

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT

Staff Report to the Regional Planning Committee
Meeting of Wednesday, September 19, 2001

SUBJECT:

Responses to the Board's Pre-Bylaw Referral of the Proposed Regional Growth Strategy

BACKGROUND:

Nov. 8, 2000: The Board authorizes Regional Planning Services (RPS) to prepare a draft Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) and to circulate it to member councils for review and comment prior to the introduction of the RGS bylaw for 1st and 2nd reading.

Feb. 28, 2001: The Board authorizes publication and distribution of *A Proposed Regional Growth Strategy for BC's Capital Region* for pre-bylaw review and comment to the end of July, 2001.

Mar 28, 2001: The Board authorizes initiation of projects to develop a regional transportation strategy, a regional housing strategy, and a regional economic development strategy and allocates funds from the 2001 RGS contingency budget as a CRD share of each project cost. The Board further authorizes staff to enter into discussions with others to develop partnership agreements to undertake the three projects.

Aug 8, 2001: The Board tables a RPC motion (to approve funding for the economic development, housing affordability and transportation strategies prior to the Board receiving all the input and committee recommendations on the proposed RGS) until after the Chairman has met with Minister Abbott, and it has had an opportunity to discuss responses to the RGS pre-bylaw referral.

DISCUSSION:

Comments on *A Proposed Regional Growth Strategy for BC's Capital Region* were received from the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area director and all member councils. Other local government organizations that submitted comments included the Cowichan Valley Regional District and CRD Parks. Four ministries (Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services; Ministry of Transportation; Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries; Ministry of Energy and Mines) and the Land Reserve Commission responded for the province. Twenty-four individual responses were received as well as ten from community organizations. No comments were received from any federal ministry or agency, First Nation, or School Board.

Attachment A - *Comments Received on the Pre-Bylaw Referral of a Proposed Regional Growth Strategy for BC's Capital Region* - includes all of the comments received. Attachment B presents the specific comments and recommendations received by member councils and other public bodies, organized by the component of the Proposed RGS to which they refer, along with staff comments and recommendations. Attachment C does the same for comments received from community organizations and individuals.

Council Comments on the Proposed RGS - General Comments

The first section of Attachment B presents a summary of council comments on the overall proposed RGS. The following table summarizes the general positions taken by member councils on the proposed RGS.

Resolution to Support proposed RGS in principle	Resolution to Support RGS Concept(s) but not as currently proposed	Comments Only	Resolution to take no position or withhold comment	Do not support RGS as currently proposed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District of Central Saanich • Township of Esquimalt • District of Oak Bay • District of Saanich 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District of Metchosin • Town of Sidney 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Victoria • District of Highlands • Town of View Royal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Colwood • District of Langford 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District of North Saanich • District of Sooke • JDF Electoral Area Director

Staff Comments and Recommendations on the Major Points Raised

In addition to specific comments and recommendations made in Attachment B and C, Regional Planning Services has the following comments and recommendations on 13 issues raised in points made by member councils and others as referenced in the Attachments and indicated below in round brackets.

ISSUE 1: Definition of Proposed Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area (UC&S) and Related Targets

Points Raised:

- 1) Amend the boundary to: remove all areas in North Saanich from the UC&S policy area (North Saanich); exclude lands identified as Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area (SEPP) in Skirt Mt. Area of Langford from UC&S policy area (Highlands); include lands near Thetis Lake within the UC&S policy area (Victoria); oppose inclusion of lands north of Thetis Lake within UC&S policy area (Highlands, Parfitt); or decrease the overall size of the UC&S policy area to leave some areas of urban reserve for post -2026 development (Eco-Research Chair, Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosis (APRM), Mogensen).
- 2) Clarify objective V (Metchosis) and either scrap it as possibly encouraging growth in rural areas beyond 1996 OCP planned capacities (APRM), or set the target even higher (Mogensen).
- 3) Tie the size of an UC&S policy area in Sooke (action 6) to the existing Highway 14 lane space capacity (APRM).

Staff Comments:

The effort to define the UC&S policy area began with the work in 1998 to develop the *Framework for Our Future Agreement*. Map 2 in the Framework Agreement shows as a general land use concept for the development of the RGS, an urban/suburban area derived from the OCPs of member municipalities. Using the 1995 *Urban Capacity Inventory* as the data source, all lands described as detached & duplex residential, commercial, industrial, and new neighbourhood were mapped as urban/suburban, which represented the first cut at defining the footprint of the future urban containment area. In North Saanich for example, this meant that residential lots in Deep Cove and along Lands End Road, as well as the Victoria International Airport property, were included in the area mapped urban/suburban.

This area was further refined through council discussions of the draft RGS options. In this case, the proposed urban containment area was mapped more precisely. In the example of North Saanich, significant areas were removed from the proposed urban containment area at the direction of North Saanich council, including residential areas in Deep Cove, along Lands End Road, and in the Dean Park area. As well, other lands in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) on or adjacent to the airport were also excluded.

The lands that remain within the proposed UC&S policy area in North Saanich, include: the residential areas in Dean Park and between McTavish Rd and the south boundary of Sidney, the Victoria International Airport and Institute of Ocean Sciences lands, and the Swartz Bay Ferry terminal and adjacent residential area to the south. In Attachment B with reference to Map 3, Sidney points to lands owned by Victoria International Airport that are within the ALR. These lands should be excluded from the UC&S policy area. The remaining areas, with the notable exception of the airport lands, are similar in development character to nearby areas in Sidney and Central Saanich that are identified within the UC&S policy area. However, removing them from UC&S policy area would not be inconsistent with the overall objectives of the RGS, as additional growth beyond existing OCP capacity levels is not proposed for North Saanich. Removing Victoria International Airport from the UC&S policy is not recommended, due to its status as a regionally significant transportation facility and due to its important role in the regional economy.

Regarding the lands in the Skirt Mountain area of Langford, the discussion on Issue 9 clarifies that both rural and urban lands can have identified unprotected green space value that should be considered as lands are developed, with an aim to preserving a significant portion of these lands. As recommended below, local government would make efforts to preserve significant portions of these areas for their greenspace values through the development planning and approval process, whether the lands are inside the UC&S policy area or not.

View Royal council notes in its comments that it will determine a position on whether the lands north of Thetis Lake should be inside the UC&S policy area after a public hearing. The process to develop the RGS to date has operated on the principle that each municipality should define its own development vision as a contribution to the overall regional pattern. To be consistent with this principle, View Royal would determine the location of the UC&S policy area boundary within its jurisdiction.

While the capacity of Highway 14 may be a factor in the eventual determination of the UC&S policy area in Sooke, in recognition of the partnership and agreement seeking focus of the RGS, it would be inappropriate to single it out as a predetermined limiting factor at the outset.

Options:

- A. Exclude all lands in North Saanich from the UC&S policy area.
- B. Exclude all lands from the UC&S policy area in North Saanich, except for the non-ALR portions of Victoria International Airport.
- C. Obtain clarification from View Royal on the location of the UC&S policy area boundary in its jurisdiction.

Recommendations:

- 1. Amend Map 3 as proposed in Option B.**
- 2. Request clarification from View Royal on the appropriate location of the UC&S policy area boundary within View Royal.**

ISSUE 2: Buffering and Land Use Transition to the Proposed UC&S Boundary

Points Raised:

- 1) Require land use transition zones or buffering on the urban side of the boundary (Metchosin, Eisenhower).
- 2) Buffer green space areas either outside (Metchosin) or within park or green space areas (Dalzell).

