

Date: February 5, 2015

Time: 7:00pm to 9:00pm

MINUTES of the Electoral Area D Advisory Planning Commission held on the above date and time at the Cowichan Estuary Centre.

Members Present:

Chairperson: Robert Stitt

Acting Secretary: Robert Stitt

Members: Kerrie Talbot, Matthew Louie, Hilary Abbott, Joe Kinrade.

Members Absent:

Calvin Slade, Kevin Maher, Peter Holmes.

Also Present:

None

Order of Business:

1. Election of chair
 - Moved and seconded that Robert Stitt be chairperson for the current year to November 2015. All in favour.
2. Discussion of merging the OCP Implementation Committee (OIC) with the APC.
 - Concept agreed in principle
 - Robert and Peter to draft addendum to APC Handbook and circulate to members for review prior to submission to Area Director Lori Iannidinardo.
3. Discussion of Cluster Residential zoning to provide input for the current review by the OIC.
 - Input from Kevin Maher and Peter Holmes provided in advance of the meeting
 - See following page for details.

Area D APC – Input on Cluster Residential

February 5, 2015

Contributing APC Members:

Robert Stitt

Peter Holmes

Kevin Maher

Joe Kinrade

Kerrie Talbot

Matthew Louie

Hilary Abbott

1. Increased density is a key issue. The VCBs were implemented to help manage and contain growth while CR zoning promotes density outside the VCBs. This seems contradictory and is causing dissent in adjoining neighbourhoods.
2. Some areas proposed for CR have an established character that does not match the higher density of CR.
3. Greater density means more vehicles, noise and other negative impacts on established, less dense neighbourhoods.
4. Some areas zoned CR appear better suited to a successful implementation than others. Factors such as road access, traffic, practicality of retaining natural vegetation, etc. need to be considered.
5. Many properties zoned CR do not have the attributes to make CR viable unless they are assembled into larger parcels. For example, long, narrow properties with significant steep slopes do not appear to be well-suited to a mix of clustered buildings and open spaces.
6. There is no sewer capacity to support the higher density developments and water quality and quantity is becoming an issue.
7. CR is not well enough defined in the OCP in terms of how it can look and work. Sample layouts would help.
8. Intro to 4.6: Question about why “four to twelve dwelling units arranged around a common space...”
9. OCP is more nebulous about what is to be protected: “... a minimum of 50% of the site remains in its natural state.” The proposed text talks of “dedication of at least 50% of the site as park or conservation area.” The subsequent reference to “small homes” needs clarification.
10. Concerns about possible challenges should be addressed after the wishes and best interests of the community have been considered.
11. The proposal to “remove the policy in the OCP which requires and OCP amendment to enter into the service area” is of great concern. Where are the checks and balances and the opportunity for public input?