

Summary of Comments/Recommendations Received from Councils, Electoral Area Directors, Governments and Public Agencies and Staff Recommendations on the Proposed Regional Growth Strategy, by Strategy Component

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Introduction and Overall Document</p> | <p>Central Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support in principle the proposed RGS. - Context (page 1) should say that the RGS is a partnership among members, rather than a political agreement between the CRD and members. - Clarify and revise 2nd bullet of Chair's introduction. <p>Colwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Withholding comment pending Minister's clarification of future of RGS legislation. <p>Esquimalt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approves the proposed RGS in principle subject to 4 points. <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Takes no position on RGS until its issues are resolved. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports concept of RGS and will work to produce final draft acceptable to all. <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Saanich is fundamentally opposed to the RGS document. - Proceed with no further studies until all municipalities have signed off on the proposed RGS. <p>Oak Bay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Endorses in principle proposed RGS <p>Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the concepts in the proposed RGS. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned with costs that may be incurred by municipalities to implement RGS and review it on a 5-year basis. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unable to support or endorse proposed RGS in its present form. - RGS should give some consideration to future amalgamations. <p>Juan de Fuca Electoral Area Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cannot support proposed RGS. | <p>Central Saanich: Concur with points 2 and 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Recommendation:</u> Change first sentence of page 1 to read: "A regional growth strategy is an agreement, developed and approved by the member municipalities and the regional district in partnership, on social, economic and environmental goals and priority actions..." 2. <u>Recommendation:</u> Delete words "stable to" from second bullet of Chair's introduction. <p>Sidney, JDF EA Director (RE: Financial impacts of RGS and impacts on land values and development costs): Currently no comprehensive study has been undertaken or budgeted to be undertaken, to estimate the impact of the RGS on land values in the Capital Region. Approval of the Board would be required to undertake such a study through the 2002 budget approval process. Similarly, no region wide estimate has been made of the potential financial impacts of implementing the RGS on member municipalities and the CRD. Some general cost estimates were made in the Technical Analysis of RGS Options regarding transportation. Work could be undertaken through the Inter-governmental Advisory Committee (IAC) to develop estimates for the consideration of the Board and member councils.</p> <p>JDF EA Director (RE: excluding JDF EA from the RGS): Saltspring Island and the Outer Gulf Islands EAs are excluded from the RGS because they fall under the planning jurisdiction of the Islands Trust. Neither Saltspring Island nor Outer Gulf Islands EAs are financial contributors to the RGS program.</p> <p>Cowichan Valley RD (RE: earthquake preparedness): This was not identified by the Board and councils in the <i>Framework for Our Future Agreement</i> (the Framework Agreement) as a regional priority to be dealt with through the RGS.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission: Concur with points 2 and 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <u>Recommendations:</u> Minor text amendments to clarify these two points. <p>Ministry of Transportation: Concur with second point. This would occur through an</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current voting structure on land use is undemocratic; vote on RGS only after issues raised by Marr Report are resolved. - Communities should define their own functions through local planning, not have it prescribed for them in the RGS. - No studies have been done to assess the effect of RGS on land values and development costs. - JDF EA should be given right to be excluded from RGS as are Saltspring and Outer Gulf Islands EAs. - Need more information on financial costs and other impacts of implementing RGS. <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commends the Board on a good document, ability to work together while retaining autonomy, and for proposing reasonable agreements and deadlines, and for referencing CVRD in Implementation and Guiding Principles sections. - Need a strategy on earthquake preparedness. <p>Minister of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congratulates Board on draft strategy, initiation of implementation strategies and monitoring programs, and looks forward to further progress towards adoption of the RGS. - Proposed RGS is complementary to most provincial interests by steering growth away from ALR/FLR, protecting blue/green space, setting out process for coordinated transportation planning. - Specific provincial concerns can be addressed through minor amendments to proposed RGS. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly supports the proposed RGS and encourages its early adoption. - Important that the economic potential of agriculture and forestry are recognized in the initiatives of the proposed RGS. - Identify lead agencies to implement specific actions and initiatives. <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed RGS is well written and presents forward-looking policy positions. <p>Ministry of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully supports the proposed RGS. - May need to adjust directions and targets in RGS following completion of transportation strategy. | <p>interim amendment (page 14, Implementation - action VI) to incorporate relevant sections of the Regional Transportation Strategy (RTS) into the RGS.</p> |
