

Summary of Comments/Recommendations Received from Non-Government Organizations and Citizens 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>Association of Rural Communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support proposed RGS and strong delineation of UC boundaries and keeping rural areas rural. - CRD has mandate to implement the RGS. <p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Express strong support for the proposed RGS. The initiatives provide an excellent grounding for realizing the regional vision; if goals are pursued in a coordinated way, CRD will become regional development model for N. America. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support proposed RGS, as the most comprehensive and promising RGS in BC to date. - Urge Board and municipalities to adopt the RGS. <p>Otter Point and Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall direction of proposed RGS is positive and supports present Otter Point & Shirley local area plan. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support key elements of proposed RGS in principle. - Reinforce the linkage between economic, environmental and social facets across the document. <p>Sierra Club British Columbia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the RGS initiative and the important proposed UC boundary. - Decisions that affect us all need to be made by all directors. <p>Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to continue to seek public participation from the whole community at all stages of the RGS process and implementation. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly support the RGS process and its overall content, its aim of regional sustainability, and strengthening its basic policy thrusts. 	<p>Community Social Planning Council: The <i>Local Government Act</i> sets out statutory requirements for public consultation regarding regional growth strategies. One requirement is for a public hearing on the RGS bylaw prior to statutory referral of the bylaw to member councils for acceptance. Proposed regional strategies for transportation, economic development and housing affordability have public consultation components.</p> <p>Royal Roads Land Use and Coastal Zone Management Course, Dieter Eisenhower: See comments in Attachment B, Introduction and Overall Document, on the financial, land value and development cost impacts of the RGS. A full cost accounting assessment of the proposed RGS has also not be undertaken nor have funds been budgeted for such an analysis at this time. Legislation requires the RGS propose a strategy for at least 20 years. Current population forecast information from BC Stats has a 25 year time frame. Although the strategy looks forward 25 years, the intent of the vision statement is to describe a very long term vision of the region, particularly with regard to the maintenance of green space, renewable resource lands, rural character and the general footprint of urban development.</p> <p>L.G. Dalzell (RE: compensation of rural communities): The land use concept in the RGS is consistent with the overall vision of rural communities at the time the Framework Agreement was adopted in 1998. In recognition of the establishment of the District of Sooke, the proposed RGS includes a provision for an interim amendment to the RGS once Sooke council has defined a new development vision for the municipality. The vision for the JDF EA is consistent with local plans in 1998.</p> <p>Warren Littlejohn (RE: loss of municipal autonomy): See comments in the staff report on the process to amend and update the RGS once adopted.</p> <p>Ann Geddes (RE: Downplaying social well being): Concur with the comment. Like regional sustainability, social well-being and the enhancement of regional quality of life is an overall broad objective of the RGS. All strategic initiatives will affect social-well being.</p> <p>1. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise the introduction and context sections to give more prominence</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>North Henderson Residents Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In general agreement with proposed RGS. <p>Willis Point Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support the principles of the proposed RGS and look forward to its adoption and implementation. <p>Richard Acton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports the proposed RGS and the proposed UC boundary in View Royal. <p>Judy Gaylord:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed initiatives are important and interconnected. <p>Royal Roads Land Use and Coastal Zone Management Course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apply full cost accounting to all aspects of the proposed RGS to determine true cost of development. – Set time frame for RGS at 50 or 100 years, not 25 years. <p>Alan Philip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Continue with the RGS process. <p>Sandra Bjola:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Colwood resident supports the proposed RGS. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed RGS leaves a lot to be desired and is the type of policy a socialist or communist government would bring forward, not a democracy. – Core municipalities should compensate rural municipalities for providing a green back-drop and recreational playground, to offset lost potential tax revenue due to foregone development. – RGS could result in unnecessary CRD bylaws and rural areas supporting things like arts centres that mainly benefit urban areas; should be a user pay policy. <p>Warren Littlejohn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Metchosis stands to lose its autonomy in determining its growth direction, with the possibility that neighbouring municipalities could prohibit development or activities in the name of regional interests (e.g.: wood-burning for home heating in the interest of regional air quality). <p>Dieter Eisenhower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Look 50 years to the future, not 25. <p>Ann Geddes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Merging social well-being with housing underplays the significance of social well-being to all other aspects of regional growth and development. <p>John Corsiglia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Continue with an RGS that confines urban sprawl to Langford and Colwood. 	