

**SHIRLEY / JORDAN RIVER CITIZENS' COMMITTEE**

**OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW**

Notice of Meeting on Wednesday, **June 25, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.**

Shirley Community Hall, 2795 Sheringham Point Road, Shirley, BC

---

**AGENDA – Meeting #9**

1. Welcome
2. Review of Agenda
3. Review of Notes of June 11, 2014
4. Status of Any Action Items
5. Boundaries of Planning Area
6. Policy Review for Settlement Theme
7. Next Meeting – *September*



Making a difference...together

## Notes of a Meeting of the Shirley/Jordan River Citizens' Committee

### Official Community Plan Review – Meeting #8

Held June 11, 2014 at Shirley Community Hall, 2795 Sheringham Point Road, Shirley BC

---

**PRESENT:** Sonja de Wit, Ron Ramsay, Claire Denesovych, Fiona McDannold, Frank Limshue, Brenda Mark, Wayne Jackaman, Dom Bernardet  
**Staff:** Tracy Olsen, Project Coordinator, Emma Taylor, Planner

**ABSENT:** Margaret Johnson, Pascale Knoglinger

**PUBLIC:** One.

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

#### 1. Introductions

#### 2. Review of Agenda

#### 3. Review of Notes of May 28, 2014 Meeting

After checking with one Committee member about the accuracy of the notes taken at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, Tracy Olsen advised the Committee that the April 23<sup>rd</sup> would be amended as proposed.

A Committee member noted that the “Stinking Fish Tour” did not occur in Shirley. Another Committee member noted that instead of “flashing light” at the intersection of West Coast Road and road used by the fire hall, he had meant flashing emergency responder.

Water accesses taken at time of subdivision were discussed noting that they are public right of way but not always developed for public use.

A Committee member not in attendance at the last meeting suggested “tele-medicine” or “tele-health” could link rural patients to doctors through video-conferencing technology.

#### 4. Status of Any Action Items

Tracy noted that Provincial Shoreline Mapping is available and will see if the mapping has been done at a scale which would be of use in preparation of the OCP.

#### 5. TUPs

Currently, there is no provision in the OCP or Zoning Bylaw for temporary use permits. Tracy explained that unless provision is made in the OCP or the zoning bylaw, anyone who applies for a TUP will have to wait until either the zoning bylaw or the OCP is first amended to be able to make an application. Emma Taylor explained that an application is required for temporary use permit and it goes through a similar public notification process as a rezoning application would. The examples of metrological testing stations and farmers' markets were given the types of temporary uses that would be applied for. Committee members agreed that something should be added to the OCP to allow for temporary use permit applications.

### **Guideline Review of Development Permit Area (DPA) No. 5 – Commercial Development Areas**

To start, Tracy reviewed the designation and justification for DPA No. 5 and indicated which properties in the Plan Area were designated as commercial. If a property was shown as being in this DPA, any commercial uses would be subject to the existing guidelines for “form and character”. All commercially zoned properties should be in this DPA. The three parcels currently zoned Neighbourhood Commercial, the one parcel zoned Commercial Recreation 3 and the one parcel zoned Country Inn are all designated Commercial. Of the four parcels zoned Jordan River Hamlet Commercial, one parcel is designated as Commercial but three are not. Of the four parcels zoned Jordan River Hamlet, one is in the Commercial DPA even though this zone does not permit commercial uses other than a Home Based Business. There is one parcel zoned Wildwood Terrace Neighbourhood Commercial, one parcel zoned Low Intensity Commercial Recreation and one parcel zoned Wildwood Terrace Tourist Commercial, none of which are in this DPA but should be. The Committee agreed that commercially zoned properties should be in the DPA but residential ones should not.

Tracy pointed out that there are lands in Jordan River designated as industrial in this DPA but which are not zoned for industrial use. For example, the log sort on the west side of Jordan River is zoned Resource Land. The properties on the east side of the river are now owned by the CRD and zoned Rural (A) and Forestry (AF). Queesto Logging is leasing two of the houses on these lands. Interest in turning one of the existing houses into a community gathering place was raised again by Committee members.

Committee members questioned there should be an industrial DPA as it might encourage industrial uses to locate here. One committee member noted that there may be some industrial uses which are suitable and a rezoning application would be required before the use would be permitted.

