



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the East Sooke Advisory Planning Commission  
Held Monday, June 25, 2012, at East Sooke Fire Hall, 1397 Coppermine Road, Sooke, BC**

---

**PRESENT:** Linda Nehra (Chair), Lindsay Trowell (Vice Chair), Rhonda Underwood,  
Nita West, Brian White  
**Staff:** June Klassen, Local Area Planning Manager

**PUBLIC:** Approximately 30

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**1. Approval of the Agenda**

**MOVED** by Lindsay Trowell, **SECONDED** by Brian White that the agenda be approved.

**CARRIED**

**2. Approval of the Supplementary Agenda**

**MOVED** by Rhonda Underwood, **SECONDED** by Nita West that the supplementary agenda be approved.

**CARRIED**

**3. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of April 10, 2012**

**MOVED** by Rhonda Underwood, **SECONDED** by Lindsay Trowell that the minutes of April 10, 2012 be adopted.

**CARRIED**

**4. Rezoning Application**

**a) Z-01-12 – Lot 7, Section 129, Sooke District, Plan VIP67208 (Stokes – 470 Seedtree Road)**

June Klassen outlined the proposed rezoning application.

An APC member noted the lot had steep slopes and how would this affect fire access. June Klassen noted that the CRD has driveway standards that are applied as part of the building permit process. The member also asked about the second building and the owner noted this will be a new house.

The Chair noted that the geotechnical report outlined some concerns and does this need to be resolved as part of the rezoning. June Klassen noted that this will be addressed through the development permit with variance process.

An APC member noted that it appears the three lots will use one existing driveway. The applicant agreed and stated there will be an easement over the one lot to provide access to the other two lots.

An APC member asked about the frontage measures and was advised these would be determined by survey to determine if they met the 10% frontage requirement.

An APC member noted that the East Sooke Fire Department had driven onto the property and there were no concerns with the driveway.

Julio Godoy – stated concerns about the driveway and was advised it would be a private road. He noted problems with strata roads.

Hugh Conlon – noted concerns about blasting and its effect on wells. He supported the application.

Jane Hutchins – asked how the rezoning benefits the community. An APC member noted that the proposal conforms to the OCP and that increased lots means more taxes to provide community services.

Hugh Conlon – noted that a direct benefit will be increased population to deter illegal dumping on Seedtree.

Jane Hutchins – noted increased population does not result in lower taxes and can lead to increased demand for services and higher costs. An APC member noted that taxes would not be reduced but there would be more residents to share the costs of services.

Stan Jensen – noted that the proposal to replace one of the dwellings will be a benefit as better quality housing will be provided and jobs will be created.

Dick Braunschweig – asked if all three septic fields were tied to one treatment system.

The applicant noted that an improved level of service was provided through the treatment plant.

John Corsiglia – heard that the biggest expense on Seedtree is lawyers due to problems with well water. Neighbours fighting over limited water and wells running dry. Should Juan de Fuca do a hydrology study of area? Serving four houses on one well is a problem.

Chair asked how provision of water is determined satisfactory. June Klassen noted that as part of the building permit process the applicant must provide proof of potable water – both quantity and quality. The quantity is established through Bylaw No. 2040.

Julio Godoy – noted problems with his strata with water and wells running dry. They have tried to drill additional wells. Also noted concern over water trucks destroying road and difficulty with who pays for repairs. Also noted problems with septic systems in their strata.

Zac Doeding – noted the technical questions are dealt with during subdivision process. Question is does application meet the density provisions in the OCP. Application involves existing buildings and could do a building conversion strata but fee simple or bareland strata preferred. The development will add wealth and value to the community.

Hugh Conlon – noted can't stop progress and noted development affects everyone. Asked if water service will be extended to Seedtree.

Zac Doeding – noted his understanding that a feasibility study is to be considered this fall.

June Klassen noted that Seedtree is in Settlement Containment Area and can be served by a water system in the future.

Bev Petow – lives on Seedtree and walks by this property. The owners are very responsible in how they developed their property. Not a change from existing uses. Agrees that applicant needs to have agreements for easements and supports proposal.

The Chair asked residents to submit their written comments. June Klassen read the comments received from the applicant from Benoit Laplante and Hock Chua, Vincent Phillips, Mehron Tabatabai and Hugh and Mavis Conlon. She also noted the submissions listed on the supplementary agenda and read comments from D. Milwarde, J.K. Hutchins, Brad and Christine Kunetsky into the record.

Gloria Snively – would not submit written comments but noted major concerns regarding water. Discussion has addressed concerns regarding steep slopes and fire truck access and added density compounding septic concerns. Noted not everyone assumes increased population density is a community benefit as many value rural lifestyle.

Julio Godoy – supports application but noted concerns with the lack of maintenance of roads in area.

An APC member asked the applicant if they had any problems with the existing wells. The applicant noted no concerns.

Chair noted Rural A and RR-2 zones are very similar.

**MOVED** by Brian White, **SECONDED** by Lindsay Trowell that the APC supports the rezoning application based upon input from the community and from the applicant and that the application move forward through the review process.

It was noted that there are many concerns with previous development on Seedtree and that the applicant has done a good job with this proposal. Through the OCP review process, need to ensure that problem developments do not occur again.

**CARRIED**

## 5. New Business

June Klassen noted that two public hearings are scheduled for July 18 at the East Sooke Fire Hall starting at 7:00 p.m. One is for the amendments to the Juan de Fuca Land Use Bylaw, 1992, Bylaw No. 2040. The purpose of Bylaw No. 3831 is to amend the Juan de Fuca Land Use Bylaw, 1992, Bylaw No. 2040 by:

- increasing the accessory building height from 4 m to 6 m for a one-storey building,
- increasing the maximum floor area for accessory buildings for parcels greater than 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>

Bylaw No. 3718 repeals and replaces Bylaw No. 3353. The proposed bylaw amends the existing Official Community Plan by including:

- a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction statement,
- amending the Development Permit No. Area No. 1: Steep Slopes by changing the lands designated from areas having slopes exceeding 20 percent or 11 degrees in slope over a minimum 6 metre run to areas having slopes exceeding 30 percent or 16.7 degrees in slope over a minimum 10 metre run,
- providing additional exemptions for development permits,
- reflecting adoption of the Parks Plan, and
- incorporating revised mapping.

June Klassen also noted that it is intended that a review of the East Sooke OCP will start this fall once the Otter Point OCP is on the road to adoption.

The Chair then raised the question of how to notify community members about the APC meetings. She suggested that an email list be started to advise residents of upcoming meetings and to provide a link to the agenda and CRD reports. There was support for this initiative by attendees and the APC members.

Gloria Snivley noted a concern that the results of the Otter Point OCP not preclude the independent community consideration of revisions to the East Sooke OCP. The Chair agreed but noted that we can learn from good examples and not reinvent the wheel.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

Chair