| <p>Initiative 1.1 - Keep Urban Settlement Compact</p> | <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow individual municipalities to adjust the UC boundary. - Include the business park and special wholesale areas north of the TCH in the | <p>Langford, Metchosin, North Saanich, Sooke, View Royal (RE: Definition, amendment, targets, and buffering of proposed Urban Containment & Servicing Policy Area boundary): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Langford major centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Add a policy stating that Councils may consider cluster development outside the UC boundary if 50% of the site will be preserved as dedicated park or amenity. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports keeping urban growth compact. – Clarify target of 90% of cumulative new dwelling units inside UC boundary. – Introduce requirement for land use transition zones on the urban side of the UC boundary, or meaningful buffering requirements. – Support servicing area boundary provided allowances are made for agriculture and water hook-ups for parcels provided for in 1996 OCPs. – Seeks meaningful participation in definition of UC boundary for District of Sooke. <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No area of NS should be inside proposed UC boundary. – UC area should be separated from Servicing Policy Areas and should not be linked to provision of urban sanitary sewer and water services. – The LWMP serve as a guide to develop and define servicing areas. <p>Oak Bay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Achieve 5% increase through a range of housing options, not just ground oriented for OB. – OB will implement 5% increase incrementally through development application process. <p>Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Impacts of servicing area boundary need to be further explored. – Identify McKenzie Quadra as a major centre. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Water and sewer extensions should be permitted outside the UC boundary to address environmental problems and to provide irrigation water to agriculture. – Support initiative 1 but there should be no further action by CRD. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Council will define the Sooke UC&S area; does not endorse any requirement that the CRD approve amendments to the OCP, UC boundary or servicing policies and boundaries. – Control growth and density with land use regulation, not servicing restrictions. Council does not endorse proposal to limit extension of services to area within the defined UC&S area. Council supports providing services to all areas of municipality to which it is feasible. | <p>Langford, Metchosin, North Saanich, Saanich, Sidney, Sooke, JDF EA Director (RE: Development and servicing extensions outside proposed UC&S policy area boundary): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Langford, Victoria, Saanich (RE: Definition, description and criteria for major centres): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission, Minister of Community, et al (RE: Development opportunities on resources lands, FLR, ALR): See discussion on Capital Green Lands in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Oak Bay, Victoria (5% increase in ground oriented housing capacity in core municipalities): The purpose of this target is to try to increase the potential to develop ground oriented housing in the core municipalities. The technical analysis of RGS options identified that in future these housing forms would be in short supply in the Core given potential market demand. Each municipality would be able to define for itself, through its Regional Context Statement, an approach that works best for it in meeting this general target. Since the aim of the RGS is not to set out annual housing construction quotas, it would be inappropriate to set a numerical target for each core municipality to achieve to meet the overall 5% objective. However, if it prefers, this is an approach a municipality could take through its Regional Context Statement.</p> <p>4. Recommendation: That these matters be dealt with through the process to develop and approve regional context statements for the core municipalities.</p> <p>Sidney (RE: No further action by CRD on initiative 1.1): The CRD would have a limited role in implementing initiative 1.1. First, through its planning jurisdiction in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area, the <i>Local Government Act</i> requires that it undertake local planning consistent with the RGS it adopts. Second, through its responsibilities for regional water and liquid waste management, it would have a role in the extension of these services that may be required by agreements flowing from the RGS. Third, the Act identifies the regional district as a partner in negotiating and approving Regional Context Statements prepared further to the RGS, and gives the regional district the statutory responsibility to monitor the RGS.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission (RE: monitoring achievement of density targets, and selling the RGS): Monitoring is required by statute. Monitoring program to be developed would include the identification of key indicators to enable quantitative assessment of the achievement of targets set out in the RGS. A public education program to publicize the RGS could be considered after adoption of the RGS.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace 5% increase in ground oriented housing with numerical target. - Specify in text descriptions of Metro Core and Major Centres that identification does not imply redevelopment; changes will be detailed in local planning policy. <p>View Royal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider amendments to RGS at any time, not just once every 5 years. - Clarify triggers (site-specific amendment?) and process for RGS amendment. <p>Juan de Fuca Electoral Area Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restriction on extension of urban services to rural areas may remove ability to use density bonusing tool. - Allow extension of community water and sewer systems services to all areas of the regional district. <p>Minister of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that land is available for economic uses, particularly more specific statements supporting acceptable resource development in renewable resource land areas. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep a close eye on achievement of density targets through monitoring. - Include a program to "sell" the concept. - Development of parts of the ALR in Sooke requires application and exclusion from the reserve. | |