Tracy advised the Committee that there are no guidelines in the current OCP pertaining to industrial uses although it is possible to have this type of policy under the current designation providing further justification is added. Earlier discussions by the Committee of the importance of screening industrial uses from surrounding residential uses and creating buffers between industrial and residential uses were mentioned by Tracy. In particular, the concerns the Committee raised about quarries. Emma explained that quarries that evolve into crushing facilities would then be subject to local zoning bylaws and this type of development permit. One Committee member noted that a DPA does not regulate use but could be used to ask for vegetative barriers and other buffering. Another Committee member noted the issues around the long-term negative impacts which industrial uses can have on the natural environment.

Tracy explained that the existing guidelines in this DPA for commercial uses do look at site development but not the form and character of the actual commercial building. Tracy asked if there was interest in controlling the massing of new buildings, for example, limiting height to one storey on flat land and two stories on sloped areas. Committee members felt appropriate massing should be encouraged.

In terms of theme, colour and materials, Committee members preferred to see natural colours with a west coast architectural theme involving the use of natural materials like wood and stone facades and natural vegetation.

Tracy asked about the fenestration of buildings in its' architectural context and the Committee agreed with the screening of roof top equipment like heating units.

Committee members suggested and supported the use of permeable surfacing for parking and bio-swales in commercial developments although Tracy noted that an additional designation and justification pursuant to another section of the *Local Government Act* would need to be added to the Commercial DPA as the current section can only regulate form and character. The Committee agreed with Tracy's suggestion to include energy & water conservation requirements for new commercial development. A Committee member expressed concern about how wastewater from commercial developments would be handled for example, soapy water from a laundry.

Tracy turned facilitation of the meeting over to Emma Taylor.

## **6. Guideline Review of Development Permit Area No. 1 – Steep Slopes**

The existing steep slope development guidelines were reviewed. A Committee member asked about how hazard trees are determined with respect to Section 4.4.4 2]. Emma responded that in some cases a Certified Arborist may need to verify the tree is a safety concern. Emma outlined that the current OCP was amended to change the steep slope DP areas from 20% to 30%. New contour data is now available so the steep slope maps have been redone based on 5m contour intervals instead of 20m. Some Committee members wanted to see stronger wording in Guidelines 4.4.4.4. (4) and (6). A Committee member suggested that trails or natural pathways should be exempted from the DP requirement if they are less than 6 feet wide.

## **7. Water Theme**

Emma presented an overview of the legislation pertaining to water in BC. She highlighted how the new Water Sustainability Act will license groundwater, require consideration of environmental flow needs, include mitigation measures, designate sensitive streams, establish water advisory boards and water sustainability plans, and may require inclusion of water objectives in local government planning documents. An example of efforts to monitor and map groundwater resources in the Regional District of Nanaimo was provided. Reference was also made to a limited number of studies conducted on watersheds in the Plan area. A watershed map showing watershed boundaries in the Plan area and a groundwater vulnerability map showing where high, medium and low were presented for information.

The Committee discussed issues relating to water quality, quantity and contamination:

- The idea of forming a local stakeholders group or more formal water advisory board was discussed.
- Committee members were interested in pursuing this idea. Committee members agreed that existing Policy 1.4.1 referencing Goudie Creek could be removed as all water sources should be considered.