<p>to social-well being as a general objective of the RGS, and amend the heading of section 3 to read simply, Housing.</p> <p>Bruce and Marion Cumming (RE: slow the rate of growth): A random sample of regional residents were asked whether we should find ways to slow down the rate of regional growth in the Regional Growth Strategy Options Random Survey undertaken in May/June 2000. The survey found that roughly 2/3 of respondents oppose taking measures to slow growth, while roughly 1/3 support this. The survey analysis found no great variation across the region in these views, with support for efforts to slow the rate of growth strongest amongst residents over 64. Although the findings of the non-random survey (reflecting the views of individuals who took the time to respond to the generally available survey on their own volition) found that 52% of those who responded were in favour of growth controls, this was not persuasive to the majority of elected officials attending the second regional summit. The proceedings of the Second Regional Summit on which basis the proposed RGS was prepared, did not call for growth slowing measures.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>Ken & Diana Pogue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RGS offers mechanisms for community to community consultation and mediation and hope that rural qualities of CRD will be protected. - Need to fully support the RGS to the new Minister. <p>Marilyn Sundeen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the initiatives for sustainable development and no urban sprawl. <p>Frank Mitchell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support all points made by Association for the Protection of Rural Metchoshin. <p>Kathleen Hennig:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed RGS presents watered down effort and more of same old, same old. <p>Bruce and Marion Cumming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to implement range of disincentives to growth to slow the rate of population increase. 	
<p>Initiative 1.1 - Keep Urban Settlement Compact</p>	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List tools to help municipalities support the UC&S Policy area and actively direct growth to designated centres. - Need action to encourage municipalities to decrease buildout area to assure a supply of some bare land post 2026. - Support strongly giving no opportunity to amend UC&S policy area except in keeping with the RGS and the 5-year review cycle. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly support creation of a regional UC& S policy area and requirement that there be no amendments to it except as part of the 5-year RGS review. - Monitoring should provide assessment of fiscal benefits of the UC&S policy area. <p>Otter Point and Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support effort to keep urban areas compact and to require agreement between adjacent municipalities for development on either side of a common border. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Find quantifiable measures for terms like "complete communities", "quality of life" and "livability". - Need to address disconnect between forecast population growth in Western Communities and existing business and activity centres elsewhere in the region (e.g.: Uvic). - Recognize and protect other regional values besides sensitive ecosystems (e.g.: cultural, recreational). - Change action 3 to read: "review, modify and implement policies to best facilitate growth and investment." 	<p>Eco-Research Chair, Smart Growth BC (growth management tools, 5-year RGS review cycle): The proposed RGS is based in part on the idea that individual municipalities retain independence over the management of land development within their jurisdictions within a broad growth management framework agreed to by all. Municipalities will determine their own approaches to planning and managing for growth within the context of mutual commitments made in the RGS. This could include a variety of regulatory, fiscal and development phasing mechanisms that will vary from community to community. Information on mechanisms to control and direct growth is widely available to professional planners, organizations, citizens and elected officials. The RGS is not the place to include a compendium of these techniques. Such information could be part of an education program (see comments in Appendix B, Initiative 1.1 - RE: selling the RGS) following adoption of the RGS. See comments in staff report on the process to amend and update the RGS.</p> <p>Smart Growth BC (RE: monitoring of fiscal benefits):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer this suggestion to the process to develop the statutory monitoring program. <p>Camosun Community Association: Indicators -quantitative where possible- will be developed to monitor the RGS, including indicators related to relative intangibles such as quality of life, livability and community completeness. Work done by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Community Council will contribute to this process. Concur with point two.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer issue of sub-regional housing/employment imbalance to Regional Transportation Strategy project management committee.

