

South Cowichan OCP Meeting
Saturday, January 22nd
Minutes of Meeting

Chair called the meeting to order at 10:15 AM

In attendance: Ken Cossey, Area B Director, June Laraman, Mike Hanson, Brent Beach, Cynara de Goutiere and Graham Ross- Smith who left at 10:50. Also present were Katy Tompkins and Mike Tippet representing the CVRD and at least 15 members of the public.

The chair noted that the Mill Bay Village Core meeting will take place on February 7th instead of January 31st at the Red McLean RM in Kerry Park Recreation Centre.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the Shawnigan Lake Village Draft Plan. This was done on a section by section (page by page) basis.

Katy pointed out that the WR designation on the map provided by the CVRD needed to be revisited, as it did not address the whole of Shawnigan Lake.

Section 1 Introduction

The chair suggested that written comments be provided on this section and the time be spent on the Objectives, policies presented in the plan. There was a good deal of discussion around a map, which showed the boundaries for the SL Watershed presented by the SL APC chair. The intent was to ensure that the focus of the plan was to ensure the integrity of the watershed going forward and locate density outside the watershed if possible.

Section 1.2 Shawnigan Village Today

Suggestion was made to remove the last three paragraphs in this section> The majority of the group did not agree that this was appropriate.

There was also discussion around some of the terminology used in the plan and a written document was submitted for CVRD review around some of these terms. For example, the term Manufactured Homes was discussed. The CVRD pointed out that this was a term used within the Provincial-planning universe and should be retained.

Section 1.3 Shawnigan Village Tomorrow

Request to add the estimated growth numbers for SL to this section of the plan as section 1.2 “Shawnigan Village Today” indicated that there were currently 7500 people residing in the area. It would be good to understand the expected growth over the plan period.

Section 2 Vision Statement & Goals

General Discussion around how the SL Village document fit into the overall plan. It was apparent that this was not well understood by those participants who were not on the SCOCP committee and did not have access to the complete draft OCP.

Suggestion that there should be a positioning statement at the beginning of this section explaining how the Village Core document related to the rest of the SCOCP draft. Also need to explain difference between Village Core and Village Containment Boundary.

Suggestion to return to use of R1, R@ etc.

R1 = Village Core Residential

R2 = Non Village Core Residential

R3 = Rural Residential

Goal 3: Reword “and becomes complete” as it is unclear what this means.

Goal 6: Change statement to read to provide housing and community amenities

Add Goal around the provision of community services as sewer and water is essential to the future development of the SL core.

Add goal re management of SL as a source of water and a freshwater recreational lake.

Concern expressed that the goals still did not link to the policies. Specific examples were requested by the CVRD to be submitted in writing.

Section 3 General Policies

Explain Development \Approval Area – create reference.

Policy 3.1 should be moved to the end and become 3.8

Policy 3.6 change “may” initiate to “will” initiate

Policy 3.6 b. change “pedestrian trails” to walkways.

Policy 3.6 add h. provision of market gardens

Section 4 Residential Development

First paragraph missing reference to Multi Family as one of the residential designations.

Section 4.2 Residential Designation Policies

4.2.5 Change “home occupation” to home based business.

4.2.6 Move to the beginning and make 4.2.1 as it defines lot size.

Section 4.3 Suburban Residential Designation Policy

Policy 4.3.3 Should give consideration to impact on watershed. Should this be encouraged? Issue should be flagged at open house.

Section 4.5 Multi Family Residential Designation Policies

Policy 4.5.5 Change “may be required” to “will be required” and also change “pedestrian trails” to “walkways”.

Add walkways not adjacent to roads will be encouraged.

Section 5 Commercial Designations

Add to the introduction how much commercial exists now vs. how much is being added.

Need to address the fact that continued growth in the SL area without corresponding growth in commercial services will create a strain on the infrastructure internal to SL and also the surrounding areas. E.g. roads, retail services etc. The CVRD should provide recommendation how to address this in the long-term.

5.1.D. Change “maximize” to “provide”. Add the word “commercial” before lake views.

5.1.G. Delete “including greenspace, parks and trails and add reference to Section 8.

Policy 5.2.4 Drive-thru franchises provide entry-level employment, which is needed in the area. This plan does not allow drive-thru commercial entities. Should be flagged as requiring community input.

Policy 5.2.6 Reword – “street right of way edge”.

Section 7 Water Recreation Designation

Needs to be revised as too narrow in scope.

Section 8 Shawnigan Lake Development Permit Area

CVRD discussed the potential to create a matrix that would explain what guidelines apply in what circumstances. It was agreed that this would be a good approach as stating all the areas in which this section did not apply was confusing particularly if it was left at the beginning of the section.

Ensure words “marine riparian” are deleted from document.

8.6.1.1. Remove “high standard of design” as too ambiguous.

8.6.1.5 Reword “ proposed buildings should be oriented and of such a scale that some view around or over the proposed buildings would remain if possible” to something simpler such as “ proposed buildings must provide lake views where possible”.

8.6.3.10 Change to permeable surfaces is required. Must deliver universal access.

Add new commercial sites must provide adequate parking with reference to guidelines.

8.6.4.7 Change “mature treed boulevard streetscape” to “a boulevard streetscape with trees or shrubbery”.

8.6.4.8 Add reference to specific documents such as BC Landscape and Nursery or Habitat Acquisition Trust.

8.6.4.11 Change Large areas of bark mulch, gravel or other similar materials are not suitable” to “areas should not be dominated by ...”

8.6.9. This section will be deleted, as it is not applicable.

8.6.10 Concern expressed that the only time the riparian regulations apply is if there are fish in the stream. It was agreed that the regulations at a local level should be expanded to evaluate the ecological health, habitat and hydrology.

Future Development Areas Outside the VCB

The CVRD indicated that we would discuss some small opportunities to expand the Village Core to entertain potential sewage disposal fields etc. A member of the SCOC committee pointed out that this was not the original intent of the discussion – that we were meant to discuss future development opportunities in the long-term that might impact the area that had not been addressed in the plan.

The CVRD pointed out that they had received strong feedback at the prior meeting that there was not an inclination to pursue this topic and did not want to discuss the issue as those committee members were not present.

The chair pointed out that the original intent had been to discuss future development opportunities that are not addressed in the plan and if the subject was not going to be discussed then it should be removed from the agenda.

The chair also pointed out that this issue should be flagged to the public, as there were many facets of the public not present on the SCOCF Committee (E.g. working families and younger people) who deserved an opportunity to provide input.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM