



MEMO

TO: Ken Cossey, Planner-Administrator
Electoral Area Planning Services

FROM: Mark Hornell
Director – Regional Planning Services

DATE: April 18, 2005

RE: Public Hearing Report on Bylaw No. 3238 East
Sooke Official Community Plan (Your file: Z-
01-03; RPS File: 11.8.1.14.3)

I've reviewed your report in light of the four recommendations made by Regional Planning Committee on January 19, 2005, subsequently carried by the Board on January 26, 2005. My comments follow in turn:

Resolution 1: Include reference to the RGS as outlined in the January 19, 2005 RPS staff report.

Comment: The proposed additions to section 2.4 provide specific reference to all RGS strategic initiatives except to initiative 2.2 (Manage Natural Resources and the Environment Sustainably). I suggest adding some language to this section that identifies how the OCP works toward the four principles of sustainability noted in initiative 2.2.

Resolution 2: Include direction in the settlement area policies regarding the scale or density of overall residential development anticipated in settlement areas.

Comment: The proposed additions to section 2.4 and section 4.1.1 include direction regarding residential development density both within and without proposed settlement areas, as recommended in the resolution.

Resolution 3: Identify, as areas to be included with the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area (RUCSPA) through a CRD initiated RGS amendment following approval of the OCP, any settlement containment areas for which servicing with regional water or sewer services is anticipated in the next five years.

Comment: The proposed additions to section 4.7.2 (specifically, sub-heading 3) identifies all 10 proposed settlement containment areas as areas to be included within the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area. The proposed wording

identifies a public water servicing phasing sequence for these areas, but does not indicate which areas would be receive water in the next five years. As well, the proposed text does not address the question of any sewer services that may be anticipated in the next five years, if any. I suggest including some language related to this timing matter, as well as the question of whether sewer service is anticipated in any of the containment areas in the next five years as well. This could be written in the context of a policy statement limiting amendments to the containment area designations only as part of a comprehensive 5-year review of the RGS, as noted in RGS initiative 1.1, action 2.

Resolution 4: Include policy guidelines that address those situations where regional water service could be extended outside the RUCSPA to address the exceptional conditions noted in the RGS (human and environmental health, fire suppression or agriculture) and in particular, policy guidelines for any wildfire hazard mitigation strategy recommendations related to the extension of regional water services.

Comment: The wording proposed for section 4.7.2 sub 3 directly quotes RGS initiative 1.1 action 5. I suggest changing this proposed wording to delete reference to member municipalities, and rephrasing it to provide specific policy direction to be used in conjunction with other sections of the OCP, in particular, section 4.11.7. The wording currently proposed states the general exemption in the RGS, but doesn't give guidance on how to use this exemption when presented with a request.

With regard to the recommendation for a second public hearing following amendment and second reading, Regional Planning Committee will need to review the revised bylaw 3238 prior to the second public hearing. The next scheduled date for Regional Planning Committee is Wednesday, May 18, 2005. Please let me know if recommendations 3 and 4 are approved, and I will schedule space to discuss this item on the May RPC agenda.

Thank-you,

Mark Hornell
Director of Regional Planning