
EAST SOOKE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW

REPORT ON NOVEMBER 22, 2014 OPEN HOUSE

As part of the East Sooke Official Community Plan Review (OCP), an Open House was held from 1:00 to 4 p.m. on Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at the East Sooke Fire Hall. Notices were sent to all residents of East Sooke who accept unaddressed flyers in their mailboxes. Approximately 35 people attended. A series of nine posters, each associated with a theme in the updated OCP were displayed. There was also one poster for Development Permit Areas (DPAs). Each poster listed the highlights of that particular theme and provided an overview of the Citizens' Committee's conversations, relevant tables and statistics. Posters to welcome participants, outline the OCP review process, highlight administrative changes and provide answers to "Frequently Asked Questions" were also on display.

A set of comment sheets was also prepared: one for each of the ten posters. The comment sheet provided similar information to what was on the poster for each theme. Open-ended questions were then asked. Most participants left their completed forms in the box provided but some took the sheets away to complete prior to November 29th, 2014. Nineteen responses were received. The comments have been transcribed in "Appendix A: Responses to Comment Sheets". There was very positive feedback on several of the solutions that the Committee developed. In particular, multi-use trails along East Sooke Road; a boat launch on the north side of East Sooke (Sooke Harbour/Basin); local access to health care ; and reducing reliance on the car through walking, cycling and improving transit ridership were all well-received.

Other activities at the Open House included a brief presentation on "What is an OCP?". After the presentation, the table top exercises started. Eleven people participated in the table top exercises, which focused on the Settlement & Local Economy Theme. The results of the table top exercises can be found in "Appendix B: Results of Roundtable Discussion." The exercise on Cottage Industry was completed but not the second exercise on the policies in the Settlement and Local Economy Theme. The results from the table top exercise have been integrated into the broader discussion of public feedback starting on the next page.

Copies of Rough Draft #2 of the OCP and the maps were available for attendees to read while sitting at tables. Attendees were encouraged to write their comments on these copies but none were received. It was observed that several people did spend considerable time going through the material.

Two planners were on hand to answer questions from the public about the draft OCP and displays. Most of the questions sought clarification on how current practice and policy would be affected by the new document, clarification on the updated mapping, clarification on the overall review process and how feedback on the updated OCP could be provided.

Discussion of Public Feedback by Theme with Recommendations to Committee

Theme: Ecological Health

Concern was expressed about Broad Objectives 412(A) and (B) dealing with the removal of gravel from watercourses and modification of stream channels. These two broad objectives were carried forward from the current OCP (policy statements 4.1 (7) and 4.1 (8). In the updated OCP, as specified by the *Local Government Act*, matters within the purview of senior government and outside the jurisdiction of the CRD, are stated as Broad Objectives instead of policies as decisions regarding “works in and about” water courses are made by the Province.

Recommendation #1: Discuss merit of keeping broad objectives 412 (A) and (B) in the OCP.

Several respondents stressed the need for stewardship and environmental planning including having the data necessary for planning and judging the success of stewardship. Many of the responsibilities for environmental stewardship and environmental planning lie with either the Province or with the CRDs Environmental Planning Department.

Recommendation #2: Add information regarding stewardship and data collection in section 310.

One respondent brought up the matter of incremental change and asked that information be included about there being a critical point at which development will begin to negatively affect the environment.

Enforcement of CRD recycling bylaws and closer monitoring of construction activities were raised but are outside the scope of the OCP.

Theme: Parks

There was extremely strong support for the policies regarding multi-use trails and an off-road trail network as well as strong support for a connection to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail for commuter and recreational use by cyclists. One respondent pointed out that East Sooke seniors must drive to reach the Goose instead of biking to it as it is unsafe to cycle along East Sooke Road to get to the Goose. This poses a challenge for some seniors who have difficulty loading/unloading bikes. Transporting bikes would also be a challenge for families.

Recommendation #3: In section 320, comment on the strong community support for both types of trails and describe the difficulties seniors and families have in accessing the Goose for biking.

Theme: Access to Water

There is definite support for a recreational boat launch on the north side of East Sooke. (The updated OCP recognizes the need for a separate planning process to either upgrade Anderson Cove or to identify an alternative site.) Some respondents were unsure about the impact of the Section 17 Land Use Designation on the future of Anderson Cove. In regard to the concerns raised about the oyster farm, it is not possible to address it in the OCP as the land is in ALR which means that the oyster farm is a permitted farm use.

Recommendation #4: Make the preference for Anderson Cove boat launch clearer in section 330 and add the concerns raised by the public about developing Anderson Cove. Also include the concerns about alternative sites such as bringing boat trailers along East Sooke Road.

