juan de Fuca Marine Trail information as submitted by Rosemary Jorna, Otter Point

Further to public comment the previous evening, June Klassen clarified that the Fire Protection Plan as referenced in Schedule A is included in Schedule D.

Dan Tkachuk, Otter Point

- Concerns regarding residences in the forest and impact on wildlife corridors/conservation
- Wildlife is well established in the area
- Visitors come with an expectation to see wildlife
- Concerns regarding fire protection, tax payer burden and Wildfire Management Branch servicing

Mei Ang, Saanich

- As an ecologist, compelled to come as proposal will have negative impact to the rainforest as development has had on tropical forests in Malaysia
- Please value nature heritage
- No economic sense
- Listen to the people

Kara White, East Sooke

- Opposed to bylaws
- Contradicts the RGS
- Proposal on unceded lands
- PDA developed and proceeding without public consultation
- Questioned who are the financial supporters of Marine Trail Holdings and who will be representing the project for the next 10 years
- APCs requested that the proposal return for continued review in 2009
- Proposal was not returned to the APCs – next meeting proceeded as a public information meeting in October 2010
- Proposal has proceeded despite public opposition
- Silver Spray negatively impacted the community of East Sooke
- East Sooke does not need any more controversy/division
- Proposal is generating xenophobia

Mike Ferrier, Duncan/Victoria

- Concerned regarding urban sprawl, wilderness experience
- Will not be the same with houses – visitors don't expect to find residences
- Precedence setting
- Regional issue
- Hopes proposal is turned down

Beverley Mitchell, Saanich/East Sooke

- Everything that needs to be said has been said by hundreds
- Current struggle has its roots in Silver Spray
- CRD legal counsel confirms there is no obligation to approve rezoning
- Issues of biases/conflict of interest associated with LUC A formation
- Please withdraw support
- Avoid needing to take matter to courts

Dorothea Haeussler, Victoria

- Refer issue to the whole Board
- Opposed to up-zoning
- Trail already too narrow, requires further land acquisition

Kate Phillips, Victoria

- Grew up in Otter Point
- No development yet has provided jobs to allow her to live in JdFEA/Sooke
- Concerned with emergency services
- Youth have not been brought into the consultation process
- How can services for a resort be considered when services cannot be supplied to existing residents

Yasmin Prince, Sooke

- Opposed
- How will the proposal ensure jobs go to locals
- Proposal provides a lesson in colonization – decisions being made by outsiders who have never lived on the land prior
- Support simple tourism such as campsites which allow for interaction with the environment
- Concern with strata structure and compliance with the RGS
- Speaker from Israeli reveals broad concern

Ellen Lewers, Sooke

- RGS designed for Victoria – RGS recommendations including those supporting walkability and transportation cannot be supported by the JdFEA communities
- Development is not supporting large homes
- Development is phased and will not proceed if unsuccessful
- Development provides sewer and water
- Wildlife food sources available beyond the development site

Deborah Wood, Sooke

- Against removal of TFL
- Against the development
- Concerned with limited consultation with the Pacheedaht and communities of Shirley, Jordan River and Otter Point
- Approval would be environmental and social negligence
- Concerned regarding wildlife impact
- Protected park is the tourism draw
- Development will only supply short time profit at the cost of public decision making
- Keep lands free of development

Werner Faust, Metchosin

- Reject application
- Park created in 1992 to be a nature legacy for children and grandchildren – it is a wildcoast recreation area
- Concerned regarding wildlife, impact to wildlife corridors and quality of life for future generations

Brian White, East Sooke

- Opposed to bylaws – inconsistent with the RGS and RRL OCP
- Approval will result in substantial negative financial and social impact
- Spoke to other similar failed and under-performing proposals
- Have seen past developers rectify issues by joining with Sooke
- Sets dangerous precedence
- Support small tourist nodes in Shirley/Jordan River and Port Renfrew
- Communities already have hundreds of vacant lots
- Proposal reflects poor economic strategy
- Current social activism in the CRD has not been seen since Clayoquot

**Katrina Farthing, James Bay**

- Area is luxury homes for animals
- Questioned if LUC A has walked the trail
- Consider the decision that is in the best interest of the lands
- If allowed, afraid more development will follow
- Hike the trail and think before making a decision

**James Coccole, Saanich – Wilderness Committee**

- Regional issue, refer to full Board
- Access to trail and wilderness has encouraged him to stay in Victoria
- Economic drive for other skilled workers to stay in Victoria is not the creation of low paying jobs, homes for visitors or tree cutting
- Against proposal

**Guy Lomax, Sooke**

- Working professional and choose live in Sooke for its access to unrivalled coast
- Visitors find the trail and Bear Beach spectacular
- Focus settlement in Sooke and Port Renfrew
- Wildcoast is what attracts new visitors and settlers

**Patricia Handy, Sooke**

- Job is in tourism and tourists want wilderness
- Proposal will spoil wilderness experience and drive visitors away
- Focus development in Port Renfrew
- Spoke to existing empty businesses and developments west of Sooke
- More benefit if proposal does not proceed

**Coral Grant, East Sooke**

- Opposed to bylaws
- Wilderness experience will be negatively impacted by vision of houses
- Don't want new owners to restrict visitors from accessing the lands

**James Hiebert, Victoria**

- Lands provide an outdoor opportunity for all levels
- Value the wilderness
- Wilderness is not a footpath through urban sprawl
- Spoke to burden to tax payers in Langford when development has failed
- Does not support vacation homes for the rich

**Faron Anslow, Victoria**

- As a surfer, felt it was important to speak
- Limited wilderness is bordered by threats of housing, mining and development
- Lands are enjoyed by wildlife and humans alike
- The desire of few should not outweigh the hundreds of trail users
- Concerned regarding traffic impact and emissions
- Resort residences will want servicing improvements
- Reject bylaws, pursue purchase and extension of the park

**Joanne Manley, Victoria**

- Used to live in Sooke – it is a beautiful community
- Concerned regarding emergency services and consistency with the RGS
- If approved, blame will follow
- Regional issue and current structure does not allow all directors to be responsible
- Return decision to the full Board to represent the majority
- Precedent setting decision

- If stopped, decision makers will be admired and acclaimed

Cedric Zala, Saanichton – Protect Our Parks, Alpine Club – Victoria

- Approval will harm the integrity of the park/wilderness experience
- Narrow strip park is vulnerable to exposure to development
- If approved, opportunity to add lands to the park will be lost
- Proposal is inconsistent with the RGS
- Development will increase the population by 1000 – this is not moderate or slow

Lynn Thomson, Victoria

- Against proposal
- TFL was transferred to private hands without public consultation
- Support wildlife habitat protection
- Stand for environment and future

Elizabeth Cronin, Victoria

- Originally from Salt Spring
- Land owners are not entitled to rezoning
- Does not support claim that proposal is the best option for the land
- Best option is purchase for protection
- Find a solution that works for the community
- Opposition is clear

Dale Read, East Sooke

- Opposed
- Proposal is in the wrong location, poorly thought out
- Concern for fire protection as development proposes cabins in the woods
- Majority is in opposition

Trina Donaldson, Victoria

- Grew up in Langford
- Do not want to see changes to the trail
- Tourism is a regional asset, enhance wildcoast
- Concentrate development in Port Renfrew and Jordan River as supported by the RGS
- Best option is not resort development
- The RGS and OCPs are created to guide development
- Development scale is inappropriate
- Opposed

Ender Ilkay, Developer – Marine Trail Holdings

- Hears the passion for the trail and the environment
- Development allows for 85% of the land to be protected and has increased the buffer from the trail
- Full build out will increase visitors to the trail by 15%
- Commitment of funds for purchase has not been announced/communicated
- Current zoning permits resource extraction

Paul Winstanley, Victoria

- The lands are a special asset
- Concerned regarding development location
- If approved, sets bad precedence
- Feel connected to the lands – development cannot happen
- Allow lands to return to old growth

