

**REPORT TO THE CRD BOARD
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2007**

SUBJECT

Report of the Public Hearing for Bylaw No. 3443 'Capital Regional District Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 1, 2007'

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to report on the public hearing on the RGS amendment bylaw. The purpose of the bylaw is to amend Map #3 of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) by extending the urban containment boundary within the District of Highlands. The extension would enable the CRD to provide water and sewer servicing to the Highlands Servicing Area as described in the Regional Context Statement. Provision of services will affect the nature and extent of development permitted within the servicing area.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of March 8, 2006, the Regional Board accepted the regional context statement for the District of Highlands which included a servicing boundary that was inconsistent with the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area (RUCSPA). The request to alter the RUCSPA within the District of Highlands was approved by the Board and staff were directed to "include an amendment to the RUCSPA to coincide with the proposed Highlands Servicing Boundary in the Regional Growth Strategy bylaw interim update."

In response to the Board direction, a draft RGS amendment bylaw was prepared and a consultation process initiated. The consultation process was initiated in February and carried through to May 2007. In response to comments received through that process, the RGS amendment was revised and brought before the Board on two occasions. At its meeting of June 13, 2007, the Board resolved "that the amendment items be broken out into individual changes and come back at the next Board meeting". At its meeting of July 7, 2007 the Board resolved to limit the RGS amendment to the urban containment boundary extension within the District of Highlands, and gave first and second reading to the amendment and referred the bylaw to a public hearing. The Board also directed that the public hearing be delegated to the Director Clement, Chair of the Planning & Protective Services Committee.

The public hearing was conducted on Thursday September 13, 2007.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The costs associated with the development and referrals of the RGS amendment were included in the 2007 RGS budget.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The District of Highland's Regional Context Statement was accepted by the Regional Board and

provides direction to change the urban containment boundary to allow for the extension of piped services to facilitate this development. The change to the RUCSPA within Highlands is required to allow for the extension of CRD water and sewer services to facilitate the development of residential and commercial uses beyond that permitted on private services. The District of Highlands made the extension of the Regional Growth Strategy's containment boundary a condition of its development policy and regulations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Following the public hearing, the RGS amendment bylaw is formally transmitted to all the member municipalities for their consideration during the 120-day review period. During this time, member municipalities must consider the amendment and state, through a resolution of Council, whether they will accept or refuse the bylaw amendment. If there is unanimous acceptance, the bylaw comes back to the Board for third and final reading. If there are one or more municipalities refusing to accept the bylaw, the provisions of the provincial dispute resolution process apply.

A representative from the Ministry of Community Services will be addressing the Board at this meeting to explain what the dispute resolution process entails.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of the RGS amendment is to respond to the request from the District of Highlands to extend the RUCSPA to enable the CRD to provide water and sewer servicing to the Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development Area to facilitate the development described in their approved regional context statement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Report of the RGS Public Hearing be received.

Tracy K. Corbett, MCIP
Senior Manager
Regional Planning

Robert Lapham
General Manager
Planning and Protective Services

Kelly Daniels
Chief Administrative Officer
Concurrence

COMMENTS:

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT REPORT OF PUBLIC HEARING

Bylaw No. 3443 Capital Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No.1, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No.1, 2007

Report of the Public Hearing regarding the amendment to the CRD Regional Growth Strategy, Bylaw No. 3443, held Thursday September 13, 2007, at the Ambrosia Catering & Event Centre, 638 Fisgard Street at 6:30 pm.

CHAIR: Director Chris Clement

CRD STAFF: Tracy Corbett, Regional Planning

Opening Statement by the Chair:

The Chair explained that the purpose of this hearing is to provide an opportunity for people to make presentation and/or written submission on the proposed RGS bylaw amendment. He also noted that it is not a meeting to debate the issues or to state a position on why the bylaw has been written.

Public Hearing Notice:

Staff read out the following:

The purpose of this bylaw is to amend the Regional Growth Strategy, Bylaw No. 2952 to allow for the extension of the Regional Urban Containment Servicing and Policy Area (RUCSPA) boundary within the District of Highlands. This requires an amendment to the RGS Map #3.