Theme: Connectivity and Traffic

Again, very strong support for separated multi-use trails was expressed with only one respondent preferring widening of the road shoulders instead of trails. This strong community support for multi-use trails was recently discussed with a Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure representative who suggested that the preparation of a network plan for multi-use trails and developing servicing standards would complement the policies in the OCP and enable the Ministry to ask for this type of trail as a condition of development approvals.

Recommendation #5: In section 340, comment on the strong community support for trails and the need to develop a network plan and servicing standards. Also add a policy statement regarding the network plan and servicing standards to section 440.

Staff followed up on the concerns raised about road capacity and road safety with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure and were advised that to assess road capacity, traffic studies use a rating system which assigns grades from A to F based on wait times at intersections. Roads will only be considered at capacity when traffic studies give ratings of "D, E or F". Because there is a very short wait at intersections on East Sooke Road, none of the intersections along East Sooke Road would receive a low rating. A Ten Year Plan for road improvements is about to be released by the Province which can be checked to see if there are any plans for improvements to East Sooke Road. Road maintenance concerns and the respondents' suggestions for improvements were also passed along to the Ministry. The concerns about heavy truck traffic are outside the scope of the OCP Review process.

Recommendation #6: Add information to section 340 on how road capacity is determined.

Theme: Social Infrastructure

While the comments received were insightful and interesting, most were not about land use. The following information provided by the respondents suggesting ways to improve the social and culture of East Sooke can be added to section 350: art & culture programs in Metchosin, ways to assist seniors; and communal dining.

Recommendation #7: Add information from comment sheets to section 350.

Theme: Community Health

Support for a community meeting place was strong but there were differing viewpoints as to whether or not it could be in an existing building or if a new building was needed. There were no comments on land use in terms of a future location. Right now, the updated OCP comments on the need for a meeting place and notes the suitability of the fire hall's current location but acknowledges there must be a planning process separate from the OCP review process.

There were conflicting opinions about access to potable water. Some thought it would lead to development while others welcome it. Some respondents pointed out potential conflicts between the updated OCP and the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) but may not be aware that appropriately one-third of East Sooke is already in the CRD Water Service Area. In the draft Regional Sustainability Strategy (RSS), which will replace the RGS, policies have been included that support the provision of water to planned development recognizing that many areas of the CRD already have CRD water. (For further information see the RSS Draft October 2014 Page

105). For improvements to the water system, the concept of user pay was endorsed by respondents.

Recommendation #8: Add information on the compatibility of the updated OCP with the draft RSS and discuss the policy statements regarding CRD Water with the Citizens' Committee to make sure they are clear in the updated OCP.

Some respondents commented on emergency preparedness and fire smart. The comments regarding emergency preparedness will be forwarded to that department of the CRD. The OCP recommends formalizing an agreement to use the Search and Rescue Training base and the interest in this type of agreement has already been relayed to both the Coast Guard and the Emergency Preparedness representative for the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area.

Recommendation #9: Add comment about support for water DCCs to section 360.

Recommendation #10: Add comments on fire smart community to section 360.

Theme: Food Security

The background and policies were generally well-received. There is definitely support for local agriculture and a farmland protection buffer.

Theme: Settlement

This theme was the focus of the roundtable discussion. The feedback from that exercise has been integrated with the comments received in response to the poster display.

There are differing opinions Policy 484(A) which supports a density of one hectare per parcel in the Settlement Land Use Designation of East Sooke. Closely associated with the concern about an increase in density was the potential for an accelerated rate of development. The development potential over and above what is now possible was also of concern.

Recommendation #11: Consider ways to address the concerns about the rate of development in East Sooke in the OCP, for example, can the number of rezonings for the purposes of subdivision be restricted to a certain number of lots per year.

Recommendation #12: Provide a comparison between the current development potential under the existing zoning and OCP policies to what would be possible under the updated OCP policies for the Citizens' Committee to discuss.

There was some confusion amongst respondents about the relationship between the OCP and zoning. Some respondents thought that a policy supporting a density of one hectare per parcel in the OCP meant that all properties must have a minimum lot size of one hectare. This is not the case. While rezoning applications for a density of less than one hectare per parcel would not be supported, the minimum lot sizes can still be greater than one hectare. Properties with minimum lot sizes larger than one hectare will continue to have this smaller minimum lot size unless an application is made to rezone the property OR if new zoning bylaw is prepared. In which case, the one hectare minimum lot size will prevail. However, setbacks and lot coverages may or may not be affected in regards to one respondent's concern about legal non-conformity. The impact that the updated OCP will have on zoning is explained in section 209.

Recommendation #13: Improve the explanation in the updated OCP of the relationship between the minimum lot sizes and OCP policies.

Concerns were expressed that a one parcel per hectare density would prevent clustering of lots. This is not the case. Lot averaging would still be possible to allow smaller lots providing the average lot size respects a density of one parcel per hectare.