- Suggestions for requiring more complete well logs, water quality tests and hydrological studies at time of development were made that could be inserted in the Development Approval Information Area section or in a subdivision servicing bylaw.
- Committee members suggested that well assessments should take into account seasonal fluctuations in groundwater supply. More comprehensive water studies would provide more of a guarantee to future owners that there is a reliable water supply as currently many wells are drilled at time of subdivision in the winter months and are dry in summer, leaving the costs of installing cisterns, drilling deeper wells or trucking in water to the new purchaser.
- A member suggested that building strata developments should be required to provide the same standard of proof of potable water as a subdivision.
- Committee members discussed at what scale of development more comprehensive hydrological assessments should be required as they can be costly for individual landowners subdividing one lot, but also that incremental growth can have long-term impacts on water supply and should be monitored.
- Committee members were interested in any funding opportunities or incentive programs available for rainwater capture systems.
- A suggestion to revise Policy 4.1.8 was made to delete the word 'unnecessary' and to reference all streams, not stream beds, and to clarify that a professional report would be required.
- A Committee member made a comment with respect to Policy 4.1.4 that the Sheringham Water Works has trouble maintaining water quality due to decaying alder leaves in Goudie Creek and would prefer to remove old alder trees and replant with Sitka Spruce where possible.
- The Committee was in support of educational campaigns related to safe storage and use of contaminants (pesticides, fertilizers, manure etc.) and proper maintenance of septic systems.
- Committee members supported the concept that certain land uses with potential for contamination should not be permitted on high vulnerability aquifers.
- A member suggested that runoff should be directed and managed to infiltrate on-site so as not to affect adjacent parcels.
- Suggestions for revising the riparian development permit guidelines included encouraging bridges instead of over culverts, recommending use of culverts that can accommodate a 200 year flood event, and designing lots in a subdivision that would not require a stream crossing.
- Examples were provided by staff and a Committee member of other local government jurisdictions that have established Development Permit Areas for protection of groundwater and Development Approval Information requirements for hydrological assessments. Committee members were supportive of pursuing a development permit area and DAI requirements. Emma asked if these regulations should pertain to any priority watersheds or development areas and Committee members generally agreed that all watersheds were of equal priority for protection.

## **8. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be Wednesday, June 25<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Community Hall to discuss the Settlement Theme. There will be no meetings during the summer.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

**THEME: SETTLEMENT**

***HISTORICAL AND EXISTING SETTLEMENT PATTERNS***

Jordan River’s origins are rooted in mining, forestry and power production accompanied by the dramatic fluctuations in population seen with the boom-bust cycle of resource based economies. Physical evidence of this type of settlement can be found throughout the original town site in the form of abandoned forestry cabins, the old and new powerhouses and small commercial buildings intermixed with houses. To the west of the original town site, two newer subdivisions have been built: the 23 lot Wildwood Terrace Subdivision and the 38 lot Shores development.

Shirley also has had a close association with resource extraction but community growth was more gradual than Jordan River’s until recent times. Prior to the 1970s, the Shirley Community Hall was the community hub with one and two lot subdivisions occurring over time along Sheringham Point Road. Another area near Shirley that has gradually developed is Invermuir Road where one or two lot subdivisions have occurred over a number of years. During the early 1970s, Seaside Estates, a 126 lot subdivision was constructed in Shirley. More recently, Sheringham Estates, an 18 lot subdivision immediately adjacent to Seaside Estates was created in 2006

<b>TABLE ONE: APPROXIMATE AGE OF HOUSING STOCK</b>						
<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Pre-1960</b>	<b>1961 – 1980</b>	<b>1981 – 1990</b>	<b>1991 - 2000</b>	<b>2001 - 2005</b>	<b>2006-2011</b>
Number of Houses	15	55	15	50	0	90

Source: National Housing Survey, 2011 and CRD Building Permits

***AFFORDABLE AND SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING***

The predominant type of housing in the Plan Area is single family dwelling units. As of May 2011, there were 240 houses in Shirley and Jordan River based on the 2011 census. Some homes have secondary suites and detached suites are permitted in most rural residential and rural zones. Suites along with mobile homes are the basis of affordable housing in the Plan Area and will likely continue to be so. Certain types of zoning that permit multiple dwelling units on a single lot also offer slightly more affordable housing.

The Provincial *Community Care and Assisted Living Act* supercedes local zoning bylaws by allowing small daycares and group homes in any residential zone. Group homes offer special needs housing for a range of clients. No large scale special needs housing developments are anticipated within the Plan Area as this type of housing is centrally located in the District of Sooke.

## HOUSING SUPPLY AND FUTURE DEMAND

According to the 2011 census, the population of the Plan Area was 415, a decrease of 14% from 2006. Over this same time period, there was 3% decrease in the population of the Juan de Electoral Area. BC Statistics has estimated that the population of the CRD will increase 0.8 % annually from 2012 to 2016 and then by 0.7% from 2017 until 2020. These rates of change were used to project population growth for Shirley-Jordan River as there is a lack of historical data specific to the Plan Area. There are also recognized difficulties when doing projections for relatively small populations as there can be dramatic changes caused by new developments or several families leaving the area at the same time.