The intent of the extension is to enable the CRD to provide water and sewer servicing to Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development Area to facilitate the development described in the District of Highland's Regional Context Statement. The boundary would incorporate an area of 267 hectares to accommodate a comprehensive development.

The Public Hearing is conducted according to the provisions of Section 855 of the Local Government Act which provides an opportunity for individuals and organizations to make their views known regarding the Regional Growth Strategy.

The Chair then called for presentations.

As outlined in the following table.

Written submissions are contained within a separate report which will be transmitted to the member municipalities and posted on the CRD website.

Order	Speaker	Address	Comments
1	Les Bjola Development Manager	Bear Mountain Master Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Province & CRD both support the ability of municipalities to self govern – but self government does not exist here -CRD Board has already approved the regional context statement which agrees to amend the RGS -Odds of achieving 100% vote is not possible -Taken decision away from the people and the Province will now take it away from you - 12 municipalities already have piped water: Highlands is the only municipality who does not have piped water and is reliant on ground water aquifers -Contamination already exists in areas along Millstream – which may affect the aquifer -Now it has the opportunity to have potable water to this area of the island
2	Greg Holloway Royal Oak Community Association	4745 Rosehill Rd Victoria BC V82 5N2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attends on behalf of the Royal Oak Community Association and Rockland Community Association -The RGS is a CRD wide bylaw to protect all of us - here is a proposal opposite of the RGS initiatives -This is the worst kind of growth -This sets bad precedence -If RGS process collapses once money comes into play, where does it stand if it doesn't stand here? -Profit doesn't come for free -The children will bear the price for present day profit taking -It is past the time to insist on Smart Growth -Please find strength to resolve to just say NO
3	Bob Flitton Bear Mountain Partnership	680 Stewart Mountain Road Victoria BC V9B 6J8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Much misinformation circulates about the proposal -It's not about use of the land, but how land already zoned is used -80% of regional district is protected from urban land use -The land here is already zoned -It will help to diversify Highland's tax base -Bylaw supports the RGS 8 initiatives...and the Board and Highlands already approved the regional context statement -Council is finalizing OCP (goes for approval next week) -I have over 500 letters of support of this proposal (included in submission package)
4	Kenn Faris	1201 Millstream Road Victoria V9B 6J3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Would like to express my objection to the extension -Can attest to the effort gone in to producing the RGS -We have an obligation to defend it

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why would the Highlands Council and CRD consider this? - Provide true regional leadership and reject the proposed amendment - Need to deny ad-hoc requests <p>He presented a petition on behalf of Greater Victoria Greenbelt Society (included in submission package)</p>
5	Ben Isitt	1147 Caledonia Avenue Victoria BC V8T 1E9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of green space and habitat - Increased traffic - Ben reads excerpts from 2 letters (1 from Bob Fliton) - Letters show the kind of back-room dealing behind the development - Encourages the CRD to oppose the RGS amendment
6	Ray Zimmerman	1252 Montrose Avenue Victoria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Talked about consequences of these decisions - The pattern we lay has costs to earth and dependents - This amendment is wasteful – urban sprawl at its worst - The proposed area is not small – it is equivalent to the area from the Legislature to Cedar Hill to Fairfield and Cook back to the Legislature - Mostly forested area in Highlands - Will increase the inefficient use of energy and auto use - Hopes the politicians consider this commercial venture and it's consequences on the web of life and our descendents
7	Chris Junck Species at Risk Outreach Specialist Garry Oak Ecosystem Recovery Team	301-1205 Broad Street Victoria BC V8W 2A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the Garry Oak Ecosystems Recovery Team - Talked about related ecosystems - Garry Oak ecosystems are rapidly vanishing due to development - Some of the most endangered ecosystems in Canada are in this area: within the CRD less than 1% of Garry Oak and associated ecosystems remain in a near natural state - Critical to conserve as many remnants of this ecosystem - This could encourage further destruction of this ecosystem - More information is in the hall
8	Bruce Hardy	236 Gorge Rd East Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appreciates this public hearing - the CRD is appropriate to hold this event - Bear Mtn. is in a class of its own in scope...it's never the same to the end - Urban containment boundary extension is expressed as a way to get water and sewage to the area, but likely there are more plans for expansion - Growth strategy should be focusing on - If passed, there will be more pressures to expand the urban containment boundary is other parts of the