**Richard Thut, Sooke**

- Was a faller and was disgusted by sales by WFP and left the industry
- Contacted CRD Regional Parks planning staff to recommend that Jordan River should be utilized for tourism, leaving the remaining lands as is
- Spoke to the CRD's Green Blue Belt protection measures – development should focus in the area from Humpback to Sooke River
- We are an invasive species and a design plan is needed

**Zoe Blunt, Forest Action Network**

- Opposed
- Benefit analysis not done
- Concerned vacation strata will turn into a full time residences
- Part time tourist residences is not an economic driver
- Pacheedaht membership not fully consulted
- Petition to remove Pacheedaht band council
- Local and regional opposition
- Application would not have gotten this far if the democratic process was being followed
- Legal action will follow if proposal is approved
- 1675 petition signatures submitted opposing proposal

**Jan Firstbrook, Victoria**

- Opposed
- More options beyond resort or resource extraction
- Raise funds for park expansion

**Rosemary Jorna reading submission from Beverley Catarell, Victoria/Oak Bay**

- Oak Bay is adjacent to the JdFEA - it is adjacent to the Chatham and Discovery Islands
- Explore and promote options
- Trail is a jewel
- Proposal is not a legitimate land use change
- Questions the degree of public consultation
- Refer to full Board

The Chair called for a break from 7:25 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.

**Al Jones, Sooke**

- Created and designed the trail in 1992
- BC Land Owners neutral on proposal
- Rural economic development is needed
- Energy needs to be directed to rebuild the trail – repairs are needed
- Buy lands from Ender or trade for lands at Jordan River

**Kevin Henry, Langford – Coast Salish/Bear Clan**

- Speaking for flora and fauna that are unable to speak against urban sprawl
- Allow lands to remain forests for another 1000 years
- Cited other sacred places damaged by development – Bear Mountain
- Development bringing destruction and greed
- Development is forcing animals into residential areas
- The answer to the decision is no
- Urban sprawl is appalling
- Way of life is connected to the Earth
- Say no to bill of sale

**Alanda Carver, Muir Creek Protection Society**

- Lands at Muir Creek were swapped to create trail
- Understands the value of nature
- Speakers are residents and tax payers
- Speakers reflect the democratic process
- Proposal will not enhance the wilderness experience
- Opposed

**Mike Ferrier, Surfrider Vancouver Island**

- Here to show support in opposition as interest is to keep access to wild beauty
- Trail follows remote wilderness which attracts visitors
- Trail should remain a living legacy, accessible to all
- Proposal will lead to future sprawl
- Give people what they want, turn the proposal down

**Liam Hildebrand, Victoria**

- Wilderness experience will be impacted by proposal
- Direct the funds that will be required for infrastructure towards trail and park
- Wilderness access is why he remains on the island
- Proposal will negatively impact local business
- Trees grow back – development is forever
- Want to be able to share with children in future
- Allow the living legacy to remain

**Slaine Sutherland, Metchosin**

- We don't appreciate how lucky we are
- Student visitors to the trail have been positively impacted by the experience
- These student visitors keep returning
- Trail attracts visitors from world wide because it is wilderness – secluded and quiet
- Proposal will have noise impact
- Focus development in Port Renfrew and Jordan River where there is existing infrastructure

**Mark Ziegler, Sooke**

- Opposed due to scope and location
- No cost benefit analysis
- Noted LUC A members' past support to save lands for park and green space
- Focus development in Port Renfrew and Jordan River
- Proposal is too large and will impact narrow park strip
- Proposal is not viable
- Not enough information to make an informed decision
- Tourism will grow but visitors will want a wilderness experience

**Dorothy Cline, Sooke**

- Speaking from the heart – this is wrong
- More consideration should be given before a decision is made
- Trail is our backyard
- Where are the speakers who support the proposal

**Beverly Colin, Otter Point**

- Broad public concern
- Opposed
- Proposal appears to contradict the RGS and RRL OCP
- CRD cannot legally enact if inconsistent with the RGS
- There are opportunities to protect and buy back – there is reactivated interest from all levels of government and interest groups