Recommendation #14: Make it clearer in the updated OCP that lot averaging and lot clustering will be possible.

One respondent was opposed to commercial marinas.

Recommendation #15: Confirm the Citizens' Committee viewpoint on commercial marinas.

The table top exercise focused on the policy regarding light or cottage industry. Generally speaking, participants were supportive of cottage industry providing it was made very clear what specific types of land uses and under what types of conditions that ~~general use~~ would be acceptable.
they

Recommendation #16: Change the wording from "light industry" to "cottage industry" and improve the wording in OCP policies to include detailed criteria for rezoning applications for cottage industries such as: small scale, non-polluting, no traffic generation, no noise to disturb neighbours, no customers coming to the business and buffering requirements.

Clustering of commercial land uses in the vicinity of the intersection of East Sooke and Gillespie Roads was supported. There was concern about directing future residential growth towards the Copper Mine neighbourhood as there would be an increase in traffic along East Sooke Road. Some respondents suggested residential growth be directed to Gillespie Road.

Recommendation #17: Discuss the differing opinions given by the public on directing residential growth to the Copper Mine area and decide if changes should be made to policy statement 484 (K).

Policies supportive of rezonings of Rural (A) zoned property for the purpose of subdivision instead of development as a building strata was not discussed in the table top exercise.

Recommendation #18: Discuss with the Citizens' Committee ways to gain insight into the public's opinions on the policies regarding Rural (A) zoning, for example, focus group discussion on Rural (A) with some of the table top exercise participants.

Theme: Climate Change

There was strong support for the Climate Change objectives and policies. One respondent questioned the compatibility of the Climate Change objectives and policies with policies in other sections.

Development Permit Areas

One respondent objected to exempting the removal of trees by hand from a development permit subject to certain conditions because of the potential impacts on other properties. This

guideline can be reworded to instill a greater sense of caution and to emphasize that the onus is on the property owner to make sure other properties are not impacted by this type of tree removal.

Recommendation #19: Add wording advising property owners that they must consider the impact on other properties that could result from the removal of trees by hand on steep slopes.

A respondent stated that the development permit area section needs stronger language, however, development permit areas can only have guidelines (not policies) which are not worded strongly.

Recommendation #20: Staff can review the language to see if it can be worded more strongly.

Concluding Comments:

This section was intended for comments that did not fit clearly into one of the themes or if the respondent ran out of room. Some respondents also followed up with additional comments which have been included here.

A respondent brought up the lack of direction in the OCP regarding cell towers. Another respondent noted there was nothing in the OCP on rainwater capture. Concerns were raised about wood stoves. Opposition to protection of property rights being included in a community plan. Comments were raised about the cumulative impact of development. A respondent felt future development was being directed towards environmentally sensitive areas. Absentee landowners and vacation rentals was another concern but may be outside the scope matters which can be addressed in an OCP.

Recommendation #21: Add background information regarding cell towers to section 380 and add a policy statement to section 480.

Recommendation #22: Add a discussion regarding rainwater capture to section 380.

Recommendation #23: Staff will discuss wood stoves with the Citizens' Committee.

Recommendation #24: Staff to investigate concerns regarding policies directing development towards environmentally sensitive areas.

Recommendation #25: Staff to investigate if there a policy statement regarding vacation rentals can be included in an OCP.

APPENDIX A: RESPONSES TO COMMENT SHEET QUESTIONS

ECOLOGICAL HEALTH

- Restoration is good, preservation is better; systematic rather than ad hoc is best. Plan wild life corridors and protect ecosystems before they are damaged
- Sounds great
- My biggest problem is the piece on allowing “streams” to be moved/changed and put back later. As stewards, this is not ecologically sound. Never should a stream or pond be allowed to be impacted and to have the OCP say it can is unethical at best. Prevent this, and in strong clear language.
- I am glad other environmentally sensitive areas are getting attention. Though I see our whole area needs good stewardship/protection.
- We have seen a devastating decline in butterfly species. We need a survey of species and flora and fauna to establish base line inventories of what remains.
- Most of us moved to East Sooke because of its rural character, East Sooke Park and local/community based life style. Lets’ keep it that way.
- I support the changes.
- When property development occurs, such as buildings, clearing road access, etc., the owner/builder/developer needs to ensure no soils/dirt make it to the road and ultimately the water courses. This is currently happening in East Sooke from the 4 on 10 development underway.
- In agreement with as such. Thank you.
- There needs to be extra consideration given to road approaches from developing properties, i.e. Cole Road, East Sooke Road, debris, large rocks, drainage, washouts, etc.
- Encourage recycling contractor (bi-weekly pick-up) and residents to maintain proper containment of their recycling. There is a problem in this area with residents placing recycle containers out days in advance of pick-up. As a result, winds & rain cause debris to be strewn about leaving a mess and the ditches full of debris. I have been picking up after this problem and general litter for 20 year within at least a 5 km range. Fines should be issued to residents that do not comply with the CRD RECYCLING REGULATIONS!