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposed UC&S policy area should be shrunk, with major green space excluded as well as natural portions of the proposed Royal Bay project. – Establish some of the areas within the UC&S policy area as future urban reserve for post 2026 development. – Consider tying size of future UC&S policy area in Sooke to existing lane capacity on Highway 14 to discourage sprawl. – Consider scrapping the target that 90% of cumulative dwelling units locate within UC boundary, as this may encourage more growth than 1996 OCPs permit in rural areas if growth rates increase. – Amend action 5 to permit service extensions to lots permitted under 1996 zoning where the surrounding area is already serviced, and where services may permit cluster development providing densities do not exceed 1996 planned levels. <p>Judy Gaylord:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposed 500 metre walking radius for Major Centres is too small, could be 800 metres. – Need to custom design configurations of each major centre. – Need explicit reference to development of University of Victoria. <p>Royal Roads Land Use and Coastal Zone Management Course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Current growth in Colwood/Langford is precluding future options. <p>Alan Philip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong UC boundary is critical. <p>Karl Sturmanis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need community discussion on planning and design of Hillside Major Centre that builds on its natural amenities. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Denying safe drinking water and sewer service outside the UC&S policy area will lead to health problems and possible CRD liability. – Increased density in certain contained areas may create slums and increased crime. – Landowners with property that crosses UC boundary face difficulty. <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RGS bylaw must support UC boundary through a variety of complementary regulations and initiatives related to service extension, location of development, transit and alternative transportation. <p>Frank Mitchell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seek agreement to keep UC&S policy area in place for longer than 25 years - leave no room for believing the boundary is only temporary, although recognize may be 	<p>Concur with the importance of other regional values (cultural, recreational) but these were not identified as regional issues/values that should be addressed through the RGS process. Concur with final point on action 3.</p> <p>4. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise action three as suggested.</p> <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin (RE: all five points): See staff report for discussion of points on UC&S policy area definition and targets, and on service extensions outside the proposed UC&S boundary.</p> <p>Judy Gaylord: Radius figures given for major centres represents a conservative estimate of what most people would be prepared to walk to reach services. Healthy and active individuals may exceed this figure. See staff comments on Table 2 in Appendix B. Concur with comment on configuration of major centres. This will occur through municipal planning processes to develop a regional context statement, and local planning and zoning for major centres. Disagree with comment regarding the University of Victoria. Although the university is a major employment node in the region, there are numerous other major activity nodes that are not explicitly referenced in the proposed RGS. These areas will develop consistent with existing municipal OCP policies. The defined major centres in the RGS are areas where changes are proposed to existing OCPs, generally in terms of greater residential densities or a broader mix of uses than currently planned.</p> <p>Karl Sturmanis: See comment on Gaylord above regarding configuration of major centres.</p> <p>L.G. Dalzell: See comments in staff report on service extensions beyond the UC&S boundary. See Attachment B, Introduction and Overall Document, on the financial, land value and development cost impacts of the RGS.</p> <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc, Frank Mitchell, Carrol and Brent Parfitt, Norman Mogensen (RE: UC&S policy area): See discussion on these points in staff report.</p> <p>5. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer Mr. Mitchell's comment regarding transportation/land use integration to Regional Transportation Strategy project management committee and the District of Sooke.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>need for minor changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Establish explicit mechanisms to integrate transportation and land use planning to avoid sprawl, such as limits to density increases that would avoid additional lanes on Sooke Rd., and designating Sooke Rd a green corridor with no additional contiguous roadside commercial and industrial uses. <p>Carrol and Brent Parfitt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Oppose urban development north of Thetis Lake in View Royal. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to establish a popular ethic and consensus on the sanctity of the UC boundary. – Set target for cumulative new dwellings inside UC boundary higher than 90%. – Accepting full build out of Colwood and Langford in 20 years a mistake. 	