Staff Comments:

Initiative 1.2 action 1, proposes that member municipalities and the CRD agree to establish policies in OCPs that buffer ALR, Forest Land Reserve (FLR), and Capital Green Lands areas from activities in adjacent urban areas. In keeping with the general principle that the RGS is a partnership agreement, where partners identify a common vision, principles and objectives but retain the right to determine how best to implement these locally, any region-wide buffering standard would have to be agreed to by all member municipalities. Regarding the second point, it is general practice that when buffers are provided to protect parks, ecological reserve or other landscape values, that the buffering is located adjacent to and outside the lands for which buffering is sought. This is consistent as well with the recommendations and practice of the Land Reserve Commission with regard to agricultural area plans.

Options:

- A. Leave Initiative 1.2 - action 1 as it is.
- B. Request the Intergovernmental Advisory Committee (IAC) to identify land use transition and buffer guidelines for inclusion in the draft RGS bylaw.

Recommendation:

- 3. Option A - leave Initiative 1.2 - action 1 as it is.**

ISSUE 3: Extension of Sewer and Water Services Beyond the Proposed UC&S Boundary

Points Raised:

Those respondents who commented on action 5 either suggested that its implications needed to be explored further (Saanich, Dalzell) or generally argued in favour of permitting, at least under a broader range of conditions, the extension of sewer and water services beyond the proposed UC&S boundary:

- 1) Allow water hook ups for agricultural irrigation and for parcels provided for in 1996 OCPs or zoning (Metchosin, Sidney, APRM) or to solve environmental problems (Sidney).
- 2) Separate urban containment from servicing policy areas (North Saanich, Sooke), let liquid waste management plans guide the definition of servicing areas (North Saanich), provide services wherever feasible (Sooke, JDF EA Director),

Staff Comments:

A common growth management technique is to use urban containment boundaries combined with concurrency policies to control the pace and pattern of growth. Concurrency means that development areas are not expanded in advance of infrastructure to serve proposed development. Typically this involves tying the expansion of an urban containment area to the ability to provide sewer and water infrastructure to the area proposed for inclusion. The aim is to prevent scattered, leap-frog development and to create contiguous urban areas that can be serviced efficiently and affordably.

In some jurisdictions the urban containment boundary is regularly expanded to take in more rural land according to a pre-set timetable and minimum lot-supply standards. The proposed RGS on the other hand, calls for the long term durability of the UC&S boundary, with the bulk of future growth (whether great or small) locating within relatively fixed limits. Under these conditions, a policy of concurrence is less critical, since the aim of the strategy is that rural areas remain rural and not stand as a reserve of lands earmarked for future urban development. The risk remains however, that sewer and water service extensions into rural areas could establish the conditions for future urban growth, if additional infrastructure capacity is built-in over and above that needed to service a rural scale of development. One way to prevent this is to use regulatory measures, servicing agreements and restrictive covenants to limit service hook-ups to rural land use levels and densities only.

Options:

- A. Expand the range of exceptions to Initiative 1.1, action 5 to include agriculture irrigation and to solve environmental problems.
- B. Request the IAC to identify appropriate language for inclusion in action 5 that would permit sewer and water service extensions beyond the UC&S policy area on the condition that services extended would be sufficient to provide for the needs of rural development densities only.
- C. Amend Initiative 1.1 and the balance of the RGS to define a Regional Urban Containment Policy Area that makes no reference to servicing, letting liquid waste management plans guide the definition of servicing areas.

Recommendation:

4. Amend Initiative 1.1 as proposed in Option B.

ISSUE 4: Definition, Description and Criteria for Major Centres

Points Raised:

- 1) Amend the size of an identified major centre: include the business area north of the Trans-Canada Highway (TCH) in the Langford major centre (Langford); map the metropolitan core as a fading circle rather than a street defined polygon (Victoria).
- 2) Add a new major centre: identify a major centre focused at the intersection of McKenzie & Quadra (Saanich).
- 3) Clarify that identification as a major doesn't mean redevelopment, changes will be detailed in local policy (Victoria).

