

JUAN DE FUCA LAND USE COMMITTEE

Notice of Meeting on Tuesday, **July 18, 2023, at 7:00 pm**

Juan de Fuca Local Area Services Building, #3 – 7450 Butler Road, Otter Point, BC

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

1. Additional information received for the following agenda item:
 - a) Agenda Item 7 a) VA000159 – Lot 1, Section 98, Sooke District, Plan VIP23938 (6144 East Sooke Road)
 - Trinita Waller, East Sooke
 - Keith and Bonnie Coulter, East Sooke
 - Renée Monchalin and Mondod Tabrizi, East Sooke
 - Scott Wollin, East Sooke
 - James Clark, East Sooke
 - NJ Hewitt, East Sooke
 - MW Yeager, East Sooke

From: [trinita.waller](#)
To: [Wendy.Miller](#)
Subject: VA000159 / SU000159 6144 east sooke rd
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2023 8:23:19 AM

CRD IT SECURITY WARNING: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I am writing in regards to the following request for a variance VA000159 (6144 East Sooke rd)

As a the neighbour of this address I will be directly impacted by this potential subdivision. I am beside the preposed road extension.

I am not in agreement with this request for variance for the following reasons.

1. The preposed access seems to be on a steep slope area. My preference will be to do a steep slope assessment. Part of the property an old growth Douglas fir environment.
- 2)The property has a seasonal stream that runs through it. Has a riparian report that addresses how the water flows and where it sits been done? With some of the torrential rains and atmospheric rivers that we have had in the past few years there has been allot of standing water for several months during the winter.
- 3) For years the existing house has been an unsupervised vacation rental home. Often the large groups that is hosts come with many vehicles. This will add more traffic to Timberdoodle and not contain it to the current address of 6144 East Sooke rd.
- 4)The preposed zoning for these lots will allow 2 dwellings per lot. That has the potential to be 5 additional dwellings in the area. It seems like quite an increase in traffic on a small road.

In regards to SU000159 please explain what that means. If money is given in lieu of parkland where will the money go.

This is a property that is largely unmanaged. For years I have been involved in keeping the broom down in the spring so that is doesn't migrate to my property, the owner has done little to mitigate any invasive species. Several large trees have fallen on my property and would still be on my access road had we not taken the out.

Best Regards,
Trinita Waller

[REDACTED]

Trinita Waller

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [jdf info](#)
Subject: Re: Development Variance Permit for 6144 East Sooke Road
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2023 2:26:20 PM

CRD IT SECURITY WARNING: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Juan De Fuca Community Planning Dept.

Re: Development Variance Permit
Lot 1, Section 98, Sooke District, Plan VIP23938
6144 East Sooke Road

From Keith and Bonnie Coulter

[REDACTED]
East Sooke, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Please note the plans provided are not readable. The photocopy quality is very poor, so we are not sure we are seeing all the pertinent information.

We strenuously object to this variance and subdivision for the following reason.

1. As an adjacent neighbour we have great concern regarding subdividing this narrow steep property and feel that this type of subdivision will not be a good fit for the current use and fabric of this neighbourhood. The property is currently used as a short-term vacation rental that caters to large, noisy, unsupervised parties that have been disrupting everyone near by. Causing much friction and there is no way to contact the owners to make complaint. No one is accountable it seems. The likelihood of the owner crowding in more vacation rental units is high.
2. This area is subject to increased volumes of run off water during sudden rainstorms and recent high volume winter rains are straining the already stressed intermittent water courses.
3. The proposed access is on a steep slope that would require large cut and fill areas that will negatively impact the existing homes on Timberdoodle Road.
4. The intersection of Timberdoodle and Woodcock Road would see increased traffic. Currently there is a yield sign on Timberdoodle that is not well observed by nonlocals making it a hazard for anyone using the steep slope on Woodcock be it kids on bikes, trucks towing boats, firetrucks, recycle, garbage collection and other emergency vehicle. Under winter conditions this stretch of road is treacherous.
5. If the zoning allows for 2 dwellings per lot that is a lot of change for this neighbourhood.
6. We are currently experiencing a rapid turnover of ownership in the immediate neighborhood and the last 3 residences are now short-term vacation rentals. The increase of loud parties, barking dogs and vehicles coming and going at all hours is taking its toll on this once quiet place.

Respectfully Keith and Bonnie Coulter.