TABLE TWO: POPULATION ESTIMATES		
Year	Population	Rate of Change (%)*
2001	490	See notes
2006	475	- 3%
2011	415	- 14%
2014 estimated**	446	+ 7%
2019 estimated	462	+ 4%
2024 estimated	477	+ 3.2 %

*\* Simple percentage change although the population change was calculated exponentially based on a rate of +0.8% from 2012 to 2016 and then +0.7% from 2017 to 2024. \*\* Based on a 9.7% share of the JdF estimated population which is the same percentage share the Plan Area had in the 2011 census.*

The median age of Shirley-Jordan River residents is 46.4 years compared to 44.8 for the Capital Regional District and 41.1 for British Columbia indicating a slightly older than average population but not as old as the Town of Sidney (56.9 years), one of the oldest communities in Canada. The average family size in the Plan Area is 1.7 which is much smaller than both that of the CRD (2.7 people) and the provincial average of 2.8. Based on the average family size of 1.7, there is a need for approximately 10 new housing units to meet the five year demand for housing until 2019 and a total of approximately 19 units to meet the ten year demand until 2024. While both the five and ten year demands for new housing can be met through the current rate of construction and inventory of lots, all of the new lots will be created outside of the Settlement Containment Area unless the boundaries are revised. (See Tables Four and Five below.)

TABLE THREE: NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS							
Year	New Single Family Dwelling	New Duplex (Counts as two units)	Moved In Single Family	Manufactured Home Moved In	Demolition Removal & Conversion to Accessory	Additional Housing Units*	Estimated Total Number of Units
2004	2	-	-	2	1	4	191
2005	8	1	-	3	-	6	197
2006	8	-	-	-	1	7	204
2007	8	-	1	1	1	9	213
2008	19	-	1	-	1	19	232
2009	3	-	-	-	-	3	235
2010	6	-	-	-	1	5	240
2011	3	-	-	-	-	3	243**
2012	2	-	-	-	-	2	245
2013	4	-	-	-	-	4	249
2014							

\* Number of new units less the number of demolitions. \*\*All of the permits issued this year were after the 2011 census was taken.

#### **FUTURE SETTLEMENT**

The current Official Community Plan has two designations for settlement. For the Settlement Containment Area Land Use Designation, residential lot sizes in the range of one hectare are contemplated; and for the Settlement Area Land Use Designation, the policies state that residential lots should be larger than 2 hectares (Policy statement 4.2.1.2 (1) b). All uses including residential are permitted in both of these designations.

None of the lots currently in the Settlement Containment Area (SCA) Land Use Designation are large enough to be subdivided under the existing zoning. There are three parcels currently zoned Rural in the SCA, which if rezoned to lot sizes in the range of one hectare as permitted by policy statement 4.2.1.2 (1) b of the OCP, up to 9 additional lots are possible.

In the Settlement Area (SA), the potential already exists for approximately 407 new lots to be subdivided. If all the properties in the SA were rezoned to allow for subdivision to parcels sizes greater than 2 hectares, approximately 1425 new lots could be created.

**TABLE FOUR: NUMBER AND AREA OF PARCELS BY ZONING AND LAND USE DESIGNATION**

<b>Bylaw No. 2040 Zoning</b>	<b>Area by Zone (Hectares)</b>	<b>Number of Existing Parcels by Zone</b>	<b>Number of Existing Parcels Designated Settlement Containment Area</b>	<b>Number of Existing Parcels Designated Settlement Area</b>	<b>Number of Existing Parcels in Other Land Use Designations</b>
Rural Residential 2 (RR-2)	59.6	131	129	2	-
Rural Residential 2A (RR-2A)	67.9	68	-	68	-
Jordan River Destination	0.5	1	-	1	-
Jordan River Hamlet	0.5	5	-	5	-
Jordan River Hamlet Commercial	0.5	5	-	5	-
Neighbourhood Commercial	2.2	3	2	1	-
Commercial Recreational	18.7	4	-	4	-
Wildwood Terrace 1	13.9	13	-	13	-
Wildwood Terrace 2	9.2	9	-	9	-
Wildwood Terrace 3	7.1	13	-	13	-
Wildwood Terrace 4	148.9	1	-	1	-
Wildwood Tourist Commercial	1	8	-	8	-
Rural (A) *	358.9	122*	14	108	-
Forestry	1418	118	-	114	4 Park
Resource Lands	1484.7	20	-	20	-
Agriculture (AG)	114.7	9	-	-	9 Agricultural
Park (P-1)	56.1	2	-	-	2 Park
Community Facility	0.45	1	-	-	1 Park
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>3764</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>16</b>

\* 24 of the Rural (A) lots identified by the GIS Department have an area of less than 0.07 ha (3230 ft<sup>2</sup>) and likely represent the strata-title areas where the individual houses are built on a larger lot. \*\* This figure does not include land dedicated as road or areas of water being leased and 1.6 ha. of uncoded.