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<p>CRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Perhaps it is or is not necessary to expand -please don't pass this amendment
9	Michael Bocking	405 Hazlitt Creek Road Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Was chair of the Highlands OCP team -Supports the extension of water and sewage to Highlands -1/3 of the municipality is park -Parks were created in 14 years and no development -It is not fair to take land as park and deny servicing -Land use is not urban or sprawl -Overall density is 1 house per every 3 acres...does this sound like urban sprawl? -80% of area is greenspace -Piped water will protect and conserve ground water -There will be more opportunities to walk, cycle, transit -It is in accordance with sustainable smart growth -Approve this proposal
10	Frank Mitchell	530 Witty Beach Road Victoria (Metchosin) V9C 4H8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Would like to reject the amendment for 4 reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highland extension is about favouring a few land owners over others. The servicing will increase their development density 2. there is very limited regional or economic benefit 3. Sound democratic process – the RGS took 7 years of cooperation among municipalities...a lot of time and energy to reach this consensus – it would be an insult to everyone involved to discard the RGS 4. there is sufficient land within the urban containment boundary to accommodate growth. <p>RGS amendment plays favourites, unnecessary environmental costs, undermine respect to democratic processes</p>
11	Alex Marr North Saanich Residents Association	NSRA PO Box 2273 Sidney BC V8L 3S8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Represents the North Saanich Residents Association -Congratulates those voting against this amendment -This is uncontrolled urban sprawl -respect the remaining rural and green spaces -Long-term vision in mind – this will erode the effectiveness of long-term planning -If we allow approval, it will not engender a sense of value of that document (RGS) -Anytime a development comes up, we must have a long-term land use plan for the long term so council will not stray from it's values -Keep the principle of urban containment in the CRD, keep urban settlement compact and do not increase services to unserved areas

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

12	Rob Jirucha	663 Caleb Pike Rd Victoria BC V9B 6G8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resident of Highlands - Works with young people - On his website, children responded to the issue. Within 1.5 days there were 60 postings - Some of the children's' comments followed, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "please save every bit" "Stop sprawl" "need to keep green space for children" "Just say no" "Deserves to remain as such" "If nature is dead, so are we" "what are you doing?" - We need to listen to the young generation – hear those words
13	Sandy McPherson (previous Highlands council member)	#3 2330 Harbour Rd Sidney V8L 2P8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will this amendment provide affordable housing? Promote water conservation? Reduce GHG emissions? Increase social and environmental health? Its it consistent with the 8 RGS goals? - Completely devoted to profits - Commoners cannot partake in this development – it is not for the common good - Rejection of the amendment shows respect to the RGS - say no to expansion and NO to the RGS amendment -
14	Sharon Lawrence	8381 West Saanich Rd Saanichton BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the land was Crown, then private - government can't take care of special interests - wants to preserve RGS: tired of process changing - it is time-consuming to be involved. - Say no to amendment
15	Alice Finale	9723 Ardmore Dr. North Saanich BC V8L 5H5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Saanich resident - Was on the council from 1993-1999 - Purpose of the RGS is to contain urban development, protect green space and protect resources - The RGS was not a hastily compiled plan – adoption process was discussed, changes were made and up to final adoption took 6 years...so why are we here? - Bear Mtn. is in violation of the RGS - This is what the RGS was meant to stop - The development does not address local housing needs – it provides high-end housing to off-shore buyers - Infrastructure is costly - Loss of area and green space is the greatest cost - No jurisdiction to accept this amendment - Vote against this change