Staff Comments:

The major centres identified in the proposed RGS do not describe all employment or mixed residential/commercial centres in the Capital Region. The proposed Metropolitan Core and eight major centres identify only those centres where additional effort would be made to focus future growth beyond what current OCPs may define. The strategy proposed is to continue the development of these centres into mixed-use, relatively high-density, walkable centres that are compact enough to be well served by public transit, walking and cycling. In essence, the metro core and major centres are proposed as the downtowns of the region. A further purpose is to

develop a series of centres between downtown Victoria and the Goldstream Avenue/CanWest major centre in Langford, that could over time be linked by high capacity public transit running in an exclusive right-of-way.

Extending the Langford Centre north of the Trans-Canada Highway would be inconsistent with this general strategy for two reasons:

- a) The business park and speciality wholesale areas north of the TCH would extend the Langford centre approximately 1500 metres north, giving the entire centre a linear extent of approximately 3 kilometres, not a walkable distance under the major centre guidelines proposed in RGS Table 2. This means that it would take a healthy adult approximately 40 minutes to walk from the south end of the centre to the north end, rather than approximately 20 minutes as currently proposed.
- b) The designation of the area north of the TCH within the Langford major centre would imply the eventual conversion of this newly developed area into a mixed-use, high-density residential-commercial area, including the conversion of parking lot areas into structured parking and residential and other higher density infill development. It is unlikely that market conditions will be ripe for this sort of conversion in the area north of the TCH within the RGS planning horizon.

Leaving the area north of the TCH out of the Langford major centre would in no way prevent the continued development of this area as an business park and speciality wholesale/retail district.

Changing the metropolitan core depiction on map 3 from a street bound polygon to a circle with a 1000 metre radius centred on Douglas Street/View Street would be consistent with the graphical depiction of other centres proposed on the map. It would also be consistent with the general principle that the aim is to define a metro core and major centres that are walkable. This would however, result in the elimination of the secondary area of the metro centre, which would decrease the potential resident population that could be accommodated adjacent to the metro core. The overall effect would be a less prominent focus on downtown Victoria in the proposed RGS from what was envisaged in the proceedings of the Second Regional Summit.

In this context, the addition of another major centre at Quadra/MacKenzie may be advisable if the secondary area currently proposed for the Metropolitan core is not approved. There is an existing commercial/service core at Quadra/McKenzie and lands proposed for redevelopment. The development of a mixed-use, pedestrian friendly centre has also been the subject of discussion for this area by Saanich council. As well, RPS concurs with Victoria's suggestion to make a clarification to the text to highlight that actual centre configuration, densities and other detailed planning will be done through municipal planning processes.

Options:

- A. Extend the Langford major centre north to include the business/speciality wholesale area north of the TCH.
- B. Keep the Langford major center as currently defined.
- C. Keep the Metropolitan Core as currently defined.
- D. Eliminate the secondary area from the Metropolitan Core and depict it as a circle with a 1000 metre radius on Map 3.
- E. Add a major centre to Map 3 at McKenzie/Quadra in Saanich.

Recommendations:

- 5. Amend the RGS as proposed in Option D and Option E.**
- 6. Amend the RGS to add a text clarification that detailed planning and development guidelines and zoning will be determined in local planning and development approval processes.**

ISSUE 5: Minimum Lot Size in Rural/Rural Residential Policy Area

Points Raised:

- 1) A 0.2 hectare minimum lot size in the rural/rural residential policy area is too small (Metchosin, Saanich, Sooke, Otter Point Shirley Residents and Ratepayers Assoc., Comosun Community Assoc.).
- 2) Rural minimum lot size should be set higher (Mogensen, Mitchell).
- 3) Reference to 0.2 hectare minimum lot size should be deleted in favour of a reference to OCP limits (Metchosin, Sooke), or placed in the glossary (Highlands).

Staff Comments:

The reference on page 5 to a minimum lot size no less than 0.2 hectares is not proposed as a policy or a goal. Rather it reflects the criterion that was used in developing the Framework Agreement and the RGS Options to separate the proposed urban containment area from rural and

rural residential areas. No reference to this figure is needed in the text or the glossary, as the rural/rural residential policy area is defined not by this minimum lot size figure, but rather by the area defined as such on Map 3, and by the rural/rural residential designations in OCPs.

RPS does not agree with the suggestion that there should be a higher minimum lot size for the rural/rural residential area. There is no need to define a region-wide minimum lot size for the rural/rural residential policy area as the basic agreement proposed is set out clearly in Initiative 1.2 - Action 2: "...to generally limit rural subdivision and development to 1996 designated capacity levels."

Recommendation:

- 7. Delete on page 5, the words "...with a minimum lot size no less than 0.2 hectares.", from the text description for the rural/rural residential policy area.**

ISSUE 6: Development in Rural Areas Beyond the UC&S Policy Area Boundary

Points Raised:

Two points were raised regarding cluster development in rural areas:

- 1) For small lot areas use cluster development to protect contiguous tracts of forest and farmland (Highlands).
- 2) Allow cluster development outside the UC&S policy area if 50% of the parent site is kept for dedicated park or amenity area (Langford).

Staff Comments:

Both points propose reasonable and creative approaches to developing land in rural areas to maintain rural landscape character, environmental amenity and resource values. If the overall developed densities in cluster developments remain within the proposed 1996 OCP designated capacity limits, then either approach would be consistent with the proposed RGS. If moderate density bonusing is used to encourage cluster development, this would still seem to be consistent with the language in Initiative 1.2 - action 2, which refers to "generally" limiting rural subdivision and development to 1996 designated capacity levels.

Options:

- A. Remove the ambiguity from the text by deleting the word "generally" from Initiative 1.2 - action 2. This would make it clear that whether cluster or conventional development

approaches are followed, the agreement is to remain within the 1996 designated capacity levels.

- B. Leave Initiative 1.2 - action 2 as is but add a sentence stating that density bonusing provisions could be used to achieve landscape protection goals and would be defined by each municipality in its regional context statement.

Recommendation:

8. Amend Initiative 1.2 - action 2 as proposed in Option B.

ISSUE 7: Update of Rural OCPs

Points Raised:

Director Henson recommends allowing updates to OCPs in the electoral area prior to their incorporation into the RGS, perhaps by adding a 7th action under Initiative 1.1 (similar to action 6 for Sooke). This would enable the electoral area to define new community visions for its OCP areas, setting out development capacities perhaps greater than 1996 or current designated capacity limits, for acceptance into the RGS through an interim amendment.

Staff Comments:

The RGS is based on the fundamental notion that for the long-term future, whatever the level of growth that occurs in the Capital Region, it should be accommodated not by the outward expansion of the footprint of urban development, but largely through infill and reinvestment in existing urban areas. This general proposal would keep rural areas rural, and ensure the construction of the greatest share (90%) of new residential development within a durable urban containment boundary. Rural/rural residential areas would not remain frozen from change but that whatever development does occur would respect a long-term rural vision. Setting the density limit for rural areas at the level permitted by 1996 OCP designations is the mechanism currently proposed to achieve this goal.

There are many ways to design rural developments to permit increases in density without necessarily detracting from the overall rural character of a place. Cluster development that results in the preservation of large tracts of farm and forest-land is one approach that may very well offer net benefits even with density increases. As well, resorts and recreational cottage developments are traditional features of the rural landscape in British Columbia, even if individual lot sizes are small, or the intensity of use on a given parcel is relatively great. What remains unclear in the Capital Region, is whether rural areas in the new electoral area have experienced (or have current

planned capacities for) a level of residential and other development that threatens to transform their fundamentally rural character. A related question is what level of additional density increase in the electoral area would effectively result in urban sprawl, the prevention of which is a clear goal of the legislation and the proposed RGS.