| <p>Initiative 1.2 - Protect the Integrity of Rural Communities</p> | <p>Highlands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small lots in Rural/Rural residential areas should involve cluster development and preserve contiguous tracts of forest and farmland. - Place any reference to lot size regarding rural/rural residential area in the glossary. - Define rural communities to include recreation and environmental protection. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete any reference to 0.2 hectares regarding Rural/Rural Residential Policy Area and replace with reference to OCP limits for areas outside proposed UC boundary. - Supports concept of buffer zones for Green Lands in Metchosin and establishing minimum standards in the RGS. <p>Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0.2 ha. minimum lot size is too small and should be revised. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipalities should define density. There are 0.2 ha. areas in Sooke that are more urban than rural. <p>Juan de Fuca Electoral Area Director::</p> | <p>Highlands, Metchosin, Saanich, Sooke, JDF EA Director (RE: development in rural/rural residential policy area, definition of rural, minimum lot size in rural areas, rural OCP updates): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>JDF EA Director (RE: RGS base year): Since the RGS was initiated in 1996 that year has been used so far in the process as the base year for forecasting, visioning, and technical assessment. However, it would be more reasonable to amend statements calling for agreements related to 1996 OCP development capacities in the proposed RGS, to OCP capacities at the time the RGS is adopted, or an agreed to base date near the time of adoption.</p> <p>5. <u>Recommendation:</u> Make appropriate text change to recognize this point.</p> <p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (RE: economic viability of farming). Concur.</p> <p>6. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer this point to the Regional Economic Development Strategy process for inclusion in the project terms of reference.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Base RGS on most current OCPs, not 1996 base year. - JDF EA should be allowed to update OCPs prior to inclusion into RGS. <p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote and target the economic viability of farming. <p>Ministry of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to reconcile desire for pedestrian orientation of major centres and their location on key routes providing inter or intra-regional mobility. | <p>Ministry of Transportation: Concur. This is a matter for consideration in the development of the Regional Transportation Strategy and also, in the definition of major centres by municipalities through processes to define their Regional Context Statements and in subsequent changes to OCPs and Zoning Bylaws.</p> <p>7. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer this point to the Regional Transportation Strategy process for consideration and to the affected municipalities for consideration in processes to develop and approve their regional context statements.</p> |
| <p>Initiative 2.1 - Protect Regional Green and Blue Space</p> | <p>Esquimalt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognize the need for a regional park in Esquimalt. <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the policy area name to Unprotected Green Space Policy Area, remove 80% and 50% protection targets, and replace with policy that green space values be considered during local planning of the area. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase sensitive ecosystem protection target from 50% to 70% and focus on protection actions of each municipality. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support initiative but only as a continuance of existing CRD Parks initiatives. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider compensating landowners of sensitive ecosystem lands. Council objects to apparent infringement on private property and potential loss of tax revenue. <p>Juan de Fuca Electoral Area Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will proposed trail system from Sooke to Port Renfrew be developed: purchase, row agreements, expropriation? <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to give more support for the agriculture and forestry sectors. <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to be a clearer vision of the private land portion as working landscapes where agriculture, forestry and mining and other resource developments can occur. <p>CRD Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the recommendations of the RGBSS have been implemented. - CRD Parks and RPS need to meet with CRD Environmental Services and the PCC to determine future CRD involvement in the RGBSS. | <p>Esquimalt (RE: regional park):</p> <p>8. <u>Recommendation:</u> That this matter be referred to CRD Parks for consideration in the next update of the CRD Parks Master Plan.</p> <p>Langford, Metchosin, Sooke (RE: Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area - targets and compensation): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Sidney (RE: support as continuance of CRD Parks initiatives): As with other parts of the RGS, the CRD would have a statutory role to monitor achievement of objectives under this initiative, and to participate in the development and approval of regional context statements. The CRD also would have a role as a participant in developing the implementation agreement described in action 2 on behalf of the JDF EA. As well, the CRD would have involvement through the ongoing initiatives of CRD Parks to implement the Green/Blue Spaces Strategy and the Parks Master Plan.</p> <p>JDF EA Director (RE: development of trail system):</p> <p>9. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer this question to CRD Parks for clarification and response.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission, Ministry of Energy and Mines (RE: agri-forest sectors, working landscapes): See discussion regarding Capital Green Lands in staff report.</p> <p>CRD Parks (RE: RGBSS): Concur with comment regarding meeting to discuss future involvement in green/blue spaces strategy.</p> <p>10. <u>Recommendation:</u> That RPS and CRD Parks report to Regional Planning Committee on appropriate changes to the RGS following meeting on future involvement in RGBSS.</p> |