- Consider a more modest proposal
- Proposal will undermine wilderness integrity
- Ender – consider donating the lands back and adding as park

**Fred Roots, East Sooke**

- Urge CRD Board to view from a larger context – long term interests and impact
- Local and regional issue
- Lands are a vital part of the coast identity and economy
- Societal issue – recreational use and trail network is BC's image
- Trail network is the economic driver, attracting local to global visitors
- Will those visitors come if proposal proceeds

**Renée Mikaloff**

- Respects regional planning
- Climate change is an obstacle for planners and politicians
- Social responsibility to protect public and environment
- Protect these lands
- Proposal will require infrastructure, loss of habitat, and influx of predators into cabin areas
- Lands are a west coast treasure
- Build upon the RGS, deny and return to the drawing board

**Jacquetta Nisbet, East Sooke**

- Moved to Canada two years ago and came because it is a less polarized and courteous society
- Act locally, think globally
- California Coastal Commission recognized need to protect coastline
- Protect your coast before coastal rush – population is growing and resources are dwindling
- Form a body to rebuild and protect the trail, joining with the Pacheedaht

**Gloria Snively, East Sooke**

- Strongly opposed
- Concern regarding public process, fair representation and democratic procedure
- Application did not return to the East Sooke APC after 2009 although further review was requested by the APC
- Ill-reported press comments
- JdFEA residents do not support the application
- East Sooke voice has been silenced due to APC changes – not granted a fair vote
- All area residents united in opposition

**John Corsiglia, East Sooke**

- Proposal is flawed
- Fire protection measures cannot be compared to Horn Lake
- Proposal does not have access to water as Horn Lake does
- Questioned the measure of 1 ½ tree lengths being used in a formal proposal

**Claudia Kobayashi, Metchosin**

- Opposed to development
- Nature nurtures and is needed by all
- Society disfunction can be contributed to a disconnect from nature

**Jim Dexter, Sooke**

- 38 year resident
- Compatibility with the RGS needs to be determined
- Terrain will make fire fighting challenging
- Concern regarding traffic increase on Highway 14

- Resort users will have to travel highway for services

Laurie Vandekerkhove, Sooke

- 40 year residence
- Sooke is hardworking, volunteer-based community that has turned into a bedroom community left at disposal of others
- Supports the proposal
- Trail will not be impacted – trail is already damaged
- Visitors will support the local economy
- Local residents afraid to speak but they are speaking to each other, supporting the application

Anne Miller, Otter Point

- Want tourists to visit local, small businesses
- These businesses are the spine of the community
- Cannot take away from nature without first considering the resulting manmade decay
- Cannot be only two options, look to the future and beyond
- Recreational users will draw more people back

Sue Innes, Shirley

- 18 year resident
- Community OCP states support for rural living with population growth in settlement containment areas
- We did not foresee TFL removal
- Opposed to proposal
- In favour of tourism but not at this location but in Port Renfrew and Sooke and at a smaller scale
- More economic value to leave as is – hikers require services
- Questioned proposal's use of rain water collection – rain water collection requires a high level of maintenance

Maureen Johnston, Langford

- Hiker and has seen children's joy of wilderness
- Opposed to the proposal – will change wilderness experience forever
- Full Board decision – proposal is a regional issue
- Proposal contradicts the RGS and RRL OCP
- Defer any decision to allow the provincial government to step up and gift the lands for park

Ron Rayner, Langford

- Opposed to bylaws
- Values irreplaceable habitat and environment
- Trail is used year-long by recreational users and wildlife

Hannah Watler, Victoria

- Grew up in Mississauga, Ontario where cornfields have been developed into subdivisions
- Spoke to a development in Maple Bay where the developer did not follow through with commitments
- Retain lands as is – a long term legacy
- Listen to the public

Victor Van Buskirk, Saanich

- In past did not speak out
- Belief in sacredness, love of wild
- Best trail close, accessible to a city
- Turn application down