Currently, the electoral area falls under the direct planning jurisdiction of the CRD. Under the legislation, the regional district must be consistent with the RGS it adopts in all its activities including planning and development. If the RGS is adopted as currently proposed, that would mean that the CRD would be required by law to plan and manage development in the electoral area in a manner that ensures its long term rural future. The current discussion regarding the future governance structure for the electoral area, however, along with its status as a new electoral area following the incorporation of the District of Sooke, seem to provide reasonable grounds to extend to it the provision afforded Sooke in action 6.

Options:

- A. Take no action to address this issue.
- B. Add a 7th action to Initiative 1.1 to permit OCPs in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area to be updated within two-years of the adoption of the RGS, in a manner that maintains the long-term rural vision for the electoral area, and is co-ordinated with Sooke's implementation of action 6 for those local planning areas that abut the District of Sooke.
- C. Add a 7th action as proposed in Option B with the condition that overall development capacity levels within OCP areas remain within the general limits established for the area on the date the RGS is adopted, while permitting the inclusion of development right transfer policies within the updated OCP.

Recommendation:

9. Amend Initiative 1.1 as proposed in Option B.

ISSUE 8: Definition of Capital Green Lands Policy Area

Points Raised:

- 1) Remove renewable resource lands from the Capital Green Lands Policy Area: describing lands in the FLR and the ALR as Capital Green Lands, obscures their working landscape quality and implies that they are earmarked for future park use (Land Reserve Commission; Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services, Ministry of Energy & Mines,

Van Isle Tree Farms Ltd.).

- 2) Include a clearer vision and more specific statements regarding economic opportunity on FLR and ALR lands (LRC, MCAWS, ME&M).

Staff Comments:

Concur and propose inclusion of a 5th policy area designation under Initiative 1.1 and on Map 3 to address these points.

Recommendations:

10. Amend the Capital Green Lands Policy Area designation under Initiative 1.1 and on Map 3 to include major parks, ecological reserves, and CRD Water lands only.

11. Add a 5th policy category under Initiative 1.1 entitled "Renewable Resource Lands Policy Area" to include all lands within the ALR, the FLR, crown forest land, stressing the long term use of these lands as renewable resource and working landscapes.

12. Amend Map 3 to include the proposed "Renewable Resource Lands" designation.

ISSUE 9: Definition of Sensitive Ecosystem Protection (SEPP) Policy Area

Points Raised:

- 1) Municipalities and landowners face the loss of tax revenue and development opportunity on SEPP area lands and consideration should be given to compensating landowners for their loss (Sooke).
- 2) Change the title to "Unprotected Green Space Policy Area" (Langford).
- 3) Postpone updating the Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory mapping on which the SEPP area is based until new information has been received from the CRD Resource Atlas project (North Saanich).

Staff Comments:

The Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area is an overlay policy designation, highlighting

the ecological values of the underlying lands and waters as identified in the Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory (SEI) and the Regional Green/Blue Spaces Strategy (RGBSS). It does not replace either Rural/Rural Residential or UC&S policy area base designations, but simply identifies important ecological values of the lands identified. These are lands designated in local OCPs either for urban or rural development and use, that have ecological values that the RGBSS defines as regionally significant (termed unprotected green space core areas) and worthy of consideration for some level of protection or preservation. These lands are either in private or public ownership.

The proposed RGS recommends that as these lands are considered for development, that municipalities and the regional district recognize the regional significance of their ecological values, and protect as much of these lands as seems reasonable, aiming for an overall minimum target of 50% protection. Protection can occur through the outright acquisition of key sites (in which case private landowners would be paid for their land) through the processes of planning and development approval or from bequests. In this case, site planning, density transfer and clustering policies could be used to tailor development in such a way that the portions of sites with highest ecological value can be preserved, while permitting landowners to profit and local government to realize property tax revenues.