| <p>Initiative 2.2 - Manage Natural Resources and the Environment Sustainably</p> | <p>Central Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Action 5 could entail significant costs and negatively affect municipalities. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporate precautionary principle into principles of sustainable resource | <p>Central Saanich, Metchosin, North Saanich, Victoria, Minister of Community et al, Land Reserve Commission, Ministry of Agriculture et al, Ministry of Energy & Mines (RE: Action 5): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports integrated watershed planning with a more detailed approach focused on environmental protection. - Make allowance in air quality targets for wood burning for heating in rural areas. - Emphasize restoration and remediation in targets for reducing environmental contaminants and increasing energy efficiency. - Aggregate policies and initiatives should respect local OCP limitations. <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move Action 5 to section 1 (Managing and Balancing Growth) and retitle as Initiative 1.3: Development of Long Term Plan for Community Sustainability; list of resources should also include ground water, agricultural soils and natural wetland areas. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support initiative but with no further action except as an extension of existing CRD service. <p>Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add reference to Capital Health Region to action 5. <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that all waste, particularly commercial and industrial waste, are not dumped in unauthorized areas either in CRD or CVRD. - Need a strategy for contaminated soils at redevelopment sites to ensure unauthorized dumping does not occur. <p>Minister of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend to suggest an inter-jurisdictional process to specifically address upcoming (within 10 years) aggregate shortage in the CRD. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LRC should be involved in integrated watershed planning due to interest in flooding and groundwater depletion. - Action 5 focuses more on future needs than on helping resource industries grow; LRC would like to be involved, along with Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Fisheries. - RGS does not give enough attention to aggregate issues. <p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive storm water management for all watershed areas is important, particularly for farmlands adjacent to urban areas. - Give due attention to local food production in assessment of long term resource needs. | <p>Metchosin (RE: sustainability principles): Concur. The precautionary principle is the environmental equivalent of the "Do no harm" principle in Medicine. With regard to environmental sustainability, the precautionary principle implies taking a conservative approach to decisions that could negatively effect the ability of natural systems to sustain life, erring on the side of caution in maintaining ecosystem health. Although it is implied in the three principles at the top of page 8 in the proposed RGS, it is not explicitly stated.</p> <p>11. <u>Recommendation:</u> Add a statement on the precautionary principle as a four principle under initiative 2.2.</p> <p>Metchosin (RE: integrated watershed planning, air quality & environmental targets):</p> <p>12. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer these comments to the processes to implement actions 2 and 3 following adoption of the RGS.</p> <p>Sidney (RE: extension of existing CRD services): Apart from action 5, all actions under initiative 2.2 are extensions of existing CRD services. Initiative 2.2 essentially proposes making an explicit reference to sustainability in the provision of these regional services, and to extend existing pilot programs and services further.</p> <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District (RE: illegal dumping): Although these issues may be important, it is not necessary to explicitly reference them in the RGS. Perhaps there is need for joint discussions on this issue with CVRD and CRD Environmental Services.</p> <p>13. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer the matter to CRD Environmental Services for consideration.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission, Ministry of Agriculture et al (RE: watershed planning): Concur. The Commission and the Ministry are represented on the IAC and would thus be involved in the implementation of action 2.</p> <p>Ministry of Agriculture et al (RE: water and biosolids for agriculture): Concur.</p> <p>14. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer these comments to CRD Water and CRD Environmental Services respectively for consideration.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Give attention to needs of agriculture in the Strategic Plan for Water Management. – Review the Peninsula Liquid Waste Management Plan for use of biosolids on farmland. <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RGS must accommodate future aggregate supply operations within a reasonable travel distance from urban markets. | |
| <p>Initiative 3.1 - Build Complete Communities</p> | <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports concept of complete communities. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support initiative but that the CRD have no involvement in rewriting relevant sections of OCPs. <p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Add farmers markets to list of criteria of community completeness. | <p>Sidney (RE: CRD role in OCP changes): The CRD is required by statute to agree to regional context statements developed by member municipalities for incorporation into OCPs. The CRD role is not to approve context statements, but to participate as a partner in their development. In the case of disagreement on the context statement, both parties (municipality and regional district) have access to the dispute resolution parts of the legislation to reach agreement.</p> <p>Ministry of Agriculture et al: In the case of a farmers market with a permanent facility and full time, year-round hours of business, this would be reasonable. In the urban parts of the Capital Region however, farmers markets occur only on weekends seasonally. However, since existing urban farmers markets are situated in locations that satisfy one or more of the criteria, there is no need to single them out as an additional point.</p> |