<p>Initiative 1.2 - Protect the Integrity of Rural Communities</p>	<p>Otter Point and Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support RGS effort to protect rural and resource lands in OP&S local planning area. – Clarify that 0.2 ha. lots are not meant as a minimum lot size for the whole rural area but an exception and not a goal. – Clarify meaning of rural character and quality of life. – Need to find ways to prevent exemptions to Local Area Plans and zoning bylaws that increase number of new dwellings on lots in rural areas. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Minimum lot size of 0.2 ha. inconsistent with protection of rural character. – Recommend phasing out pockets of small lot housing, commercial and other uses over time when more sustainable options are identified. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include explicit provision that buffering of rural and green areas should occur on the urban side of the line, with buffer areas held by third party conservation covenants. – Changes to the UC&S policy area boundary should only occur through a comprehensive review that would have to be signed off by all municipalities as required for the RGS under the Act. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Contain buffer zones within a park or green space area, not on adjoining properties. <p>Dieter Eisenhower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Create a greenbelt or buffer zone between municipalities with no high-density development close to the borders. <p>Marilyn Sundeen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do not allow 0.2 ha. lots outside the UC&S area boundary. <p>Frank Mitchell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 2 hectare minimum lot size in rural areas is preferable. 	<p>Otter Point & Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association, Camosun Community Association, Assoc. for the Protection of Rural Metchosin, L.G. Dalzell, Dieter Eisenhower, Marilyn Sundeen, Frank Mitchell, Norman Mogensen (RE: minimum lot size in rural/rural residential areas, rural character, buffering, amendments to UC&S boundary): See discussion in staff report on these issues.</p> <p>Otter Point & Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association, Camosun Community Association (RE: exemptions from local area plans, pockets of small lot housing): These are local matters properly in the jurisdiction of municipalities and land use management for the JDF EA.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Set minimum lot size in rural areas at 10 ha. and require covenants to protect all high natural values found thereon. 	
<p>Initiative 2.1 - Protect Regional Green and Blue Space</p>	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increase protection target for Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area from 50% to 85%. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implementation of GBSS key action. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amend first paragraph to recognize provincial and national significance of some regional green/blue space and of the need to work collaboratively with other's goals. – Need to link a large part of the urban core with the integrated system of parks and trails. – Set more ambitious trail completion target. – Target of 80% protection of sensitive ecosystem areas adjacent to UC&S boundary is admirable, but could detract from protection of available areas in the urban core. – Protection target for balance of sensitive ecosystem area should be 50% by 2016, 100% by 2026. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increase Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt target to 100% completion by 2011. – Increase Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area protection target to 100% for lands within 500 metres of the UC boundary by 2010, and 100% protection of the balance by 2026. <p>Alan Philip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Accelerate the process to acquire and protect park-land and sensitive ecosystems. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Owners of sensitive ecosystem lands should be compensated if they can't develop. – Landowners along parks and trails risk loss of privacy, trespass and vandalism. <p>Dieter Eisenhower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Set target of 100% completion for Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt. <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prevent development of remaining foreshore areas. – Complete ground assessments of sensitive ecosystem areas to establish true inventory of critical ecosystems. – Buffer critical ecosystems. – Include tree-cutting restrictions in RGS bylaw to protect rural areas. 	<p>Eco-Research Chair, Camosun Community Association, Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin, Alan Philip, L.G. Dalzell, Mark and Kelly LeBlanc, Norman Mogensen (RE: targets, buffering, inventory for sensitive ecosystem protection): See discussion in staff report on these points.</p> <p>Camosun Community Association, (RE: provincial and national significance of green/blue space, greenspace linkage to urban core): Concur with both points.</p> <p>6. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise introductory paragraph of Initiative 2.1 as suggested.</p> <p>7. <u>Recommendation:</u> Consult with CRD Parks and core municipalities on possible greenway corridor identification to connect southeast urban core with regional green space network.