PARKS

- Separated and off-road trails are highly desirable. Grateful to Committee for not requesting wider or straighter road. Better maintenance would be good, especial maintenance of painted center line on road. Install cat’s eyes in centre.
- Trails separated from the roads & vehicles is important for safe travel and a healthy lifestyle.
- Could bike and people trails follow the contours as in the old rail lines (i.e. the Goose)?
- Parks are important and should reflect the best qualities of the area
- I support trail network development
- Better road ways before multi-use trails

Parks Continued:

- Totally in support of trail system connecting neighbourhoods and parks. Pike Road and Anderson Cove. As long as “alongside East Sooke Road” does not mean on the shoulder of this dangerous road for walkers and cyclists. We NEED a path right off- never touched by vehicle/motorized traffic – the road, separated by a green space.
- Section 424: Park acquisition will be considered. “Considered” is too weak a word – I would like more teeth in this document to get trails/wild parkland wherever you can.
- There are several dog parks with off-leash exercise of dogs and small door enclosures. cf Friday Harbour.
- No safe walking along East Sooke Road!
- Definitely need safe route for pedestrian and cyclists along East Sooke Road especially also Gillespie. East Sooke Road VERY unsafe. Very difficult for elders to put a bike on a car and take bike to Galloping Goose so elders don’t get to ride bikes often. Also, I’ve seen teenagers skate boarding from Tideview to Grocery Store and back – very unsafe.
- I totally support a pedestrian and cycling trail along East Sooke and Gillespie Roads. It would be good as a minimum to connect from the Galloping Goose at Roche Cove to East Sooke Road both to Becher Bay Road and west to Pike.
- Most definitely! As a regular cyclist and hiker, formerly road my cycle on East Sooke and Gillespie Roads but with heavier traffic and narrow or no shoulders, I don’t feel safe anymore. Wider shoulders along with bordering painted lines, modifying several blind corners.

ACCESS TO WATER:

- Different accesses should be available given roads, strongly suggest non-trailered, self-propelled watercraft
- YES!!
- Two or three at various spots might be an encouraging thing for getting on the water for many different reasons: health& safety!
- I support the idea of a boat launch in East Sooke
- Re: The development of the boat launch at Anderson Cove. Is the Committee aware of the First Nations proposal to have a shellfish industry in the basin which would prevent any access?
- Good idea but I imagine very costly. Not in favour if it creates another tax levy.
- Please protect the boat launch at Anderson Cove Road. Is it slated for development with the oyster lease?
- I support the theme.
- I oppose a boat launch at Anderson Cove, especially because the Chinese operated/funded oyster farm wants a landing at Anderson Cover. I am completely opposed to the oyster farm as Sooke Basin does not have the water quality to support an oyster farm. The fish farm resulted in the death of all fish stock and the oyster farm is subject to the same environmental issues. We need to respect the privacy of adjacent land owners. Parking seems a nightmare on such small curvy section of the road.

Water Access Continued:

- I support the recommendations.
- Like these policies and recommendations.
- I believe a few basic improvements could be made to the Anderson Cove boat launch such as a small road realignment improvement and minimal parking improvements.
- Anderson Cove location has much potential but significant modifications; realign the road corner and build up the launch approach with a little room for parking and signage. This section of the road is notoriously dangerous even without being used as a means of launching boats. I have witnessed several accidents and almost weekly, near misses!

CONNECTIVITY AND TRANSPORTATION

- Terrific objectives. Fundamental traffic issue arises from number of houses allowed. There is a connection, and traffic can be diminished by restricting the number of dwellings. What is the carrying capacity of the road? Let us not develop into a version of the Sooke Road. Consider seasonal restriction of truck traffic to preserve road.
- MOT needs to upgrade road to Provincial Standards. Painted centre line (cat's eyes) painted side lines, improved surface.
- Bicycle and walking trails are very much a priority.
- Current heavy truck and equipment on roads has become a very serious hazard in recent years.
- Need to clarify current carry capacity on East Sooke Road (vehicles per day). Major wear & tear of big trucks (weight & speed)
- Even parallel to the East Sooke Park fire access & great walking & cycling. Health & safety.
- I am not as interested in multi-use trails as much as wider shoulders on East Sooke Road
- Never mind the buses; the large trucks necessary for construction are far more dangerous.
- Lights at the intersection of Gillespie and Highway #14 should be considered by the Ministry.
- Great objectives and some nice suggestions.
- If traffic safety is a top priority, why is there any density drive (four hectares to one hectare)???
- Why are the huge trucks allowed carte blanche? Other community/many other communities restrict truck use to avoid wear and tear (especially in the west season). I/we would strongly support this.
- Better scheduling for Transit buses and added for Saturday even if there is only 2 trips a day. Reconsider some of the odd pick-up and drop-off locations which are out of the way or too far away from neighbouring residences. Currently, the Transit bus does not service past Llanilar Road. It should also service up to Pike Road. There are commuters that would use the bus, even if it would run 2 trips in the day during regular commuter times.
- Generally agree.
- BC Transit needs a bus service on Saturday and better scheduling to attract ridership.
- Sooke District Municipality needs to assist (cost sharing) for the traffic volume increase due to the Silver Spray section. Many heavy construction vehicles travelling along Gillespie and East Sooke Roads to Silver Spray.