July 16, 2023

Attn: Wendy Miller

Dear Juan de Fuca Land Use Committee,

RE: Development Variance Permit for Lot 1, Section 98, Sooke District, Plan VIP23938 – 6144 East Sooke Road

Thank you for providing us information on the above application. We are residents of Timberdoodle Road in East Sooke. This letter is to inform you that **we are in opposition** of the proposed four-lot subdivision application, as well as the reduction of the minimum frontage requirement for proposed Lot 3. We will be directly affected by the proposed application. We have highlighted below some of our concerns that we ask that you please take into consideration.

- 1. We are opposed to the use of Timberdoodle Road being utilized as an access point for construction equipment and machinery.**
 - a. Timberdoodle Road is narrow – proposing a significant safety concern for residents, habitat, and emergency vehicle access;
 - b. We propose the use of East Sooke Road as the only entry point for all construction equipment and machinery, and for Timberdoodle Road to remain in its current state.
- 2. Dividing the current singular lot into a four-lot subdivision will have negative consequences on the existing habitat and native species.**
 - a. The existing application will have negative impacts on land security, water usage, and sewage management;
 - b. The maximum subdivision proposal should not exceed three-lots maximum, with one main dwelling allowed per lot;
 - c. An Environmental Assessment must be completed and shared with impacted residents of East Sooke and surrounding First Nation communities.

We look forward to future engagement and the negotiation process.

Sincerely,

Renée Monchalin
Mondod Tabrizi

██████████, East Sooke

July 17, 2023

Attn: Wendy Miller

To the Juan de Fuca Land Use Planning Committee:

RE: **proposed variance VA000159**(for Lot 1, Section 98, Sooke District, Plan VIP23938 – 6144 East Sooke Road)

I am the adjacent neighbor to the North at the bottom half of the property and I will be directly affected by the additional density and development of the lots.

I am opposed to the variance which would allow for subdivision of the property to four lots. Specifically, I am opposed to the use of Timberdoodle being used as access for additional subdivision as well as to the overall increased density based on the following concerns:

1. Safety and traffic concerns based on use of Timberdoodle for construction, resident, and emergency access to the subdivision:
 1. Timberdoodle is a very narrow road with limited shoulder area. As it is, resident and service vehicles on Timberdoodle must often pull off the road or back up into a wider portion in order to let oncoming vehicles pass by;
 2. The existing turnaround does not extend to my property () or the other two properties at the end of Timberdoodle, private trash and city services actually have to back in and back out or stop at the top of the road;
 3. Adding construction and residential traffic to the existing road creates serious safety concerns for residents, children, pets, and wildlife walking on Timberdoodle;
 4. Adding additional vehicle traffic, construction vehicles or machinery would create a hazardous situation for emergency vehicle access.
 5. The property in question already has a main entrance on East Sooke Road and any additional access should come from the East Sooke entrance to the property.

2. Environmental, water, and sewage impact of additional density in this sensitive area:

1. Loss of additional soil, trees, and native plants will exacerbate flooding, damaging runoff, and the ability to absorb rainfall;
2. Increased density will add water stress for existing and future residents – in the midst of a Stage 5 drought;
3. Increased density creates septic pressure and other environmental concerns, including increased runoff and drainage from land and roadways flowing into the Basin.
- 4.

As a final note, I also want to mention that in general, the area of East Sooke Road where it accesses Coppermine Park draws numerous walkers, families with children and pets, bicyclists, and joggers who cross the road for Coppermine Park access. Additional traffic and residential density (4th Lots) will inevitably make the access to and use of the park and road even more dangerous.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Scott Wollin



From: [J Clark](#)
To: [jdf info](#)
Subject: Nearby property owner concerns over VA000159
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 12:16:18 PM

CRD IT SECURITY WARNING: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Re: variance VA000159 (6144 East Sooke rd)

To whom it may concern,

I have been a neighbour in the vicinity of this property for over a decade, and the variance for the proposed lot brings up concerns that put me in disagreement with the proposal due to these reasons:

a) The existing house is being used as a short-term vacation rental, and it is already consistently disrupting the entire neighbourhood with excessive noise due to daytime partying that often extends well into the early morning after midnight many nights). The owners do not appear to be resident to the area, nor appear to concern themselves with the impact this has on how it affects the natural environment in this area. Adding an additional set of lots on this same property which already makes up for more noise disturbance than all of the other properties in the surrounding area combined, can only impact the wildlife species even further, adversely affecting the natural environment of the area.

b) As a secondary result to (a), the property, as is, already substantially affects the use and enjoyment of the adjacent properties (including ours), so adding a further set of buildings will only multiply the issues already present. The property owners of the proposed variance do not concern themselves with any of this, as they are not resident, nor do they appear to have made any changes whatsoever over the last few years of renting out the vacation home in order to allay the concerns of the residents who are local and do live in the area.