</p> <p>Camosun Community Assoc., Assoc. for the Protection of Rural Metchosin, Dieter Eisenhower, (RE: trail completion targets, Sea to Sea GBB targets): CRD Parks has recommended the targets given in the initiative as reasonable under foreseeable budget and program conditions.</p> <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc, Beverly J. Bullen (RE: marine and foreshore protection): Identification of regionally significant blue space areas, including marine and marine foreshore areas was undertaken in the Regional Green/Blue Spaces Strategy. Marine areas with regional blue space value are identified on the RGBSS maps as Blue Space Core Areas. Generally the RGBSS proposes a vision of protection for these marine and foreshore areas, but generally recognizes that these areas come under the jurisdiction of the federal and provincial governments. In some cases the RGBSS identifies the Board's recommendation that the area receive special protection (e.g. designation of Saanich Inlet as a National Marine Conservation Area). The terrestrial focus of the proposed RGS reflects its primary concern with matters under municipal jurisdiction.</p> <p>8. <u>Recommendation:</u> That RPS confer with CRD Parks on the possible inclusion of a component on Blue Space protection in the RGS, for review by Regional Planning Committee and the Board.</p> <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc (RE: regional tree cutting bylaw, tax incentives for conservation covenants): Tree cutting bylaws are a matter of municipal jurisdiction. The suggestion on tax incentives for conservation covenants can be considered in the implementation of action 2.</p> <p>9. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer comment on tax incentives to process to implement action 2.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide tax incentives for those who put conservation covenants on their land. <p>Beverly J. Bullen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include concrete actions to protect the marine environment. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target of 50% protection of Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area too low. 	
<p>Initiative 2.2 - Manage Natural Resources and the Environment Sustainably</p>	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly support integrated watershed planning action. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of watershed based planning key action. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support integrated watershed planning including effective implementation measures. - Support review of strategic resource needs including aggregate but RGS should clearly state that municipalities have right of approval for quarries within their boundaries. <p>Otter Point and Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specify what is a natural resource and recognize the importance of potable water in rural areas dependent on groundwater sources. Groundwater availability should set the limits on rural residential development. - Need to recognize and protect the Kemp Lake Watershed as a water catchment area. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add "renewable resources" to sustainability principle III. <p>Deborah Masters and Jack Storey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Kemp Lake designated watershed area needs to be expanded to include the entire watershed boundary with the inclusion of the Waterworks District Area and preserved as a surface water supply area and protected wildlife corridor. <p>Mark and Kelly LeBlanc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zone all water and wetland areas as watershed and give those used for drinking water same protection as CRD water catchment lands. <p>Marilyn Sundeen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Watershed planning must be adhered to and given teeth. <p>Kathleen Hennig:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't see any commitment to reduce and clean waste that we put into the environment. - Need forecasts of freshwater and sewage treatment needs for 25 years and how these will be met in the RGS. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include precautionary principle in principles of sustainability. 	<p>Eco-Research Chair, Smart Growth BC, Assoc. for the Protection of Rural Metchosin, Otter Point & Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Assoc., Deborah Masters and Jack Storey, Mark and Kelly LeBlanc, Marilyn Sundeen (RE: Integrated watershed planning, surface water supply areas): Comments are all reasonable and should be addressed through implementation of action 2, including consideration of protection of surface water supply areas.</p> <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin (RE: regulation of quarries): See staff report for discussion on this issue.</p> <p>Camosun Community Association: Concur. 10. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise sustainability principle III accordingly.</p> <p>Kathleen Hennig, Norman Mogensen: Issues related to potable water, solid waste and liquid waste are addressed through the Board's currently approved Strategic Plan for Water Management, the Solid Waste Management Plan, and the Core and Peninsula Liquid Waste Management Plans.</p> <p>Norman Mogensen: Addressed in recommendation 12 in Appendix B. Issues of climate change are referenced generally in action 5. It should be noted that global climate change was not identified as a regional issue to be addressed through the RGS, notwithstanding the seriousness of this issue.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include commitment to treat all sewage before discharge. - RGS treats climate change too lightly. 	