Changing the title to "Unprotected Green Space Policy Area" has the advantage of highlighting the currently unprotected status of the ecological values of these lands. If this proposed policy is adopted into the RGS and implemented, monitoring should reveal a net decrease in these lands over time and a corresponding increase in lands with protected green space status. Concur that CRD Resource Atlas data should be used to update the SEI mapping.

Recommendation:

13. Change the title under Initiative 1.1 and the legend on Maps 3 and 4 from "Sensitive Ecosystem Protection Policy Area" to "Unprotected Green Space Policy Area".

ISSUE 10: Protection Targets for SEPP Area

Points Raised:

- 1) Remove 80% target and 50% targets and replace with policy that green space values be taken into account during local planning for SEPP areas (Langford).
- 2) Base target of 50% protection is too low (Mogensen) and should be increased either to 70%

with a focus on the protection actions of each municipality (Metchosin), 85% (Eco-Research Chair) or set at 50% for 2016 and 100% for 2026 (Camosun Community Assoc).

Staff Comments:

The proposed RGS contains a target to protect from development 50% of lands the RGBSS defines as *Unprotected Green Space Core Areas*. This target is proposed as reasonable and achievable given that much of these lands are privately held and have existing development rights of one kind or another. A more ambitious target is proposed for lands within 500 metres of the proposed UC&S boundary, in an effort to establish a green space buffer along the boundary over time. There are problems apparent with both of these targets as currently stated.

First, the text on page 7 proposes trying to protect 50% of the defined lands (and 80% of the lands within 500 metres of the UC&S boundary) *from development* by 2016. As currently worded, this is highly ambitious. Many landowners may not want to develop their lands by 2016 leaving outright acquisition the only viable way for local government to achieve the target, which implies willing sellers even if local government could afford to purchase lands on this scale. The same problem arises in the case of public lands. The federal government for example, may not wish to either develop or transfer lands with unprotected green space values within the time frame.

With regard to the 80% target, the first problem is compounded by the fact that the most rare and valuable lands may not be in the vicinity of the proposed UC&S boundary. Trying to achieve this target would have the effect of distorting implementation of the policy (and misallocating scarce resources and public effort) to achieve an objective (buffering the UC&S boundary) secondary to the policy.

The aim of this policy proposal is to encourage local government, through their planning and development management activities, and through careful purchases, negotiations with other levels of government or through the receipt of bequests, to protect currently unprotected core green space areas as opportunities arise. As such, staff concur with Langford's recommendation with the exception that agreement should be reached on a reasonable target (perhaps 50%, perhaps more) for use in local planning and development approvals processes.

Options:

- A. Amend the text on page 7 to emphasize trying to achieve a target of 50% protection as lands are approved for development through local planning and development approval processes.
- B. Option A with target increased to 70%.

Recommendations:

14. Delete target to protect 80% of unprotected core green space area within 500 metres of the proposed UC&S boundary on page 7 and from Table 3.

15. Amend Initiative 2.1 as proposed in Option A.

ISSUE 11: Review of Long Term Strategic Resource Needs

Points Raised:

- 1) Municipalities have the right to regulate quarries within their jurisdiction (Metchosin, APRM).
- 2) Need to seriously address upcoming aggregate shortage (LRC, MCAWS) perhaps through an aggregate resource management plan (ME&M).
- 3) Action could be costly and negatively affect municipalities (Central Saanich).
- 4) Reference the Capital Health Region in Initiative 2.2 - action 5 (Victoria).
- 5) Give greater attention to local food production (MAFF)

Staff Comments:

Concur with comments 1, 2, 4, and 5. Unclear regarding the negative affects on municipalities in point 3. With regard to proposal for an aggregate resource management plan consideration of this idea could be specifically included for evaluation in the terms of reference for the study to implement action 5, within a regulatory context that respects the rights of municipalities to regulate quarries within their limits.