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

16	Karel Roessingh Previous mayor of Highlands	2369 Munn Rd Victoria BC V9E 1H4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Bear mountain came with a spirit of cooperation initially – but the social and environmental leg of the proposal dropped off -The proposal has promised \$2 million in taxes and tax diversification for the municipality -those projections are wildly overrated -Commercial diversification is half of that -Broken promises -If the region is worried about the financial future of the Highlands, I assure you it is sound. There have been no tax increases in the municipality over the last 10 years -We can survive without the amendment - the question should be “can the Highlands survive with this amendment?” -Appeals to reject the amendment
17	Ingmar Lee	3706-2371 Lam Circle Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A long-term resident of Victoria -Forests are being clear cut and levelled to make way for subdivisions. -Blast rock from Bear Mountain is used to fill up valleys on the site -Entire valley has been clear cut -This causes water run-off and erodes the valley -An example of how Bear Mountain views and treats water -It has already built out Phase 1, the rest would require an interchange -Bear Mtn. is worst example of development -Allowing this sets a precedence -Once forests are logged, developers come in to subdivide -Please refuse this development
18	Henora Johannesen	1741 Millstream Road Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Highlands resident -Loves rural Highlands – they own a well, are conservative -There is a small tax base and urges to adopt this development -Means that they will be able to contain development in the area – it has already been zoned -It is a chance to have controlled development -Support the amendment: urges CRD to adopt the amendment
19	Frances Pugh Saanich Inlet Protection	6963 West Saanich Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Member of the Saanich Inlet Protection Society -One threat of continuity is urban containment -Attended all sessions on the RGS development -Sprawl costs the district: infrastructure, ecological - decimates the flora and fauna -Sprawl leads to more sprawl - Much time and effort went into the RGS -Hopes you turn down this amendment

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

20	Krista Roessingh	3706-2371 Lam Circle Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ecologist -Born and raised in Victoria: Has strong attachment to this place -Feels like these developments profit from the natural environment -If we look in a global context and bring it down to the local -We are privileged (in this country) to be able to plan for development -The RGS does not go far enough -We need to do everything we can -Two other concerns: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic – interchange, and increased traffic will affect the region 2. Affordable Housing – it will not contribute to (this is a travesty) out of town people have no sense of place or value for the price paid
21	Peter Dixon	2208 Edgelow St. Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -50-year resident -Bear Mountain development will require a lot of water -This is a limited resource and must be managed sustainably -Every development must be a component to the long-term water plan for the CRD -This will impact water supply -Plans are taking place – thoughtful planning -CRD Water services is expected to maintain supply -Every time a development is approved, it is a detriment to the entire CRD -If passed, CRD is expected to supply the water, but have no authority to enforce how it is used -The current voluntary conservation is unreliable -CRD has no legal jurisdiction to municipal planning and zoning -Extending the urban containment boundary without conservation countervails any attempt to plan for the future -suggests reject the amendment
22	Fran Thorburn	20 San Jose Ave. Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Represents the Council of Canadians -turn down the amendment for 4 reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. must preserve land and green belts 2. Increased CO2 emissions are higher due to urban sprawl – must resolve this and decrease emissions 3. Tax payers – under siege for infrastructure costs 4. Elected politicians are obliged to hold bylaws

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<p>5. Citizens are not given enough time to learn about the issues – process needs to slow down</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We seldom think of future generations – we must consider the future (also associated with Raging Grannies) - Say no to the amendment
23	Marcie MacLean	1321 Millstream Rd Highlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -20-year Highlands resident -OCP was not adopted and therefore the 1997 OCP is still in effect, which opposes piped water and sewage -Rural areas experience limited population increase -Are 14 goals in the RGS (Pg 33 of RGS) – take note of #4,7,10,14 in respect to this amendment -If accepted there will be impacts on the rural lifestyle and on the RGS -Many impacts on the watershed: Altering water courses, clear cuts, irrigation of golf course -If permitted, there will be increased cost to residents: social, environmental and financial -Highlands went door-to-door – out of 600 residents, 572 did not support this and Highland's district ignored this -This will be the first 'chomp' into the Highlands -Highlands is thought to be in financial trouble – we are sound -Please uphold the integrity of the RGS and not approve this amendment -Bear Mtn. has the zoning, but to obtain the maximum zoning they require water.
24	Herman Surkis	3488 Sunheights Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This is a true public consultation -The development made promises – Bear Mtn. exceeded original intents and applications -would like to propose that the CRD take this golden opportunity to prove whether they are stewards of public trust or private trust -RGS is out of date – it needs to be more stringent
25	Luke Woodyard	c/o Portside Marina Brentwood Bay Rd Brentwood Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Member of the Coalition to Protect Goldstream -Why would we have an urban containment boundary if it stands to be amended? -Multi-million dollar residences – who does this appeal to – no one can afford this -Lack of transparency of Langford community (<i>Highlands?</i>) -CRD should send a message to Langford that if they do not follow suite, they will not be approved for future issues -Rich ghetto
26	Carolyn Knight	Victoria BC V8R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Resident of Victoria