Connectivity & Transportation Continued:

- Widening and repairing East Sooke Road is a great idea & would improve safety. “Safe” bike paths would be fantastic.
- The existing transit service is so sparse I feel sorry for anyone relying on it.
- We have teenagers who cannot get back to East Sooke on weekends and at night. This would be extremely dangerous!
- I strongly support a link to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail for commuting by bicycle and a network of neighbourhood trails in addition to the multi-use trails.
- I strongly support improving safety of roads in East Sooke, in particular, East Sooke Road itself.
- I strongly support improving community connectivity with multi-use paths.
- I strongly support improvements to Transit Routes.

THEME: SAFE & HEALTHY COMMUNITY

- Customers must pay for water infrastructure. Priority is Coppermine. Strongly support setbacks, community meeting place.
- Careful of depending on private SAR entity for emergency response services.
- Water available has in the past and present a control in the building of areas. Is this not still a good control of building sites? And if wanted, a lot of water is available in the winter and more than enough is for the taking from the rainwater with all the technologies available.
- Re: use of old fire hall changed to community hall – I state that I am totally against the reuse of the old fire hall; give it to the fire department to practise on. I support all the other objectives.
- Emergency preparedness is critical and non-existent in East Sooke.
- Remember – provision of potable water can lead to increased density which leads to health & safety concerns on road and more climate change/greenhouse gas/unhealthy living.
- Thank-you for moving forward & recognizing that a viable community needs water infrastructure. This is a least a first step!
- There needs to be a mechanism for helping adults who are under stress. Probably, some “shut-ins” and troubled individuals require support including guidance, counselling and psychiatric services.
- Probably, we need a secular analogue to the old-fashioned “community church”. Even an elder’s council with some authority to raise funds and relate to authorities on behalf of residents.
- In connection with a “safe community” theme, there needs to be something like a sponsored “Elders’ Council” that has some ability to initiate actions for individuals who happen to be in need or under stress. If, there was a minister or church, it could fill this role, but “god is Dead” these days and who can the lonely and distressed consult?
- Generally agree.
- Most every rural community I know of has a well-development community/neighbourhood emergency plan. Nearby neighbours know the names and phone numbers of other neighbours in their pod and they occasionally hold meetings and have a plan. Why has East Sooke never organized?

Safe & Healthy Community Continued:

- I strongly support increased services at settlement areas: e.g. Coppermine Road, Gillespie/East Sooke Road intersection.
- Make East Sooke a “Fire Smart” community.
- The current Copper Mine Reservoir has a very limited capacity. Definitely DCCs.
- I strongly support a community gathering place.
- Yes, we need a meeting place in East Sooke.
- I am also totally in favour of bringing water to these areas which have already been designated for settlement but have had water issues.
- Yes, I agree.
- Upon new housing in which water hook-ups are required, individuals should have to pay towards necessary upgrades to our infrastructure.
- Make East Sooke a fire safe community. Keep brush and storing an overabundance of wood products, flammables in tall greases near vehicles and structures (fire smart). We need to be proactive in regards to those that do not comply. This is a real concern since there is a property very visible from East Sooke Road and closely located to other property, structures and livestock.

FOOD SECURITY

- Maintain buffer around ALR
- I would be very careful. Most farms are coping well. To encourage more building is not smart.
- All motherhood stuff, I support.
- Sounds reasonable.
- Great.
- A buffer strip around lands in the ALR seems reasonable, especially ALR lands buffering environmentally sensitive areas and park lands.
- Generally agree.
- We need more community education on supporting local farming and also possible allotment gardens.
- Those individuals and organizations need to be encouraged and supported. They should not be overtaxed and penalized or limited in how they can bring their product to market within safe guidelines.

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

- A small medical office could be part of a multi-use plan at 1397 Copper Mine once the Fire Department is in the new “under construction” fire hall. Improve VIHA services in East Sooke. Volunteers don’t have necessary skills to cover range of social services.
- Motherhood issues, I support.
- I strongly support improved access to health care and social services.