**Moonfist/Myke Colbert, Sooke**

- Decision is the will of the people
- Make proper investigation first, don't rush
- Environment respect and protection dear to all
- Process proper and in favour of proposal

**Neal Wasser, Victoria**

- Wilderness experience influenced him to remain on the island
- There is a need for economic growth but construction is short term
- There is a need for a community economic plan
- Trail is close enough to allow and support day visits from the urban core
- Spoke to an exchange student's experience on the trail
- Lands need protection, resorts can be found anywhere
- Small subdivision applications require neighbor support as should large proposals
- Explore options
- Full Board issue – southern Vancouver Island issue

**Jacklyn Fairhead, Victoria**

- 6 year resident originally from Seattle
- Area is beautiful because of wilderness
- Opposed to the bylaws and rezoning
- Refer issue back to the Board
- Resort visitors will not love the trail as we do, leaving trash and pet waste which leads to habituation of bears and deer
- Focus development in Jordan River and Port Renfrew
- Proposal will turn visitors away

**Georgia Jones, Planet Earth**

- Spoke about Steven Lewis, Massey Lectures and *A Short History of Progress* which notes that the worst thing is tree cutting
- There is a world depletion of wildlife
- Only a small percentage of the forest remains

At 9:50 p.m. the Chair adjourned the Public Hearing, advising that the resumption of the Public Hearing would commence at 5:00 p.m. on September 8, 2011 at Edward Milne Community School.

Mayor Saunders, City of Colwood, and Mayor Evans, District of Sooke, relayed that they would not be able to attend on September 8. The Chair advised that all public submissions will be presented to Board Voting Block A.

The Chair resumed the Public Hearing on September 8, 2011 at 5:02 p.m.

**PRESENT:** **Director M. Hicks**, Chair by Resolution of the Capital Regional District Board on Wednesday, June 29, 2011 as continued July 13, 2011  
**CRD Staff:** J. Klassen, Local Area Planning Manager; W. Miller, Recording Secretary

**ATTENDANCE:** There were approximately 50 people in attendance.

The Chair introduced the Voting Block A member, Bob Gramigna, District of Metchosin, Alternate and John Horgan, MLA, Juan de Fuca. The guidelines and procedures of the Public Hearing and Notice of Public Hearing were read to those present and the Chair called for comments from those in attendance.

June Klassen advised that written submissions were received from the following individuals: Beverly Collin, Sooke; Brian Roth, Sooke; Zoe Blunt, Forest Action Network with 1675 petition signatures; Cynthia Callahan-Maureen, Victoria; Rory Lambert; Aaron Hill, Victoria; Lynn Thomson, Victoria; Kathleen Sutherland, Victoria; Fred Roots, Sooke; Beverley Mitchell, Victoria/East Sooke; David Cohen, Saanich; John Hasell, Oak Bay; Cederic Zala, Saanichton – Protect Our Parks, Alpine Club – Victoria; Laura Graves and Gord Veldman; Axel Joosting, East Sooke; Jeff Danielson, Sooke; Ellen Lewers, Sooke; Deborah Wood, Sooke; Kate Phillips, Victoria; Dr. Brian White, East Sooke; Gillian Young; Heather Phillips, Otter Point

Brian Cameron, Saanich

- He and Saanich elected representatives should have as much say
- Issue is regional
- Frustrated since release of TFL without public consultation
- If put to referendum, release would have been turned down
- Against sprawl – it is against modern planning concepts
- If approved, decision is misguided and more will follow
- There is a clear cut behind his house and can hear and see activities on those lands up to 450m from his house
- Proposal will have a noise impact and negatively affect the wilderness experience
- If approved, credibility will be affected
- Approval will be a travesty of democracy

Harold Shipton, Shirley

- Too many unanswered questions
- Who is Marine Trail Holdings Ltd. 1, 2 and 3 and what is their intent
- Is their intent to operate or sell
- How will the corporate structure operate – collection of taxes and fees, maintenance of the lands and amenities
- Claim of no impact to the trail is sales propaganda
- How will access at non-access points be stopped
- BC Parks only supports minimal access at identified points
- How can it be assured that the proposed jobs will provide local benefit
- Cost analysis not performed
- Concerned with servicing including bylaw enforcement, fire protection, fire protection training
- What is the course of action if the proposal proceeds but is unsuccessful
- Potential for resource extraction is not the reason to approve the proposal
- Say no to the proposal