| <p>Initiative 3.2 - Improve Housing Affordability</p> | <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports affordable housing in a community appropriate form. <p>Oak Bay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include a component on how the University of Victoria and Camosun College envisage provision of student housing. <p>Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Endorse terms of reference for HAS. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support initiative as municipal initiative only, with no further action by CRD. | <p>Oak Bay (RE: Uvic and Camosun College student housing): No specific estimates were made of future housing supply on the campuses of the college and university.</p> <p>15. <u>Recommendation:</u> Contact university and college to obtain estimates of future on campus student population and revise forecast estimates on Table 1 accordingly.</p> <p>Sidney (RE: HAS initiative): This initiative was one of three regional initiatives identified at Capital Summit 2 as necessary components of the RGS. On November 8, 2000 the Board directed RPS to prepare a draft RGS on the basis of the summit findings, including a housing affordability strategy component. On March 28, 2001 the Board approved the project in principle and reserved \$50,000 in funding, as a CRD contribution to the work in partnership with others.</p> |
| <p>Initiative 4.1 - Increase Transportation Choice</p> | <p>Esquimalt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Guarantee that transportation services to existing centres will be maintained and enhanced. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports basic principles and targets. – Explore approaches to providing transportation alternatives to rural areas that account for the needs and safety of rural residents and farming. <p>Sidney:</p> | <p>16. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer all comments received on Initiative 4.1 to the project management committee of the Regional Transportation Strategy.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support initiative and implementation agreement for short, medium and long term transportation planning. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure equal representation from all municipalities involved in providing for current and future transportation needs. <p>View Royal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Any dedicated high capacity transit row through VR would require council approval. <p>Juan de Fuca Electoral Area Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – What will be transportation servicing cost of having JDF EA serve as a bedroom community? – Will JDF EA receive public transit service? <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Put more emphasis on linkages between the CRD and the CVRD, including public transportation linkages, improved rail service and continued operation of Mill Bay ferry. <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consider potential for over 130,000 dump truck loads of gravel annually to meet CRD needs in transportation strategy. <p>Ministry of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to establish a balance between strong support for non-auto modes and the negative consequences of congestion - roads and highways will continue to be a core service. – Need to manage access to provincial highways to ensure safety and sustain roadway performance. – Need to coordinate improvements to highways 1 and 14 with economic development initiatives in the CVRD and Sooke. | |
| <p>Initiative 5.1 - Strengthen the Regional Economy</p> | <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Add to second to last bullet under action 2: "Actions to support agriculture including finding fair and effective ways to: improve irrigation water supplies and access to nutrients, investigate recycling of wastewater for agriculture and horticulture, and expand local and export markets for farm products." <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to reference economic advantages of Sidney's industrial areas. – Support initiative by private sector with no further action by CRD. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stress the economic benefits and opportunities of natural resources, and make provision for material needs for construction (i.e.: aggregate). | <p>All comments made are reasonable and should be referred to the Regional Economic Development Strategy for consideration in the development of terms of reference for the project. With regard to Sidney's comment regarding the CRD role, the CRD has a minor financial stake in the project of \$35,000 and staff participation in the project management committee. The lead agency as currently proposed is the private sector Greater Victoria Enterprise Partnership Society. The primary funding organization is the federal government through the western diversification program.</p> <p>17. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer all comments received on Initiative 5.1 to the project management committee of the Regional Economic Development Strategy, once established.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Put more emphasis on tourism. <p>Minister of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The economic strategy take the broadest possible scope in consideration of economic needs of the region, in particular, consideration of resource activities such as agriculture, forestry and aggregate. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Identify a lead agency for the economic strategy initiative. – Broaden reference to agriculture in Issue V to cover all agricultural and forestry activities, including high value & specialized agriculture and value-added forestry. – Gather the bulk of agriculture and forestry initiatives under the economic strategy. – Give the resource industries a separate strategy from the urban issues. <p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Actions to enhance high-value & specialized agriculture need to be part of an overall plan to enhance food security through local food production. <p>Ministry of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Major industrial generators should be near high-density nodes to reduce trip length and infrastructure needs. – Need to balance need for aggregate with community values. | |