- Currently, there several user groups regularly using the “Fire Hall” for healthy cultural activities such as Yoga, Fitness Training and karate classes and senior get-togethers. This can increase.
- Page 34 and 35 of Rough Draft Version 1, September 2014: I really object to an East Sooke OCP which refers heavily to Sooke and leaves out other neighbouring community’s social infrastructure and arts & culture. Our kids and friends/neighbours go to schools in Metchosin and Colwood. They also are part of Metchosin youth groups and that Art Council, and 4 H and Royal Roads. We like many of us – 70% of my neighbours- NEVER go to Sooke, and do NOT see it as “our” community. The ES OCP is our OCP.
- As we ponder converting the old fire hall into a community centre, of some sort, there is scope for supporting educational, musical, recreational and vocational activities for several age groups.
- All above objectives are excellent. There is an urgent need to provide more assistance to senior citizens and more support should be provided to artists and cultural activities – nature talks, walks, historical talks, etc. There is real need for a community hall/centre with expanded facilities and activities.
- We need a community centre with informal, low cost support for dining together. Eating together is a start. The Elder dinners have been very encouraging and well-received by many. We need a venue where informal meeting is both welcome and encouraged.
- There is a definite need to maintain and encourage the use of our current East Sooke Hall. Currently, it has several user groups for Yoga, Karate, Senior Group, Fitness. Perhaps, in the future, a medical clinic, garage services, etc. once the new fire hall is completed.

SETTLEMENT & LOCAL ECONOMY

- Good home based businesses; good clustering. Overall 1 hectare zoning undermines clustering; leads to creating a big subdivision with an inadequate road. Keep diverse size of lots; this is a sloppy solution to 4 on 10s.
- No marinas. Noise and time restriction on East Sooke fishing charters.
- Let us not allow light industry before we define what it is!
- Although one hectare is the desire, there are specific problems re: “non-conforming” properties of less than one hectare or 0.4 hectare when some rules prevent owner’s ability to rebuild in situations of rebuilding after fire/destruction – zoning needs to be corrected to bring these properties into legal zoning size as to their use.
- I support, especially the change to one hectare lots. Gets away from the 4 on 10.
- I support the provision to make CRD water available to all of East Sooke.
- I generally agree.
- Very much support these objectives.
- In an age of economic decline, I fully support ways like these to enable people to survive financially. Secondary suites are good for the owner and the person that has now found a beautiful, affordable place to live. These people are often our parents or our children. Thank-you for moving forward with this. And thank-you for trying to address issues for those burdened with Rural A zoning.

Settlement & Local Economy Continued:

- Wow, converting EVERYTHING in East Sooke to one hectare is huge. I am not in favour of this. Good planning – in my mind – is sustainable HUBS rather than sprawl. And increasing density to this extent, contradicts any concern over safety on ES Road or climate change. And it violates the community (your definition of “clustered” residential settlement) and (“As stewards of the community and unique natural environment). And it violates our RGS and the Regional Urban Containment & Servicing Policy Area whose main functions are (1) to limit the area serviced, so reducing cost of infrastructure; and (2) protect rural areas from unwanted sprawl! Yes, cluster near Gillespie intersection and Coppermine & even increase housing in a FEW density areas * BUT NOT everywhere!
- Cottage industry works within existing statute times of operation/noise levels/traffic levels/lights, etc.
- A lot of East Sooke people do not want more development. We want more natural history, study and sharing of ideas on independent living and doing things ourselves.
- One lot per hectare sound like the end of most of our undeveloped space outside of East Sooke Park. We need to do a better job of taking care of ourselves and what we have already “developed”! We are not doing a good job with current members. We don’t need more growth.
- I have been suggesting this for many years as it makes perfect sense. It does not change the current density and could in fact lead to a lesser density of the settlement areas. A future owner would have the opportunity to subdivide into more sensible and ecologically friendly lots, the minimum of which would be 2.5 and others could be three to ten acres. This may entail providing a proper road but the cost would be justified by reducing the present limitation of 10 acre lots. I am certainly not recommending that the current rights of 4 on 10 strata be eliminated, but under the current bylaws, all four homes must be constructed in a limited time frame, making it very difficult for a family who needs to have some financial security to obtain it. I want to go on record as being 100% in favour of the zoning suggested for the settlement areas. It has always been my opinion that a minimum 2.5 acre zoning would not change the rural ambiance of East Sooke and in the long run, would actually improve it. If the proposals are accepted, the people of East Sooke would likely benefit by needed consumer conveniences and a more logical approach towards providing needed housing.
- The settlement provisions, namely the one hectare average lot size, the 0.4 hectare (one acre) minimum parcel size; and the single settlement area provision.
- I support containment areas and commercial development at Gillespie and East Sooke Road. Increasing the density of lots from 4 on 10 acres to 5 (one lot per one hectare) will not solve issues related to the 4 on 10. It only increases density and increases issues with water division, etc. So, I am opposed to one lot per hectare especially because it opens up development across East Sooke. Let’s try to solve the issues related to 4 on 10.