Kevin Neish, Port Renfrew

- Has viewed the Public Hearing submission binder – approximately 400 submissions with only 5 in favour of the application

Kludane Buser-Rivet, Saanich

- Read from submissions forwarded by two teenage friends opposing the proposal as it will steal opportunities from the next generation
- Proposal disrespects aboriginal rights
- Where are the speakers in support of the application if the proposal will bring strong economic growth
- Opposed to the proposal
- Refer to full Board

John Hasell, Oak Bay

- PDA requires improvement before proposal should proceed
- PDA reflects the unedited work of multiple authors – noted discrepancies in page numbering, missing information, missing titles, duplication of schedule numbering

Vicky Husband, Highlands/Otter Point

- Questioned why public meetings have only been held in Sooke when proposal affects many
- All voices are not being heard
- There are more than two options for the land
- Funding campaign could be successful
- Proposal is based on questionable economics
- Issue began with removal of the TFL without public consultation
- Read from a letter to the editor – the public is furious

Sven Biggs, Vancouver

- PDAs are a new phenomenon – municipalities give up rights in exchange for limited amenities
- This PDA provides parking, emergency access and parkland and a trail access – exchange is not good value
- This is not a good deal

Trina Donaldson, Victoria/Wilderness Committee

- Submitting 32 letters opposing the proposal
- Read from a letter from Samuel Godfrey, Saanich, supporting protection of the lands for their social and tourism value
- Read from a letter from Lisa Barrett, past Bowen Island Mayor, noting that developments never pay for themselves – they are done at the cost of environmental loss and are subsidized by the taxpayer

James Coccole, Saanich

- RGS and RRL OCP took time and money
- Original sin was the removal from the TFL
- What happens the next time a proposal comes forward - again giving up for development
- Retain lands as is

Rosemary Jorna, Otter Point

- PDA does not allow for restructuring for next ten years even if bylaws are repealed
- Questioned if the PDA for the Wildwood development is succeeding
- Lands were purchased with zoning understood
- When purchased, no intent to rezone was communicated
- 2009 proposal was not supported locally
- In 2009 developer indicated no interest in high end cabins but small cabins, no strata and no nightly rentals
- In 2009 Port Renfrew APC relayed need for economic stimulus but still stated concerns with the proposal
- There is no obligation to approve
- Seek a better proposal

Zoe Blunt, Forest Action Network

- Lands have little timber value
- Extractions would require Development Permits as lands have identified riparian and steep slope areas
- Mining rights are not held by the developer
- Claim of only two options is offensive
- Concerned regarding PDA and upholding the RGS
- PDA does not provide protection to the CRD

Heather Phillips, Otter Point

- When she took a seat on the Juan de Fuca Land Use Committee, she took a duty to listen and request that the public's wishes be expressed in the proposed bylaws

- People have had to chase information in a continually changing proposal
- PDA can be changed by staff without Board or public consultation
- PDA does not address reservoir/water maintenance and supply
- No reason has been given to support rezoning
- Add to the park, allowing community time to purchase the lands
- There are other alternatives beyond rezoning or resource extraction
- Existing legal bills are already a burden on the JdFEA
- Required infrastructure will also be a burden on the JdFEA

Rosemary Jorna reading submission from Sheila Wallace, Otter Point

- Claim of benefit to Sooke and community not believed
- Proposal will financially benefit a few
- Responsibility to preserve for the benefit of the broader community
- Jobs will be limited
- Port Renfrew has been successful with made-in-community solutions
- Seek creative and sustainable solutions

Shelly Breadner, Sidney

- We are here because we have been disrespected by BC politicians
- Lands should be retained for biodiversity as provided by the wilderness
- These lands have no voice
- Officials have been entrusted to listen to the voices
- Lands should be secured for generations to come