Initiative 3.1 - Build Complete Communities	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly support focus on building complete communities. - Criteria outlined on page 9 should be mandatory for projects of any neighbourhood significance. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend sentence introducing community completeness criteria emphasize need to meet each of the criteria to the greatest extent possible. - Need to reference the contribution that a complete community makes to human health. - Experiential quality of walking environment is true test rather than distance and time. - Need to introduce a discussion of demographic change expected into the RGS and the implications this holds. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly support co-location objective and RGS should state concrete criteria for its application. - Change criterion VI to 200 metres from 400 metres. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept could create major problems. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add provision of allotment gardens to criteria of completeness. - Expand criterion V with addition of 'tsunami risks'. - Add an action requiring municipalities to report annually on building permits issued compared to goals of the strategy. 	<p>Eco-Research Chair, Camosun Community Assoc., Assoc. for the Protection of Rural Metchosin, Norman Mogensen (RE: criteria of community completeness): The degree to which the criteria for completeness will be mandatory is a municipal decision, to be defined initially in their respective regional context statements and more fully through local development regulations and procedures. Concur with suggestion that effort should be to meet each of the criteria to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p>11. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise introductory sentence to the criteria as suggested in point one by Camosun Community Assoc.</p> <p>Generally concur with comment on experiential quality of walking environment but nonetheless note the importance of measurable distance based criteria. Definition of "Walkable" in the glossary addresses in part the quality of the walking experience. Point on Tsunami risk would fall under lands "prone to flooding", in criterion V. Suggestion to change criterion VI to 200 metres (a 3.5 minute walk) from 400 metres would be unduly limiting on possible locations for appropriate new development. The point regarding the contribution of community completeness to human health is referenced, albeit obliquely, in the last sentence of the introduction.</p> <p>12. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise last sentence of introduction to 3.1 to make points more plainly.</p> <p>Camosun Community Assoc. (RE: demographic change). Concur with this important point.</p> <p>13. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise Context section of proposed RGS to highlight demographic changes forecast for the Capital Region.</p> <p>Norman Mogensen (RE: monitoring of building permits): This should be addressed in the process to develop the RGS monitoring program, action III under Implementation.</p> <p>14. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer this comment to the process to undertake Implementation action III.</p>
Initiative 3.2 - Improve Housing Affordability	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting diversification of the housing stock inside the UC&S boundary will 	<p>15. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer all comments received on Initiative 3.2 to the project management committee of the Regional Housing Affordability Strategy.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<p>address affordability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need more detail to give confidence that all municipalities will support measures to address housing affordability. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support HAS. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Complete HAS in less than 2 years with a focus on families below median incomes. – HAS should focus on tools available to local government, irrespective of the actions of other parties (especially higher levels of government). <p>North Henderson Residents Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apprehensive that RGS is not serious about housing affordability. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Allow more building in all areas will result in more housing affordability. <p>Dieter Eisenhower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We have a social responsibility to provide access to affordable housing to all members of society. – Use integrated design of mixed uses to avoid security guarded compounds. <p>Kathleen Hennig:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Housing for elderly, addicted, transient, troubled needs to be provided in every community in the metropolitan area, not just downtown. 	