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

		2M2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Concerned about the issues – will there be another hearing? (Chair: no) -Mountains have always been protected land – view tops are special places -Lands are significant to first nations -Question whether proper assessments have been done – it has been a lumpy process and things may have been missed (i.e. the bears, birds and frogs are gone, toxic levels in water, at risk areas, demands for irrigation water are high -She is worried her grandchildren won't have clean water to drink
27	Rose Henry	Victoria Coast Salish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Disturbed to hear that all of the natural critters are gone – this shows a lack of respect from the business people -There is nothing to stop these people – please stop now and listen to the people who live in Highlands -Stop urban sprawl -First Nations no longer live there -There are better solutions to preserve what remains of nature
28	Calvin Sandborn	403 Constance Ave. Esquimalt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is our vision? -Grew up in California – know what a developer can do to an area: fear that will happen in Victoria -Corporate idea of 42 storeys -We have turned this land into a commodity -(Skirt Mtn. had it's named changed to Bear Mtn) -Listen to the young people: referenced previous presentation -Real bears are important – not a corporate logo -Many invested years into the RGS vision: this is the first step to defeating that vision
29	Fred York	743 Finlayson Arm Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -50 year resident -SUPPORTS the amendment -Urban containment boundary was drawn politically, not geographically or physically – it was not until the Official Community Plan (OCP) that this became clear
30	Judy Gaylord	1692 Carnegy Crescent Saanich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Was involved in the RGS development -Watching progress with dismay -Thought there was a clear understanding of the urban containment boundary -How did it get this far? Vision has been watered down -Once adopted, the urban containment boundary be changed for health problems only -How does this fit with the Community Energy Plan?

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Bear Mountain is attracting external investors – we can't meet our own housing needs -She supports all points against the amendment
31	Natalie Chambers	Bleinkinsop Resident Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Concerned about extension of the RUCSPA -We need to set a precedence – cause each developer is waiting to hear the decision -reject this extension, protect green space and farmland
32	Elaine Limbrick	3836 Munn Road Highlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Evident that there is confusion -People see the Bear Mtn. of Langford, not the Highlands side -Wildlife is not extinct -Transportation is only possible via car right now, there are few buses -Water run-off is a problem in the Highlands, but no effort is being made to conserve and I applaud any efforts to do so
33	Nancy Barns	141 Bushby Victoria BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Seen region eroded by sprawl – it is time to stop -Speculation is affecting quality of life -If you set a boundary, stick with it
34	Sigrid Johansson	1741 Millstream Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -We are not against saving green space -The previous council approved development for this area – this is not the issue here -The question should be "Will we use municipal water, or wells?" -If we don't approve this, they will draw from the aquifers and this will affect our wells -If we do approve this, people can be directed to conserve water – it is much more difficult to enforce well water use -i support the amendment -There are procedures put into place to consider these issues – this is democratic
35	Colleen Robertson	1835 Millstream Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Former Highlands councillor -She understood that the RGS and OCP were planning tools – working documents -Residents always expected development on the south borders -CRD has taken advantage of the Highlands for years – residents have given them parks and done so much for the CRD -I don't remember CRD asking Highlands to be a sewage dumping region – now it is: CRD didn't hold a public hearing about that -This is not only a Bear Mtn. issue – approvals are already in place -I support the proposal and ask for permission to run our own district
36	Robyn Fagan	1281 Pembroke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about developers taking a mile when given an inch