Aaron Hill, Victoria

- Regular trail user
- Big subdivisions are urban sprawl
- Proposal contradicts the RGS
- Consider proposal's impact to adjacent lands
- Not against development, supports developments planned with the public interest in mind
- Need to respect First Nation rights
- Focus development in Port Renfrew and Jordan River, leaving lands allow the area to become the next Tofino
- Work with Province to purchase
- Want to be able to hike unspoiled forest line, visiting Jordan River or Port Renfrew for services and amenities

Ellen Lewers, Sooke

- Development proposes that more than half the lands be left as park or protected areas
- Development proposes emergency and fire servicing
- Development has increased buffer between development boundary and the trail
- Proposed building materials will fit in with natural setting
- There should have been more APC consultation – strive for better governance
- Support the proposal but PDA must ensure protection and control – if not, bring back for review

Kara White, East Sooke

- Opposed
- East Sooke has been weakened as a community by the Silver Spray development
- Proposal polarizing communities – local/regional, extraction/rezoning, insiders/outsideers, urban/rural
- These polarities are being used to manipulate

Kate Phillips, Victoria

- Lands are not old growth but remarkable second growth – it is what we have left

- Funds for purchase can be raised
- Work together to add to the park
- Proposed jobs will be service jobs requiring workers to commute – where is the gas station
- Service jobs may not attract workers simply due to distance

**Don Brown, Sooke**

- Other similar projects in the Province should be reviewed to examine their outcomes
- Other projects have had to bring in workers, resulting in little long term economic benefit
- Black window developments – no one there
- There is an opportunity to create a regional parkway, beginning a network of trails – an incredible attraction
- Proposal is just the beginning – there will be more foreign land speculators
- Build on the RGS, allowing for implementation
- Support for a community cooperative for purchase and future acquisition

**Barry Mosher, North Saanich**

- Opposed to the proposal
- Park expansion is an option
- Proposal is a strip development in a remote location that will demand servicing
- Proposal contradicts the RGS
- Focus development in Port Renfrew and Jordan River
- Ignoring the RGS and RRL OCP is a slap in the face to the public
- Urban sprawl does not support economic development
- Refer to full Board for full municipal input
- Wilderness experience will be diminished

**Sid Jorna, Otter Point**

- Does not support the PDA – unenforceable and filled with loop holes
- 300,000 visitors come for wilderness
- Consider gateway enterprises in Port Renfrew and Jordan River to increase economic impact

**Patricia Handy, Sooke**

- Few support the proposal
- Proposal has nothing to do with tourism, rather real estate for resale
- Proposal goes against the RGS
- Wilderness being taken for granted
- Say no

**Rosemary Jorna, Otter Point**

- Find another site
- Do not pass the bylaws

**Diana Studer, Victoria**

- Unfair to say the issue is a local issue only
- Opportunities to purchase the property as seen in Penticton
- Developers here to make money
- Developers are not here for the long run
- Caution community about turning to outsiders who claim they can solve problems
- Questioned if claims of environmental design/protection have 3<sup>rd</sup> party accreditation
- Do you want this type of resident in your community
- Local property taxes can be expected to increase as seen in other resort communities
- Local B&B and rental homes will lose customers
- Proposal sets precedence for neighbourhood destruction

Pascale Gourdeau, Danie Martin, Cholé Houle-Johnson - Pearson College

- Proposal will only profit a few
- International interest in nature experience
- Proposal will be an environmental disaster
- Can find vacation centres anywhere, visitors come to marvel at the natural beauty
- Stop the proposal

Brian Roth, Sooke

- We are here because the Province made the wrong decision
- Approval of the proposal will be a greater wrong
- Wilderness area needs a buffer without human habitation
- Extraction is a better option – forests will grow back

Barry Mosher, North Saanich

- Has spoken to a Voting Block A member
- Has spoken with Murray Coell – North Saanich
- Reject – more options will become available