<p>Initiative 4.1 - Increase Transportation Choice</p>	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support adoption of a RTS within 2 years of the adoption of the RGS. – Targets are too low and none given for major centres; suggest by 2026 a minimum PM peak period mode share by non-auto modes of 40% for trips to, from and within major centres. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Specific strategies need to be outlined in the RGS to ensure transportation policies are implemented. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Targets appear to be too modest and air quality targets need to be stated. – Include some of the targets from Healthy Atmosphere 2000. – Add target on reduction of automobile modal share. – Include action on need for inter-regional transportation coordination and linkages with BC Ferries, BC Transit and the Victoria Airport Authority. – Last bullet on page 10 is obscure and should be deleted. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to make the targets for transit & non-auto trips more ambitious. 	<p>16. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer all comments received on Initiative 4.1 to the project management committee of the Regional Transportation Strategy.</p> <p>Camosun Community Assoc. (RE: last bullet on page 10). Concur.</p> <p>17. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise to state this principle more plainly.</p> <p>Judy Gaylord, Royal Roads (RE: prominence of high capacity transit): Direction from second Regional Summit was to work toward high capacity transit as a second phase of the development of the RGS, focusing priority in the initial planning period on the development of a network of major centres, with the intention to connect centres in the key downtown-Western Communities corridor with dedicated right of way, high capacity transit when population, development and fiscal preconditions are met. Part of the work of the Regional Transportation Strategy will be to identify those preconditions and trigger points.</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Make identification of right of way, acquisition of all publicly owned components and half the private components the 5-year target for a high capacity transit system. – Need more specific proposals for increasing rural transport choice like smaller buses on rural routes. – Consider disallowing any net increase in land devoted to private car traffic and parking. <p>Judy Gaylord:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need stronger language regarding high capacity transit connection from downtown to Western Communities. <p>Royal Roads Land Use and Coastal Zone Management Course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need better planning for transit and possibly Light Rail Transit. – Encouraging growth in WC contradicts goal to reduce auto-dependency. – Incorporate an Air Care program into RTS. – Rationalize public transit system with convenient park and ride nodes and economic incentives to use transit. – Consider establishing regional transportation authority. <p>Alan Philip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Subsidized transit to rural areas will result in traffic reductions. <p>Larry Wartels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Introduce 10 minute headways, an LRT, car-free zones downtown, free buses in the core, and an \$80/year unlimited ride bus pass. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not reasonable to expect everyone to walk, bike or take transit. <p>Dieter Eisenhower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Use smaller buses on rural routes and preserve the Galloping Goose Trail for future LRT. <p>Marilyn Sundeen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No increase in lanes on Sooke Rd. – Set transportation targets sooner than 5 years. <p>Kathleen Hennig:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reduce automobile and truck traffic in the downtown core. – Need to reduce automobile generated pollutants to long term safe levels. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Aims for sustainable transportation are at odds with 20 years more urban sprawl in the western communities. – Targets are too low when considered in light of global climate change. 	

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Hire a psychologist to reverse the 'snob factor' related to public transit. – Include targets for CO2 emissions. – Institute demand management practices over transportation choices of rural residents. 	
Initiative 5.1 - Strengthen the Regional Economy	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Most citizens experience the CRD economy regionally; support REDS and pursuing growth in New Economy sectors. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – REDS needs to continue to involve all sectors, including the community. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Add a bullet under actions to recognize the value of existing industries and the need to maintain them. – Profile the existing diversity of the CRDs economy. – Add water to the list of strategic economic resources. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support list of issues to be addressed, including agriculture. – Give attention in the REDS to needs and opportunities for poor people and full range of home-based enterprise. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do not agree with putting more jobs (thus growth) into the western communities. – Focusing more employment at the Airport and at Keating will lead to more commuting. – Support agricultural strategies that anticipate climate change causes and effects. – Include strategies to develop clean energy from tides, currents, wind, solar, thermal. 	<p>18. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer all comments received on Initiative 5.1 to the project management committee of the Regional Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>Camosun Community Association: Concur with all comments.</p> <p>19. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revise introductory paragraph text and list of regional growth management and quality of life issues as suggested.</p>