Recommendation:

16. Amend Initiative 2.2 - action 5 to incorporate suggestions made in points 1, 2, 4, and 5.

ISSUE 12: Process to Amend RGS Including the Proposed UC&S Policy Area Boundary

Points Raised:

- 1) Municipalities should be able to define and amend the UC&S boundary independently

(Langford, Sooke, Littlejohn, Dalzell)

- 2) Allow changes to the UC&S boundary at any time (View Royal), identify triggers and clarify process for amendment (View Royal, Metchosin).
- 3) Permit changes to the UC&S boundary only through process of comprehensive review agreed to be all with the same degree of sign-off as required for original RGS (Eco-Research Chair, APRM).
- 4) Ensure meaningful participation by other municipalities in the definition of the UC&S boundary in Sooke (Metchosin).
- 5) Keep the UC&S policy area boundary in place for more than 25 years, with recognition of need for occasional minor changes (Mitchell).

Staff Comments:

The proposed RGS envisages the identification of an UC&S Policy Area that has long term durability and that would be subject to infrequent amendment, and only as the outcome of a comprehensive 5 - year review of the RGS. This would ensure a degree of stability in the location of the boundary, ensure that all proposed amendments are considered in the same regional context, and would enable all member municipalities a role in agreeing to amendments to the boundary.

Beyond this specific proposed agreement, any member council or the Board could propose changes to the balance of the proposed RGS at any time. However, changes to the RGS can only occur with the assent of the other parties to the agreement (the CRD and all member municipalities) following the process defined under the Act. This includes the requirement for public hearing, statutory referral for acceptance, sign off and if necessary, dispute resolution to reach agreement.

Although the proposed RGS does not set out a process to define issues or events that could trigger a review or set propose a way to administer this process, it does propose doing so in Implementation action II, through the preparation and adoption of a Master Implementation Agreement. The IAC could be asked to define principles for the Master Implementation Agreement that could be circulated to member councils and the public following 2nd reading of the RGS bylaw.

Options:

- A. Request IAC to identify and propose principles for the preparation of the Master Implementation Agreement proposed in Implementation action II, for consideration of

Regional Planning Committee and the Board for circulation as information along with the RGS bylaw following 2nd reading.

- B. Maintain the proposal not to amend the UC&S policy area boundary except as an outcome of a comprehensive 5 -year review of the RGS as set out in Initiative 1.1 - action 2.
- C. Delete Initiative 1.1 - action 2 thereby allowing initiation of proposals to amend the UC&S policy area boundary at any time.

Recommendations:

17. Endorse Option A and Option B.

ISSUE 13: Financial Implications of Implementation

Points Raised:

- 1) Need to clarify costs to implement strategy (Sooke, View Royal) and priority of actions.
- 2) Include section on financial implications for each municipality and that actions will be subject to individual council review in the context of annual budgets (Langford).

Staff Comments:

The staff comment in Attachment B (RE: financial impacts of RGS...) proposes that the IAC could be asked to investigate, estimate and report on the financial implications for all member municipalities and the CRD of implementing the RGS. This could include a request to report on the appropriate priority of actions for implementation. This information could be prepared as a technical report that could be circulated to member councils at the time of the statutory referral of the RGS bylaw after 2nd reading. Including this technical background information of this sort is not appropriate in a broad policy document such as a RGS.

Recommendation:

- 18. Direct the IAC to investigate, estimate and report on the financial implications for all member municipalities and the CRD of implementing the RGS and to report also on the priority of implementation actions, for circulation with the RGS bylaw after 2nd reading.**

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Planning Committee recommend to the Board that:

1. Recommendations 1 - 18 included in the body of this report be approved;
2. Recommendations 1 - 33 inclusive in Attachment B to this report be approved;
3. Recommendations 1 - 21 inclusive in Attachment C to this report be approved; and,
4. That *A Proposed Regional Growth Strategy for BCs Capital Region*, revised as approved, be prepared as a draft bylaw for the consideration of the Regional Planning Committee.

Mark Hornell, MCIP
Director - Regional Planning Services

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

W.M. Jordan, Executive Director