Vicky Husband, Highlands/Otter Point

- Options will open up
- Will work for vision for the future
- Funds can be raised with CRD as seen in past
- Need a coastal commission
- Allow for opportunity to work together
- The public is clear

Terry Chaptlas, Mechosin

- Opposed
- Proposal is profit based, out of place and result in short term benefit and absentee ownership
- Will lead to further land speculation
- Lands are the start of a rare jewel - opportunity to add to established park
- Has heard the servicing concerns
- Proposal has fanned the flames of protest – developer only has to sit and watch property value increase
- Developers are only interested in profit

Karl Johnson, Victoria/Sooke

- Lives in Victoria with family in Sooke
- Family opposes the proposal
- Lands should be park
- Full Board decision – coastal impact
- Return for review by full CRD planning – climate change, sea level changes, food security
- Long term plan factoring in First Nation resource areas, agricultural lands, ground water, eco-forestry, wildlife/vegetation corridors and trailways is needed
- Consider impact on future generations

David Caterway, Victoria

- Turn down, delay to allow time to purchase

Laurie Rumsby, Sooke

- Heading for extinction at this rate
- Rainforest is needed
- Proposal is ridiculous/criminal
- Explore options to purchase and harvest for trees for long term profit

Jennifer King, Sooke

- Area youth are looking at ways to create own revenue sources
- Contract work will most likely go to outside workers
- Will result in loss to local businesses
- No one has the right to make money however possible
- Will lose green corridor
- Developments/residences already vacant in Jordan River and Port Renfrew

Brian White, East Sooke

- Planning process has not happened yet
- Opportunity to start serious planning with full Board
- Opportunity to mobilize public/politicians
- Enormous community commitment expressed
- Show leadership

Shane McCaskey, Langford

- Father from Detroit – Big Bear Bush wilderness is lost
- Winsor Ontario – no wilderness left
- The lands are our little piece of wilderness
- Change location – Port Renfrew or Jordan River

John Hasell, Oak Bay

- Ender Ilkay has won awards as a developer for the profits he has made for his investors
- Claims that buffer will be 1 ½ tree lengths or 30m from the trail but trail is in constant change
- Sea levels are changing and development will dictate future location of the trail

Don Scott, Saanich

- Spoke to 200 unit condo development in Manitoba
- Development should be considered under a proper plan with capacity of sustainability and preservation of natural state a priority
- Lands are all within an hour drive
- We are here because lands were removed from the TFL – to allow another way for forest companies to generate revenue
- Worked with the Round Table for the Environment – proposal is contrary to the work of the CRD for the last 20 years
- Climate change – carbon needs to be counted as closely as money
- Proposal is vehicle dependent

Vicky Husband, Highlands/Otter Point

- Development was bought for 3 million, developer now wants 6 million

Anita Wood, Sooke

- Climate change is relevant to the Juan de Fuca Trail
- Hopes Public Hearing will bring tangible results
- Proposal is far from other communicates, far from the required paradigm shift
- Proposal is short term and profit oriented
- Options for the communities will be lost
- Local resilience is positive action – it is Transition Initiative
- Vacationers have a place but at B&Bs and small eco-industries

At this time, the Chair welcomed Mayor Mendum, District of the Highlands

Judith Rayburn, Victoria

- Opposed to the proposal – infrastructure required, precedence setting, not in the public's interest

Zoe Blunt, Forest Action Network

- Understands bylaws will not be on the September 14 Board agenda
- Understands a motion will be put forward challenging the proposal's consistency with the RGS
- No more comments can be made after the close of the public hearing but this is not the end to the public speaking out

Terry Chapelas, Metchosin

- Be careful for what you wish for – citing Lake Louise as an example

Harvey Williams, no residency stated

- Concerned that the property will be flipped once rezoned

The Chair called three times for further discussion on the bylaw and hearing none closed the Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 3755 and Bylaw No. 3783 at 7:55 p.m.

On behalf of Voting Block A, the Chair thanked all speakers for their valuable input.



CHAIR, Director M. Hicks



RECORDING SECRETARY, W. Miller