| Implementation | <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amend to indicate that actions will be subject to individual council review in the context of annual budgeting restrictions. – Include a section on financial implications for each municipality. <p>Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seeks clarification of process for future amendments to RGS. – Include reference to work needed to gain First Nations cooperation. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to consider the cost to implement the strategy, both in staff time and fees. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No CRD implementation except for existing programs and regional transportation strategy; all other implementation measures should be municipal initiatives. – Sidney cannot become active in implementation except through 5-year OCP rewrites. <p>View Royal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support actions in principle, but need clarification of costs, means of payment, and priority. <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines:</p> | <p>Langford, Metchosin, Sooke, View Royal (RE: Financial costs of implementation, process of amendment): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Metchosin (RE: First Nations): This point is generally referenced under Implementation item VII, on page 15.</p> <p>Ministry of Energy and Mines (RE: aggregate resources plan): See discussion in staff report on this point.</p> <p>Sidney (RE: CRD role in implementation): See comments above in this appendix related to the regional district's statutory responsibility to implement a RGS it adopts.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include development of an aggregate resource management plan. | |
| Map 3 - Growth Management Concept Plan | <p>Central Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to confirm map details of urban containment (UC) boundary. <p>Highlands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exclude lands identified as Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Area in the Skirt Mt. Area of Langford from the UC area. - Revise sensitive ecosystem areas on map to reflect current uses in south Highlands in particular for the proposed Highlands business park. - That Rural/Rural Residential areas be revised to include lands currently zoned residential 6, 7, & 8, Community Institutional, RR2 in Eagles Lake and existing Commercial/Light Industrial in the Highlands Business Park. - Millstream Industrial Park should be inside UC boundary. - UC boundary in View Royal should remain south of Thetis Lake Park. <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise the UC boundary to reflect Lanford's OCP and current amendments proposed, and designated cluster-housing areas. - Amend UC boundary to reflect results of Sanitary Sewer Study in the area south of Glen Lake and the methodology used in establishing the Langford OCP. <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Wain Rd and W. Saanich Rd. from Wain Rd. south to McTavish Rd. to reflect devolution and include McTavish Rd from W. Saanich Rd. to Hwy 17. <p>Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include city's Thetis Lake Nursery property in UC&S area. - Show the boundary for the Metropolitan Core as a fading circle centred on Douglas/View rather than as a street-framed polygon. - Note on map and supporting text that boundaries are conceptual only and will be defined in local planning, policy and zoning. - Shade major centres in city to highlight where existing low-density residential areas may expect protection under local policy. <p>View Royal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include lands defined in the VR OCP for future urban use within UC&S boundary. - Council will determine its position on lands north of Thetis Lake following a public meeting. - Include disclaimer on Maps 3 and 4 stating that maps are general, not to scale, to ensure that exact boundaries or minor amendments would not require RGS amendment. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> | <p>Central Saanich (RE: map details of UC&S boundary): Concur.</p> <p>18. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with Central Saanich and staff to define accurate location of proposed boundary.</p> <p>Highlands (RE: Sensitive ecosystem protection area in south Highlands): See discussion in staff report on the first point regarding Skirt Mt. Area. On the second point, concur that for those lands that have already been developed maps should be revised to exclude lands which no longer have ecological value. For those lands that have not yet been developed, suggest that designation remain to identify lands with ecological values that need to be addressed through local planning and development decisions.</p> <p>19. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with Highlands staff on the revision of sensitive ecosystem area designation for lands where ecological values that warranted recognition in the RGBSS, have been eliminated or significantly compromised due to development.</p> <p>Highlands (RE: Rural/Rural Residential Area designation and existing zoning): Apart from lands in parks, ecological reserves, crown and private forest lands, and ALR lands, all lands in Highlands are designated Rural/Rural Residential, with some lands having the additional identification of regionally significant ecological values.</p> <p>Highlands, Victoria, View Royal (RE: location of proposed UC&S boundary in View Royal and South Highlands): See discussion in staff report regarding location of boundary in north View Royal. Concur with point regarding Millstream Industrial Park.</p> <p>20. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with Highlands staff to revise map to define UC&S area boundary in south Highlands.