c) The road that would need to extend into the property is a very small, practically a single lane traffic road (two vehicles can not easily pass each other in opposite directions). Adding an additional (up to) 5 dwellings with an average of 1-2 vehicles each seems an inordinate amount of traffic for the existing road to support. I believe the density of the housing and the road to support it would be inappropriate for the development level of the area.

d) There are natural features in the area that are of concern. One is the seasonal stream that runs through the area, and how this would be handled, especially give the steep slope areas and the significantly increased water flow over the last few years.

For these reasons, I am in disagreement with the variance. There is the fact that the current property owners already consistently allow their single dwelling to substantially affect the use and enjoyment for the adjacent properties (and beyond). They have had years to show some concern or regard to the actual residents in the area, but have done nothing to curb the already present issues they are creating which are affecting the natural environment and wildlife. Increasing the density significantly on the single property can only multiply the issues based on the disregard already shown during past years. This variance seems it will result in an inappropriate amount of development and density into the area already being disrupted

primarily by that particular property.

Regards,

James Clark



--

James Clark

Time Zone: GMT - 08:00

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND E-MAIL DISCLAIMER

The information contained in this e-mail is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not an intended recipient you must not copy, distribute, or take any action in reliance on it. Although we have taken every reasonable precaution to ensure that any attachment to this e-mail has been checked by viruses, it is strongly recommended that you carry out your own virus check before opening any attachment, as we cannot accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of software virus infection

From: [NancyJane Hewitt](#)
To: [jdf info](#); [Al Wickheim - Director JDF](#)
Subject: regarding application for proposed variance at 6144 East Sooke road
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 12:23:58 PM

CRD IT SECURITY WARNING: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello

I live at [REDACTED].

I am writing to request that the existing zoning regarding 6144 East Sooke Road be upheld and this application for additional subdivision be denied.

If I have understood correctly, acceptance of this application would allow more than double the occupancy at this property.

The more trees in neighbourhood, the cooler the temperatures.

When a neighbourhood loses trees, the temperatures increase and drought conditions are exacerbated.

Water shortage is a concern.

Traffic density is a concern for me. I travel Coppermine road on a daily basis to access East Sooke Park.

Essential services being further stretched is another concern.

I am requesting that the existing density zoning to be upheld at the 6144 East Sooke Road property.

I request that this application for a zoning variance be denied.

thank you for your time,

NJ Hewitt

In reference to CRD file VA000159, relating to:

Lot 1, Section 98, Sooke District, Plan VIP23938 – 6144 East Sooke Road, Sooke, BC

Application for a Development Variance Permit

First, thank you for the opportunity to present a submission to this committee tonight.

My spouse and I have lived in the East Sooke community for 33 years, and have owned property close to the applicants since 2001. We share a small cove with the applicants and several other property owners.

There are ten properties that create the cove, with the applicant's property at the easternmost point. Of those ten properties, four are currently operated as vacation rentals and one is a former vacation rental.

My interest is in maintaining a lifestyle that is quiet, relaxing and as reasonably undisturbed as possible. While vacation rentals are accepted as a part of many communities, East Sooke included, they can bring challenges for other people living nearby.

Of the current and past rental properties in this small cove, only one has a consistent and long term pattern of being rented by partiers, with behaviour including loud music well into the early morning, yelling amongst themselves on the dock, yelling at others, hitting golf balls into the Basin, setting off fireworks during dry summer months (with fire bans in place) and causing a response from our volunteer fire department, operating watercraft at high speeds across the cove, and into the open water beyond.

The behaviour of clients renting the other vacation rentals is the opposite, with behaviour well inside what any neighbourhood would see as respectable and acceptable. The reasons behind the difference are unclear, but it suggests a difference in management mindset or ability of the business.

I note the application includes division of the property and the construction of another building with direct access to the waterfront and two more behind. Any increase in the number of buildings for this property has the potential for exponential increases in the noise and unacceptable behaviour that many of the clients of this landowner present. The detrimental impact on year round residents is present already and any increase in that impact is unacceptable.

My concerns are:

- General increase of density in the neighbourhood
- Precedent being created for increased density within the neighbourhood
- An increase in noise within the neighbourhood, especially should the current property owner set up any one of the new buildings as a vacation rental, given past practice

I am in opposition of the application.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide a submission.

MW Yeager