**TABLE FIVE: NUMBER OF POTENTIAL NEW LOTS BY ZONE \***

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Minimum Lot Size</b>	<b>Potential New Lots Under Existing Zoning **</b>	<b>Potential New Lots In Settlement Containment Area by Rezoning ***</b>	<b>Potential New Lots in Settlement Area by Rezoning ***</b>
Rural Residential 2 (RR-2)	1 hectare	none		n.a.
Rural Residential 2A (RR-2A)	1 hectare	5		n.a.
Jordan River Hamlet (JR-1)	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Jordan River Hamlet Commercial (C-1B)	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Jordan River Destination Resort (CR-1A)	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Wildwood Terrace 1, 2 and 3	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Wildwood Terrace 4 (WT-4)	2 hectare average	73		n.a.
Wildwood Terrace Tourist Commercial	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Commercial Recreational 1 (CR-1)	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Commercial Recreational 3 (CR-3)	2 hectares	4		n.a.
Country Inn (CR-4)	2 hectares	none		n.a.
Rural (A)	4 hectares	38	9	103
Forestry (AF)	4 hectares	283		617
Resource Lands (RL)	120 hectares	4		710
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>407</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1425</b>

\* The following assumptions were made to calculate the subdivision potential: Isometric plain; No servicing restrictions; No road dedication; No park dedication; Did not consider the subdivision potential arising from 946 subdivisions for family members, road bi-sections or consolidation and re-subdivision of lots (e.g. Consolidating two lots then subdividing to create three). Properties zoned C-1, Agriculture or Park are not included in this table.

\*\* All of these lots are in the Settlement Area.

\*\*\* For residential development, the minimum lot size of one hectare for the Settlement Containment Area Land Use Designation and a two hectare minimum lot size in the Settlement Area Land Use Designation was used to calculate the potential number of lots from rezoning.

### **OBSERVATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR CITIZENS' COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Much of the development potential in the Plan Area comes from lands currently zoned Forestry or Resource Lands that are designated SA. For the purposes of subdivision, the Forestry Zone has a 4 hectare minimum lot size while the Resource Lands Zone has a minimum lot size of 120 hectares. However, policies in the OCP indicate support for rezoning applications that would see the creation of lots as small as 2 hectares.

Lands zoned Rural are another significant source of development potential in the Plan Area. For the purposes of subdivision, the minimum lot size for the Rural Zone is four hectares. Up to four single family dwellings plus one detached suite are possible on each four hectare lot. Table Five indicates up to 38 additional four hectare lots could be created from existing lots that are 8 hectares and larger. Up to 152 additional single family dwellings could then be built on these new lots. Because multi-dwelling units are being built on one lot, the houses are usually strata-titled. This form of tenure has benefits but can also create problems

If an application was made to rezone a Rural (A) property to the minimum lot sizes prescribed by the OCP, it is likely that an existing rural residential zone would be selected. Typically, per lot, only one single family with a suite or one-two family dwelling unit is permitted in the rural residential zones. Table Five shows that if all of the Rural properties were rezoned in accordance with current OCP policies, then up to 112 additional lots could be created, of which 103 would be outside the SA. Based on this rezoning scenario, 112 dwelling units might be built instead of the 152 single family dwellings possible under existing zoning.

**QUESTION: Should policies be added to the OCP which support rezoning applications for Rural (A) lands to zones which allow for one house per lot?**

With the possible exception of nine new lots, all future development in the Plan Area will occur outside of the SCA. As the Plan Area is not serviced by CRD water or sewer, the restrictions placed on access to CRD water for properties outside a SCA are not really applicable. Further discussion is needed though around the imbalance between the significant development potential in the SA and the limited development potential in the SCA. A containment area is intended to act as the focal area for future growth and discourage rural sprawl.

