



Making a difference...together

**Notes of a Meeting of the Shirley/Jordan River Citizens' Committee  
Official Community Plan Review – Meeting #15  
Held April 22, 2015 at Shirley Community Hall, 2795 Sheringham Point Road, Shirley BC**

---

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

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

**1. Introductions**

**2. Acceptance of Agenda**

**3. Review of Notes from the December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Meeting**  
Accepted.

**4. Presentation on Changes Between Rough Draft 2 and Rough Draft 3**

An overview of the key changes between Rough Draft 2 and Rough Draft 3 was given by Tracy Olsen. Section 209 documenting the consistency between the draft OCP and the Regional Growth Strategy has been added to Rough Draft 3. The CRD Board may choose to deal with the Regional Sustainability Study (RSS) before it looks at the OCP, in which case this section will need to be rewritten to describe the OCP's consistency with the RSS.

Once the updated OCP is adopted, s. 208 states that any amendments to the zoning bylaw must respect the lot sizes specified in the OCP with the exception of parcels that already have zoning allowing for smaller lot sizes. Section 210 clarifies that 3% is the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area's contribution towards the target of a 33% reduction in GHG for the CRD.

A sentence has been added to s. 212 regarding the administrative boundary of the Plan Area. One Committee member noted that there may have been a change to the response area of the Shirley Volunteer Fire Department. Staff will investigate and make corrections.

In Parts Three and Four, most of the changes are based on Committee's review of Rough Draft 3 and feedback received from the public at November 2014 Open House. Examples of the changes include noting the need for environmental monitoring; support for rain capture; and the interrelationship between roads, bridges and emergency preparedness.

On page 53, the numbering of the land use designations is incorrect and will be revised to read s. 405, 406 and 407. On the same page, a Restricted Development Land Use Designation has been added. Schedule B has not been revised yet to reflect this new designation. This topic will be discussed further by the Committee under agenda item #5.

A statement regarding public consultation for permanent antenna systems has been added (464.G). Industry Canada regulates telecommunication towers and its legislation supersedes provincial and local government in this regard. If the towers are over 15 meters high and being used for certain purposes, the federal government does require public consultation and has a standardized process for proponents to follow in the absence of a

community prescribed process. The purpose of s. 464.G is to establish the groundwork for developing a community specific consultation process.

As requested by the Committee, s. 464 I has been added stating opposition to commercial composting facilities.

Other policies added to Rough Draft 3 include s. 484.A stating growth will be gradual and of a low density, 484.S regarding outdoor recreational use of Camp Jubilee, s. 484.T notes that industrial uses on Settlement or Pacific Acreages Land Use Designations are not supported and s. 484.U states only industrial uses associated with forestry or mining are acceptable on only on those land use designations which support these types of uses.

For the Sensitive Ecosystem Development Permit Area, one eagle's nest has been added to Schedule E. Within the 100 metre buffer area around this nest, development such as construction activity will have to take place outside of sensitive life-cycle times. (s. 524.N) initially, four eagles nests were to be added to this development permit area based on the Wildlife Tree Stewardship (WiTs) mapping. When WiTs was contacted for the map coordinates of the four nests, staff was told that these trees are not being monitored and the mapping may not be accurate. Only one of the trees identified by a biologist during the preparation of the 2014 Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory can be confirmed as an active nest with accurate mapping coordinates. The last paragraph in s. 542 will be corrected to reflect that there is one tree in the DPA instead of four. The OCP can be amended to include other eagle nests subject to confirmation they are active and the location can be accurately mapped.

In the Riparian Area Development Permit Area, in case all of a property is within a SPEA, a guideline has been added requiring a QEP to provide a professional opinion on where the proposed development can occur on the site with the least amount of impact (s.534.U). Section 630 with the definitions has been added.