Implementation	<p>Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, University of Victoria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Initiatives need to be implemented logically: green/blue spaces and urban containment first, followed by transportation strategy, affordable housing initiatives, economic development initiatives and then measures to support compact settlements and complete communities. <p>Smart Growth BC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to build partnerships with neighbourhood associations and other groups to assist in implementing the RGS. <p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Link water management plan, liquid waste management plans, solid waste management plans to RGS with performance targets and explicit "accountability" references. 	<p>Eco-Research Chair (RE: order of implementation): Regional Planning Committee has indicated its commitment to the notion of full, as opposed to phased implementation.</p> <p>Smart Growth BC, Camosun Community Assoc. (RE: public education and ongoing involvement): See comment regarding education program in Appendix B, Initiative 1.1. Partnerships as described will also be developed through the implementation of individual RGS actions, for example, the designation and planning for major centres at the municipal level. The legislation sets out clear requirements for public consultation in the review and update of the RGS.</p> <p>Camosun Community Assoc. (RE: accountability references in plans for regional environmental services, criteria behind each performance target, add more targets): Implementation action V refers to the statutory requirement for all CRD programs, bylaws,</p>

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference specific commitment to ongoing public involvement in RGS process including 5-year updates. - Add program of ongoing public education. - Publish information on the criteria behind each performance target. - Expand the number of performance targets that contribute to community completeness, livability, environmental health and others. <p>Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommend that RGS reviews require same degree of sign-off as initial RGS. - Monitoring plans, administration, and budgets need to be agreed upon in process to approve RGS and with full public consultation. - Not clear why 2 years is required to agree on regional context statements. <p>Alan Philip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need appeal mechanism regarding municipal policy changes that may contradict RGS. <p>L.G. Dalzell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipalities should be able to make development decisions without interference of other municipalities - otherwise, might as well amalgamate. <p>Norman Mogensen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor the counter trends such as loss of valuable natural habitat not in protected areas, residential and commercial development in rural areas as a percentage of all development. 	<p>spending and policy to be consistent with the RGS. Initiative 2.2 actions 1 and 6 also address this concern. RPS is preparing a report on the process to identify performance targets for the RGS. Additional targets may be arise for community completeness, livability and environmental health following implementation of some of the actions in these areas, either through an interim update following monitoring of the actions, or through the 5-year statutory update.</p> <p>Assoc. for the Protection of Rural Metchosis: See staff report for discussion of process to amend and update the RGS. Process to develop a monitoring program for the RGS is scheduled to take approximately one year. If monitoring program must be reviewed in tandem with draft RGS bylaw, possible adoption of the RGS is put back by at least one more year. The Act gives member municipalities 2 years to prepare regional context statements following adoption of the RGS, although it may not require this much time in all or any cases.</p> <p>Alan Philip, L.G. Dalzell: See staff report for discussion on process to amend and update the RGS.</p> <p>Norman Mogensen (RE: monitor counter trends): 20. <u>Recommendation:</u> Refer comments to process to develop RGS monitoring program.</p>
Map 3 - Growth Management Concept Plan	<p>Van Isle Tree Farms Ltd.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove trail link that crosses our two private forest land parcels in the FLR on Humpback Rd. and Sooke Rd. - Remove the identification of our private forest lands as Capital Green Lands as it creates the expectation of unrestricted public access. - Do not include our lands from within the conceptual boundary for the Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt. 	<p>Van Isle Tree Farms Ltd.: Concur with all comments. See staff report for recommendation regarding removal of FLR lands from Capital Green Lands designation, and Appendix B recommendations 26 and 27 regarding map amendments to the regional trail network and the Sea to Sea Green/Blue Belt boundary to address the concerns on these points.</p>
Map 4 - Regional Green/Blue Spaces System	<p>Camosun Community Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add a greenway connection from the Hillside Mall Major Centre to the larger regional network of parks and trails - the Bowker Creek Corridor is one of several possible connections. <p>Wagon Train Estates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct mapping error showing manufactured home park as sensitive ecosystem at the north end tip of Florence Lake. 	<p>Camosun Community Assoc.: See recommendation 7 above.</p> <p>Wagon Train Estates (RE: mapping error): See Appendix B, recommendation 28. 21. <u>Recommendation:</u> Include in general process to revise sensitive ecosystem protection policy area mapping, noted in Appendix B, recommendation 28.</p>
Table 1 - Population, Dwelling Unit and		

Proposed RGS Component	Comments & Recommendations Received	Staff Comments & Recommended Actions
Employment Forecast		
Table 2 - Metropolitan Core and Major Centre Performance Guidelines		
Table 3 - Summary of Targets by Priority Area and Strategic Initiative		
Appendix A - Regional Vision	L.G. Dalzell: – Disagree with vision for Metchosin.	L.G. Dalzell: This point has not been raised by Metchosin council.
Appendix B - Guiding Principles		
Appendix C - Green/Blue Spaces Vision		
Appendix D - Glossary		