CLIMATE CHANGE

- Sounds good.
- Love the concept of increasing walking/cycling trail that is OFF/REMOVED from the road (ES Road)!! Kudos on this one!! I think this committee (most committee members) don't care about climate changed/greenhouse gas reduction OR don't understand how to be environmental stewards of East Sooke. Look at your weak and ineffective language – "Discourage", "educate", "review", "consider", "collaborate with other governments ... through one or more of the following" REALLY!?! "ONE" would fulfill your mandate?! And your actions -> increase density way beyond current existing zoning (472 N) so increase traffic on already unsafe road even increasing driveways to 4 on 10s. and buildings + buildings on properties means less green space. You even talk about "moving streams" in your "Ecological Development" (+ move them back later). This indicates a complete lack of understanding or serious concern for climate change, greenhouse gas emissions and stewardship of preserving rural areas needs strong language like: "To ensure that there is no modification of stream channels and banks. Prevent the removal or addition of gravel, soil, sand AND vegetation to or from stream beds." Prohibit development which requires ... alteration of ponds or wetlands.
- Again, better transit and connections.
- Walking/cycling trails are very important.
- Excellent objectives. A rural community with lots of trees – the Sea to Sea Green Belt idea is support by the CRD and significantly reduces GHGs.
- In agreement.
- Increase our transit connections and trail network for walking and cycling.
- No idle zones at bus stops and school bus stops (vehicles waiting for pick-ups)

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREAS

- OK
- Generally agree.
- Weak language "can be requested". Make language stronger – and even better – we have almost no farm land in East Sooke, so to allow subdivision or rezoning should not be allowed. I would hope our OCP would do EVERYTHING possible to preserve and protect.
- Re: hand removal of trees – except then you are contributing to flooding – or at least way more water on the properties below. (removing these trees from steep slopes, I say don't do it!)
- Looks good.
- Rather than development permit areas, we need intelligent support for arborist services as many houses appear to be threatened by very tall trees which do fall in stormy weather. It appears that some arborists charge exorbitant rates and this puts existing homes at risk. Better to have home maintenance and safety support area. Also we need support for home upgrades and maintenance with an eye toward fire safety.
- Definitely agree.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

- Lots to think about and lots has been done congrats to all!
- In Part One – The Community, there is a sentence in the second paragraph which works in direct contrast to our community plan, “The residents of East Sooke value their property rights and seek to protect these rights.” I thought an OCP was a vision statement of how a community and residents and environment all co-exist, or how we want it to be. That one statement sets an ugly tone; it is clearly anti-community and has no place in any OCP. I can think of many examples – home based businesses, setting up parks/trails/buffer zones, development of boat launch, access to water, setbacks from flood, any protection of any area, neighbourhood community use, etc., etc.!! That one statement can come back to bite every community initiative. This is a COMMUNITY plan – best for the group (and the area) not individual property owners! Please take this sentence out.
- Thank you for all your hard work in trying to move East Sooke forward in a realistic way that enables viability.
- Thank you to all those involved to-date.
- There needs to be more attention to those who do not believe in “growth” as a community objective. It is a truism that many rapid growth organizers are dangerous. Sustaining a community doesn’t mean growth. Often, growth is deleterious and does not include intelligent maintenance of older homes and infrastructure.
- Maybe I have overlooked the respective section in the draft OCP, but I did not find any reference to clean air and air pollution. Smoke from wood stoves and open burning are two sources of pollution in the community of East Sooke. Strangely enough, I was unable to find any wood smoke bylaw on the CRD website. The only mention I could find was in myrecyclopedia where it says that “wood smoke is chemically active in the body 40 times longer than tobacco.” Again, did I overlook something or is there no wood smoke bylaw in the CRD. Does the CRD offer a woodstove exchange program as the CVRD does?
- Issue related to absentee landlords are currently critical, especially along the waterfront. During 7 month of the year, those of us who live along Seagirt Road are frequently disturbed by loud music, beach and boating parties as a result of home owners living in Calgary and renting out on a weekly basis house on the water front with NO supervision of noise levels. Is there somewhere that this can be regulated. It seems that at least 25 to 30% of the houses on the water front are owned by absentee landlords.
- Thank-you for providing this opportunity. It would be much more effective if a higher percentage of residents would voice their concerns and interest! Change comes with numbers.
- Suggest that the following should be included: *The community of East Sooke shall be consulted on the installation of all commercial antenna systems (not just towers), regardless of height, following a comprehensive public consultation.* Often service providers choose locations that suit their company’s needs best, a comprehensive public consultation can ensure that the location that meets the community’s needs best can be found.