</p> <p>Langford (RE: location of proposed UC&S policy area boundary): Concur.</p> <p>21. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with Langford staff to revise the map accordingly.</p> <p>North Saanich (RE: Mapping of provincial highways): Concur. Note that map 3 shows provincial highways not as policy designations but merely to provide orientation.</p> <p>22. <u>Recommendation:</u> RPS staff to make the suggested map changes.</p> <p>Victoria, View Royal (RE: Identification of metro core, map description of major centres, text caveat): See staff report for discussion on identification of major centres including metropolitan core. Concur with suggestion to add a text/map disclaimer. Disagree with specific identification of low-density areas within centres that may expect protection under local policy. This is properly a local planning matter and too fine a level of detail for a</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FLR lands in northwest Langford should remain in reserve; designation as Capital Green Lands gives the impression the lands are earmarked for future park use. | <p>regional map. To map such areas now would pre-judge the outcome of work on regional context statements and local centre plans.</p> <p>23. <u>Recommendation:</u> RPS staff to add text/map disclaimer.</p> <p>View Royal (RE: lands defined in OCP for future urban): Concur.</p> <p>24. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with View Royal staff to revise UC&S boundary accordingly.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission: See discussion on Capital Green Lands in staff report.</p> |
| <p>Map 4 - Regional Green/Blue Spaces System</p> | <p>Central Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm map details of ALR. - Show regional trail on Mt. Newton X Rd, not Stelly's X Rd. - Confirm location of trail through Oldfield Valley and location of Mt. Newton X road on map. - Consider making trail system more comprehensive showing suitable municipal trails. <p>Highlands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define limits of Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt. <p>Langford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend map to remove ALR designation on the Goldstream Meadows property and the pending removal of ALR designation on Hull's Field. <p>North Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Postpone updating the sensitive ecosystem inventory mapping pending receipt of further information on the CRD Resource Atlas. <p>Sidney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct mapping errors for Capital Green Lands in particular for ALR lands on Airport property. - Identify areas of Roberts Bay, Beaufort Road, Mermaid Creek, Reay Creek, Peter Grant Park and the Lochside Waterfront as Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Areas. <p>Sooke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise map to recognize removal of some lands from ALR. <p>Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify City's Mill Hill holding as Rural/Rural Residential. - Add Gorge Waterway to map. <p>View Royal:</p> | <p>Central Saanich, Langford, Sidney, Sooke, View Royal, Land Reserve Commission (Accurate identification of lands within the ALR): Concur with comments regarding need to fine tune mapping of ALR lands, to remove lands that have been excluded by the Commission, or properly identify lands within.</p> <p>25. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with LRC to revise ALR mapping accordingly.</p> <p>Central Saanich, CVRD, CRD Parks (RE: Amendments to regional trail network): Concur with all points. CRD Parks is responsible for the identification of trails for inclusion in the regional network and connections with trails in the CVRD. This includes the identification of criteria to determine if a trail should be part of the regional network.</p> <p>26. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with CRD Parks and Central Saanich to make amendments to the regional trail network, including removal of identified regional trail segments through lands owned by VanIsle Tree Farms.</p> <p>Highlands, CRD Parks (RE: Define a boundary for the Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt): CRD Parks has developed a proposed boundary for the Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt. Subsequent correspondence with VanIsle Tree Farms Ltd and CRD Parks has resulted in a revision of the proposed boundary, to exclude VanIsle Tree Farms lands from the proposed boundary.</p> <p>27. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with CRD Parks to make the map revisions.</p> <p>North Saanich, View Royal, Sidney, Victoria, Land Reserve Commission (RE: Updating of lands identified as sensitive ecosystem protection policy area): See staff report for discussion on this point. With regard to suggestions by Sidney and Victoria for the identification of additional lands as having sensitive ecosystem values, and by View Royal that lands have been misidentified, CRD Parks should coordinate discussions with each municipality to revise the maps. Also, CRD Parks and RPS should coordinate with CRD Environmental Services on updating the maps in light of information derived from work on the</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify some of the sensitive ecosystem policy designations in VR. - Remove ALR designation for lands excluded in VR (on map 3 also). <p>Cowichan Valley Regional District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Show connection between Trans-Canada Trail and Galloping Goose Trail. <p>Land Reserve Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define working landscapes in a map designation category separate from the Capital Green Lands. - Significant area south of Colwood Centre in ALR is shown as Sensitive Ecosystem Protection. - ALR lands near airport are not properly identified. - Showing ALR and FLR lands as either Sensitive Ecosystem or 'Green Lands' is inconsistent with the ALR and FLR Acts. <p>CRD Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend map to delete proposed regional trail through lands owned by VanIsle Tree Farms and replace with proposed trial segments further west. - Include a boundary for the Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt. | <p>CRD Resource Atlas. Concur with point made by LRC regarding removing sensitive ecosystem policy area identification from ALR and FLR lands.</p> <p>28. <u>Recommendation:</u> Coordinate with CRD Parks, LRC, CRD Environmental Services and municipalities to amend sensitive ecosystem protection policy area mapping.</p> <p>Victoria (RE: Mill Hill property): Changes to the policy designations for this property in View Royal should be confirmed by View Royal.</p> <p>29. <u>Recommendation:</u> Confer with View Royal staff on the appropriate designation for the City of Victoria's Mill Hill property under the View Royal OCP, and amend map accordingly.</p> <p>Land Reserve Commission (RE: Working landscapes): Concur with recommendation. Map 4 depicts ALR and FLR land separately but Map 3 maps both with parks, watershed lands and ecological reserves as Capital Green Lands. See staff report for discussion on this point and recommendation.</p> |