On Schedule C, Steep Slope Development Permit Area, some small slopes are being removed. Even though the slopes are steep (33%+), they are less than 3 metres in height and do not meet the definition of a Steep Slope. The DPA maps for East Sooke and Otter Point are also being revised.

On Schedule D: Riparian and Foreshore, the new mapping of Goudie Creek has been added to establish the DPA and all watercourses should now have a 30 metre buffer.

## **5. Discussion of Rough Draft 3**

The focus of the conversation was the proposed Restricted Development Land Use Designation area in Jordan River. Staff explained the release of the 2014 BC Hydro Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Report has made the CRD aware that there is a greater risk of dam failure in the case of an earthquake than previously thought. The main concerns are habitation and sleeping accommodations in the high risk areas for flooding at the mouth of the Jordan River. The proposed wording for the Restricted Development Land Use Designation discourages but does not prevent existing uses in this area. Rezoning for new or additional uses that involve habitation or sleeping accommodations would not be supported.

A Committee member felt that the people living in Jordan River should be responsible for the risk, the risk has not changed just because of the report and it is more likely that an

earthquake with a point 9 magnitude will occur closer to Haida Gwaii than near Vancouver Island. The member is very upset that the CRD campground is closed and sees contamination of the Jordan River as a greater issue than the risk posed by the dam. Another Committee member appreciated that this matter was a liability issue for the CRD.

Staff noted that BC Hydro had assessed the seismic risk of all dams in the Province and the Jordan River Dam was found to have the highest risk. Other dams also have a high risk but BC Hydro had chosen a different approach to managing the risk such as upgrading the dam. In Jordan River, BC Hydro decided to try to purchase the properties at risk.

Dave Read wanted confirmation from staff on whether BC Hydro would be able to rezone areas within the Jordan River hamlet to commercial and industrial uses. He is opposed to an expansion of industrial and commercial uses in the hamlet as it would not be attractive.

Staff explained that the wording in the OCP is intended to support rezonings consistent with the land uses shown on Schedule B providing there are no sleeping accommodations or habitation. For example, small commercial uses in the hamlet such as restaurants and retail stores are still supported. Since the Restricted Development Land Use Designation as currently worded in Rough Draft 3 does not appear to make this point well, staff will rewrite this section.

Leslie Lajeunesse noted there are a number of eagle nests within the Plan Area not shown on the map.

A Committee member asked why there was not a groundwater DPA. Staff advised more data on aquifers is needed to be able prepare the necessary mapping for this type of DPA.

Another Committee member suggested adding the phrase: "to ensure sustainable supply and no draw down effect" to s. 414.I. Emma advised that consideration of this policy will be given as part of the servicing bylaw rewrite.

It was noted s. 442.H should use the broader term "resource use", not just forestry.

S. 444 Q and R densities. A Committee member asked if dwelling unit meant suites. Staff advised that the OCP establishes the policy but the specifics are in the zoning bylaw. Staff will check for consistent use of the term "dwelling unit" in the draft OCP.

## **6. Public Event 4 – May 9, 2015**

There will be an Open House on May 9<sup>th</sup> at the Shirley Hall. When asked by staff for ideas on how to advertise the event, Committee members suggested a mail-out, posting signs on mail boxes and notifying OSPRRA.

## **7. Outline of Formal Process**

Emma Taylor advised the Committee that once the final draft was prepared, it would be presented to the Land Use Committee along with a staff report. The Land Use Committee could then ask that the referral process be started. Emma confirmed that the Advisory Planning Commission would be one of the referrals. After the referral process is completed, the OCP returns to the Land Use Committee for its approval to send it to the CRD Board. The Board can give first and second reading to the bylaw and call for a public hearing. After the public hearing, a third reading and then later, a final reading can be given to the bylaw.

**8. Committee Appreciation**

On behalf of Electoral Area Director Mike Hicks and Local Area Planning Manager June Klassen, Tracy thanked the Committee members for their contribution and acknowledged the valuable insight that has been provided.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.