

CVRD
ELECTORAL AREA A
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 7, 2019
7 p.m. Mill Bay Community League Hall

Present: Area A: Glenn Terrell (Chair) Mike Pankiw, David Knott (Sec), Archie Staats, Ken Hart, Margo Johnston.

Regrets: Laurie Vasey, Kate Segall

Adoption of Agenda: Approved

Old Business: File No DP 19A06

The applicant was requested to return to the APC with a revised sign as the original was found to be too large, as there has been no further communication from the applicant the following motion was made

Application DP 19A06 be rejected until such time as the applicant presents a revised sign that is more in keeping (from a dimension perspective) with community concerns.

Motion passed.

New Business:

Review of comparative data, draft LAP vs Current.

Here are observations noted:

Purpose

CVRD staff have asked regional APCs to undertake several tasks as part of the OPC harmonization process including:

- using the reference table (attached) to find existing policies from the existing OCP (official Community Plan) Development Permit Area (DPA) (pages 42 onward) in the proposed regional harmonized Official Community Plan (HOCP) document distributed in September;
- reviewing graphics specific to our LAP and identifying errors, omissions and compliance;

The graphics review by APCs has been put on hold as another update by staff is occurring.

Comments on the cross-referencing exercise are offered below. It is noted that CVRD staff are trying to reduce repetition and minor inconsistencies between the DPAs in the various LAPs as they move into harmonization and modernization.

Please note that some of the Section numbers in the reference table do not correspond with the text e.g. Form and Character are in Section 5 and 9 while Section 10 has Mill Bay/Electoral Area A specifics. Also, page numbers are non-sequential and, in many cases, apply to the section only. This makes following the commentary below more challenging.

Scope

While the CVRD document goes beyond harmonization only, this review is limited to assessing whether the current guidelines are reflected in a harmonization context. The review can't comment on the modernization components as they are to reflect modernization of OCP policies and the zoning which has not occurred.

Reference Table Based Harmonization Comments

Local DPA General Guidelines: The reference table is not specific where the general guidelines are and they indeed are dispersed. On pages 27 and 28, Part 10 of the proposed document there is a focus on Mill Bay Village which catches the 'unique ideas.

Agricultural Protection (p. 46 of existing): The existing document is thin on agricultural protection guidelines. The proposed DPA (Part 4, pages 1-5) is more comprehensive in terms of objectives and guidelines. Guidelines should reflect zoning uses e.g. if biogas becomes a permitted or discretionary use in the land use bylaw, the new DPA guidelines will need to be updated.

Habitat Protection (p. 50&51 of existing): The proposed document includes habitat protection in the Sensitive Ecosystem section (Part 2 pages 11 – 16). It makes sense to do this by definition as ecosystems are all inclusive of flora, fauna, vegetation, etc. Specific references are "SE 11&12" which are general in nature and therefore more flexible for use by the Development Officer to be more strict/lenient as circumstances dictate.

Landscape, Rainwater Management and Environmental Protection (p.51& 52 of existing): The proposed document takes the existing guidelines and reassigns them in various sections of the proposed document. Parts 5, 9 & 10 of the proposed document gather most of them and a few are located in areas such as 'sensitive ecosystem' (Part 2). They are captured and added to and their location and context in the text make sense (to me).

Marine Riparian (p.53-55 of existing): In the proposed text, Part 3 pages 17-21 captures the intent of the existing guideline.

Outdoor Lighting (p. 57 of existing): The lighting guidelines have been incorporated to Section 5 (Form and Character pages 1-17) of the new document which is appropriate as lighting is part of the ambience

Parking, Vehicular Access and Pedestrian Access (p.58 & 59 of existing): The guidelines are carried in Parts 5, 9 and 10 of the proposed documents.

Freshwater Riparian (p.60-62 of existing): This is captured in Section 1 of the proposed document.

Sensitive Ecosystems (p. 62 & 63 of existing): The proposed document equivalent is Section 2 and as noted above, includes other sections of the existing document.

Signage (p. 64 & 65): Part 5 of the new document (p 13 & 14) outlines signage guidelines

Subdivision Guidelines (p. 65): These exist in our current DPA and are out of place. Subdivision is its own process, rules and guidelines. The reference table suggests these guidelines have been captured in Parts 9 & 10 although I couldn't find them and I am OK with that.

Overall Impression: The format proposed is easy to follow. More graphics and pictures are encouraged to help understand the guidelines as words can't do it as well.

On the whole the commission for area A are satisfied that the essence of Area A OCP DPA has been captured in the draft regional HOCP

Review of maps for completeness:

Comments: More labels on roads etc. would help identify areas

It was noted on map DPA 5 that a number of creeks were missing such as Hollings Creek and Handerson Creek

Adjournment 7:30 pm