| <p>Table 1 - Population, Dwelling Unit and Employment Forecast</p> | <p>Central Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipal staff need to confirm these forecast figures. <p>Esquimalt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify where 25% population increase for E will be housed. | <p>Esquimalt: The population estimate for Esquimalt included an assumption that by 2026 DND lands in the Wardroom/Hospital site and Macaulay/Work Point would be redeveloped as urban communities with a significant mix of residential uses.</p> |
| <p>Table 2 - Metropolitan Core and Major Centre Performance Guidelines</p> | <p>Saanich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Density guidelines are high and S needs to explore further how or if it can fullfill them. - Review walking time/distance figures to be consistent and perhaps expanded. <p>Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise to make mix of use and density statements more general. | <p>Saanich: The gross density figures given are slightly higher than gross densities actually found in standard 3-story walk up neighbourhoods in the CRD, such as the northwest part of Fairfield between Cook Street and Quadra Street. In these areas, gross densities typically range from 60-75 units/hectare. Actual density ranges for major centres would be defined by municipal planning processes, primarily through regional context statements and local plans and zoning to define major centres. Walking time/distance ratios reflect a conservative estimate of the distance/time most people are prepared to walk to reach services (50 metres/minute average walking speed). Engineering manuals generally give average walking speeds of approximately 73 metres/minute, translating to a 10 minute walking radius of 730 metres, and a 20 minute radius of 1460 metres. By this standard, current centre radius guideline reflects a 7 minute, rather than a 10 minute walk. As such, the radius of major centres and the metro core could be increased. However, given the aging of our population, the guidelines should assume a more moderate average walking speed.</p> <p>Victoria: Concur with comment on function/mix of uses. Density ranges are already quite general and relatively broad and would be defined more accurately through local planning processes.</p> |

| Proposed RGS Component | Comments & Recommendations Received | Staff Comments & Recommended Actions |
|---|--|---|
| | | 30. <u>Recommendation:</u> Change the function/mix of use tables to remove percentage of housing type estimates and include more general statements on the relative balance of residential mix for each centre type. |
| Table 3 - Summary of Targets by Priority Area and Strategic Initiative | Land Reserve Commission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add more action steps to table, identifying lead agencies and short and medium time frame targets. - There is no time frame given for any actions relating to forestry and agriculture. | Land Reserve Commission: Actions and targets summarized in the table are the ones currently proposed. As with actions relating to forestry and agriculture (which may be defined through in the Regional Economic Development Strategy), this table will be revised through an interim update of the RGS to incorporate any more specific actions and targets from the regional strategies for transportation, housing affordability and economic development. |
| Appendix A - Regional Vision | Esquimalt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add the following statement: "It is Esquimalt's intention to strengthen its commercial/retail sector to service the expanding needs of the community as a result of population increases which will result from the adoption of the Regional Growth Strategy and to market our central location to businesses and high-tech industries." Sidney: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include reference to industrial lands and growing knowledge-based industries in vision statement for Sidney. View Royal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove VR from Western Communities section. - Amend VR vision to read: "VR will have a series of economic centres providing expanded retail, professional financial and convenience services. Single family detached housing will remain the predominant housing form with some provision made for other types of housing. A network of foot and cycle paths will provide neighbourhoods with access to shopping, recreation and natural open space. Natural amenities associated with shorelines, streams, estuaries, hillsides and forested areas will be protected." | Esquimalt: Concur. 31. <u>Recommendation:</u> Amend vision statement accordingly. Sidney: Concur. 32. <u>Recommendation:</u> Amend vision statement accordingly. View Royal: Concur on change to vision statement. Regarding removing VR from the Western Communities section, RPS has reported development and other statistics for View Royal as part of the Western Communities since the mid-1980s. This reflects VRs former status as part of the Langford Electoral Area. To ensure comparability of data for monitoring purposes, RPS suggests that VR continue to be identified as part of the Western Communities. 33. <u>Recommendation:</u> Amend vision statement as requested. |
| Appendix B - Guiding Principles | | |
| Appendix C - Green/Blue Spaces Vision | | |
| Appendix D - Glossary | | |