**QUESTION: Are there lands suitable for inclusion in the Settlement Containment Area which would serve the purpose of drawing future development to certain areas and away from other areas? Smaller parcels zoned Rural (A) immediately adjacent to the existing Settlement Containment Area? Keep in mind that an increase in density created by adding lots to the SCA must be off-set by reducing density elsewhere.**

Consideration should also be given to changing the land use designation of parcels currently zoned RR-2 and RR-2A from SC to SCA. No additional lots or development potential would be created by this change as there is already a one hectare minimum lot size for both the zoning and land uses designation of parcels. In the Shirley area, lots zoned RR-2 are already clustered together and should all be in the same land use designation. All of the properties zoned RR-2A are in one subdivision at Jordan River.

Whether lots that are already one hectare or smaller in size should be included in the SCA providing they are immediately adjacent to the SCA could also be looked at. Again, there would be no increase in development potential by this change.

**QUESTION: Is there support for this adjustment to the boundaries of the SCA?**

Another topic for discussion should be adding a new land use designation to the OCP for properties zoned Resource Land (RL). Creating this type of designation and associated policies could be used to send a clearer message regarding the important role these lands have in sustaining

resource based industries like forestry. A minimum lot size for possible rezoning applications in the range of 4 hectares to 120 hectares could be established. Areas in the Jordan River town site zoned Resource Land might not be suitable for inclusion in this type of designation. Although, some of the lands zoned Forestry (AF) might be included in this conversation about a new resource based designation especially larger, land-locked parcels with no access to the public road network. Another option is to create another new land use designation for Forestry and Agriculture zoned lands with policies supporting a minimum lot size of 4 hectares if a property is rezoned.

**QUESTIONS:** Is there interest in creating a new land use designation for parcels zoned Resource Land? Should larger parcels zoned Forestry which are not accessible by public road be included in this type of land use designation or could another new land use designation be created for Forestry and Agriculture? Should some of all of the properties zoned Resource Land surrounding the Jordan River town site be kept as Settlement Area? Keep in mind, these land use designations and policies do not change existing zoning. They only come into effect if an owner applies for a rezoning.

When looking at a new land use designation for Resource Lands, consideration must be given to how any decrease in the subdivision potential of these properties would be handled in the context of the overall density of the Plan Area. Will density be transferred to other land use designations or will it be used to establish a density reserve which may eventually be tapped into over the next 50 to 100 years?

**QUESTION:** If there is a new land use designation that increases the minimum lot size from the 2 hectares currently supported by the OCP, how should the decrease in density be handled in the overall context of the revised OCP?

The minimum lot size for parcels zoned Rural and Forestry is 4 hectares. When looking at options for future development, the current OCP does not offer any guidance other than general policy statement encouraging the continued use of privately managed forestry lands for forestry. As a default, subdivision under the existing zoning may appear as only other type of development preferred by the community. Instead of appearing to support subdivision of large parcels of land into four hectare lot residential subdivisions, alternative types of development should be considered for the Forestry and Resource Land zones. Policies that support low impact tourism activities such as guiding lodges and wilderness camps on lands zoned Resource Land and Forestry could be added to the revised OCP.

**QUESTIONS:** Should policies be added to the OCP for Resource and Forestry zoned properties that support the development of low impact tourism related activities on these lands if the owners no longer want to use them for forestry related activities? Are there other types of uses that could be encouraged on these lands which are acceptable to the community?

Within the Shirley-Jordan River Plan Area, some areas require specific attention. Muir Creek and the adjacent lands are environmentally sensitive and the community is interested in the long-term protection of these lands as park. However, one large property that straddles Muir Creek and is partially in the Otter Point Plan Area encompasses these environmentally sensitive areas. During the recent preparation of the Otter Point OCP, a formula for increasing density in exchange for provision of a parkland amenity was developed for the portion of the property encompassed by this OCP. Amenity bonusing is also possible in the Shirley-Jordan River Plan Area by virtue of policy statement 4.2.1.2 (6).

**QUESTIONS:** Should a policy be developed specifically for this property that supports amenity bonusing in exchange for parkland? This amenity would be over and above the parkland dedication/cash in lieu required by the *Local Government Act* at the time of subdivision? Are there other amenities elsewhere that the community is interested in acquiring in exchange for an increase in density such as the protection of other environmentally sensitive areas?