- The main deficiency in the Plan is that it does NOT recognize those accumulating impacts, the significance of the cumulative impacts of development, nor does it include any statements that cumulative effects will be addressed in the development permitting process.
- Section 383 of the OCP draft suggests that there is potential for an additional 272 additional houses on 13 lots 8 ha or larger. The Plan does not state how many 4 Ha lots zoned “Rural” are in the Plan Area. Regardless of whether or not the developable properties stay as 4 on 10 stratas or become 1 ha fee simple lots, the potential for more linear development for roads and driveways and more fragmentation as land is cleared for more houses over more years, will certainly negatively impact ecological health and ultimately social health through decreased air and water quality and economic value will the loss of east Sooke’s prized natural amenities. Perhaps not noticeably at first – what’s 10 more roads and 20 more ha of cleared land? But as those impacts accumulate with more development over more years, without consideration for cumulative impacts, East Sooke will be changed forever and will NOT provide the same wonderful natural amenities we enjoy today for future generations. I would urge you to include a requirement and a framework reference to assess each development proposal in the context of the cumulative development in our region. Information on the Cumulative Effects framework is available at the website above. Those future generations you refer to the first paragraph of this draft will thank you, and so will I.
- I would hate to see a well-intentioned Plan be misconstrued the way the building strata zoning option was, but I am concerned that will be the case with the goals and objectives that are stated in the draft Plan. The goals for ecological health (section 411) support the idea of cumulative impacts. 411/B “enhanced through well planned development”. But the well planned development objectives all are geared toward ecologically sensitive areas. They fail to acknowledge: 1) the impact of more and more development over time and they and 2) the essential contribution provided by the surrounding “common” natural areas natural areas that provide most of the oxygen, most of the air and water quality regulation and most of the habitat for non-human creatures in East Sooke. Sensitive areas cannot exist as islands surrounded by human development.

APPENDIX B: RESULTS OF ROUNDTABLE EXERCISE

EXERCISE #1: COTTAGE INDUSTRY

Appropriate Size and Scale

- Should not be: Noisy – how to define?
- Should not be: Environmentally damaging, eg. Air pollution, wood smoke emissions
- What is the approval process? Public involvement?
- Lot size: appropriate use on various sizes
- Larger lot size can accommodate setbacks, but size may not address all issues
- Noise in building – baffling
- Visual buffering – landscaping, fencing
- Art Studios pottery, glass, etc. might be suitable
- Concerns about a pet crematorium

Necessary Controls

- Unwanted uses get pushed out to rural areas
- No increase in traffic including from deliveries
- Fishing charters, tourist accommodation, vacation rentals – need to recognize them and regulate if required
- Regulate only where broader neighbourhood disturbed
- Infrequent noise of chain saws, i.e. rural uses
- Consistent with other rural communities (amalgamation)
- Location – certain areas more suitable?
- Enforcement difficult
- Careful not to disrupt existing conditions
- People need clarity on what economic opportunities are

Light industrial

- Noisy sheep vs. gravel crushing
- No negative health consequences
- Consciousness
- Only if defined and specified in certain area, not generally suited to East Sooke
- Careful about drawbridge mentality and not exclude everything
- Define it/recognize it. Neighbourhood friendly in traffic, noise, to kids, etc.
- Stronger language – not “consideration”
- Should increase GHG emissions
- Traffic impacts could be more fore home office than for light industrial
- Road safety and capacity are affected by increase in population

Cottage Industry Continued:

Supporting policy

- Balance regulation, specificity, public process which is community based, committee group, review regulations on a case by case basis
- Determine what do we want? Youth and food production
- Ex. SSI coffee issue
- Don't pull up drawbridge unless intrusive use
- Light industrial not the focus – impacts should be the focus; criteria, categorization
- Health including electromagnetic pollution

EXERCISE #2: SETTLEMENT & LOCAL ECONOMY

Density at one parcel per hectare

- Population increase is low
- Development potential and zoning can more than accommodate population growth projections
- RGS – clusters of density and protection of environment – how to reconcile this?
- What would one hectare look like in future if developed to one hectare? Plus secondary suites?
- Traffic concerns
- What is vision?
- What is development potential?
- Other solutions to resolve problems?

Locating Residential Development

- Rural A = 4 hectares
- Province should address building stratas
- RR3 = 2 hectare lots
- Some interest in Coppermine/Parkheights for larger lots
- Focus services (bus, water, fire) could preserve larger areas
- Proper access still one way in – traffic
- More than one center for density? Gillespie intersection but again...
- Transit hub – focus development here
- Split catchments for schools currently – how to resolve this?
- Build community – hub to meet neighbours, balance rural privacy connections
- Education of realtors, owners, etc.
- Driveway Access
- Emergency vehicle access