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -People are driven by money -What does it mean to have a RGS? CRD needs to take the helm -Developers don't care about quality of life -Need to develop a meaningful RGS – this is out of control -Reject this
37	Heather Phillips	2459 Kemp Lake Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Found a plan of Highlands before Bear Mtn. – it was a good plan – it may need to be updated in light of this amendment - Suggests that the developer is interested in making money -Colonized by people with money -Poor planning cannot be addressed with more poor planning -There are no targets -Highlands is undeveloped because that was the intention/plan -Sympathizes with Sooke, but that is a different issue
38	Brian Gilbert	1422 Lang Street Victoria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Was part of a committee regarding Gypsy moth spraying -It was happening on his property and he worked with officials -Through education and research and information dissemination to neighbours, he was able to facilitate -Must have an open mind to all views -There is a huge call from the public to keep the definition of the urban containment boundary – keep this definition but look for more information -He envisions a development here as well, and appreciates the challenge, but this issue needs to be addressed in a different way -I reject the amendment
39	Emma Lehrer	430 Chester Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Depleting natural resources in place of growth -Transferred land from public to private interests -Decisions have been made without consultation -Act upon decisions expressed here -Developers make money from bullying – citizens get no benefit -Lots of concern expressed about the urban containment boundary: Lip service is not enough
40	Herman Surkis	(second time speaking)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This is amusing and annoying – when developers scream that this is unfair and undemocratic – somehow it is not unfair when they bulldoze without public consultation -Clean water – bad planning to start with, let's

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not make it worse - If we need to build a road to make traffic smoother – if you build it, they (people) will come - Put in more water, people will use it and more development will happen - I agree, if you pipe water, some things will be better (i.e. they won't go to the aquifers) – but if this does not pass, it will affect the sales on these lands - I am not against growth, but I am for smart growth and I have seen little in the West Shore
41	Marcie McLean	(second time speaking)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Millstream meadows is a CRD sewage lagoon (it is also already in the UCB and CRD water can be piped in to the area) - If this amendment is not successful and CRD water is not brought in, then there is still a potential zoning of 68 single family dwellings - There is still much misinformation out there
42	Deborah Curran	49 Pilot Street Victoria BC V8V 2A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land use lawyer and part of the RGS process from the early stages - It is important to note, that 6 of the 8 regional growth strategies contain a UCB – all mention its importance - The RGS has allowed each municipality to set an UCB for themselves for a 5-year period - Changing the UCB– it is a discussion for when we need more land for growth - I feel the CRD RGS is the strongest in the Province and it is disappointing that we are discussing this proposal only one year prior to the Comprehensive Review, when we should be discussing it - I am taking issue with the process the CRD has taken - the CRD is conducting this at the incorrect time - The amendments should only occur in the context of the 5-year review: need to ask then if we need more land. But this question isn't being asked. It is a case of the tail wagging the dog. E.G of the Regional District of Nanaimo – after their review they did not expand the boundary. No land use need was demonstrated. - I urge you not to approve the amendment, on the principle that the process is wrong – it must be done at the time of the 5-year review
43	Eric Bonham BC Water & Waste Association	5216 Stag Road Victoria BC V9E 1G7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to respect how we work together - Involved with Convening for Action on Vancouver Island - I started to look at why we don't communicate better - We are looking at things in a fractured way – we need to change the way we look at things together

Report of the Public Hearing for RGS Bylaw No. 3443
 Report to the CRD Board Meeting of Wednesday October 10, 2007

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This process is backwards: much construction has already taken place – we should have started at an earlier time with the CRD process and deal as we progress - We need to review how we do business for future proposals
44	Sandy McPherson	(second time speaking)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a disconnect on ground water - To establish a golf course, 360,000 gallons of groundwater per day are required - Ground water does not respect municipal boundaries - A huge amount of water continues to be used by Langford – not many know that they tried 5 times to drill in Langford to water the golf course – they were unsuccessful – so they take the water from Highlands to water the Langford golf course - A problem exists over lack of control over ground water - People do not realize a huge amount of water is already going from Highlands to Langford: they are pumping out the aquifer

The Chair called a first, second and third time for further submission and hearing none, declared the Public Hearing respecting the Bylaw No. 3244 Capital Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1, Amendment Bylaw No. 1, 2007 declared closed at 9:12 p.m.

The CRD received 176 individual submissions (19 in favour, 157 against the amendment); 525 form letters supporting the amendment, and a petition against the amendment signed by 780 people.

I certify this report as being fair and accurate.

Director Chris Clement

Tracy K. Corbett, Senior Manager
 CRD Regional Planning