

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

**ELECTORAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2008**

A D D E N D U M

PAGES

DELEGATIONS (Requires motion)

- 2 **John Moore, French Creek House and French Creek Estates**, re Proposed Area 'G' Draft OCP (Bylaw No. 1540, 2008).

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

- 3 **R. Dean, Director, FCRA (The Friends of French Creek Conservation Society)**, re Development Permit Application No. 60735 – Lundine Lane – Area G.
- 4 **R. Robinson, President, FCRA (The Friends of French Creek Conservation Society)**, re Area 'G' Draft OCP.
- 5-6 **M. Jessen, Secretary, French Creek Residents' Association**, re Area 'G' OCP Review and Adoption Process.

Burgoyne, Linda

From: djmoore [djmoore@creekhouseressort.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 1:53 PM
To: Burgoyne, Linda
Subject: EAPC Meeting Tonight at 6:00pm

Dear Linda,

We hereby request to be placed on the above noted agenda as a delegation to address the EAPC.

Name: French Creek House and French Creek Estates
Address: 1-1025 Lee Road, Parksville, BC V9P 2E1
Telephone: 248 3713

Topic: Proposed Area 'G' Draft OCP (Bylaw 1540. 2008).

Please confirm receipt and the sufficiency of this email by telephone at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,
John Moore

Burgoyne, Linda

From: RICHARD DEAN [rddean@shaw.ca]
Sent: Sunday, January 06, 2008 11:02 PM
To: rddean@shaw.ca
Subject: Lundine Lane 4 lot subdivision DP Permit 60735

Director Stanhope:

FCRA first learned of DP 60735 - subdivision of lot 6 on Lundine Lane when a director read the Jan 8 agenda of the EAPC on the website(posted Jan 4).

On behalf of FCRA I wish to inform you that our Board does not agree with the staff recommendation for a 4 lot subdivision. As you are aware we support infilling of lots where the proposal adheres to RDN bylaws, covenants on title and the Local Government Act. You are also aware that residents in the Lundine Lane/Meadow Drive area are becoming increasingly frustrated by the dangers of using the junction of Johnstone Road and the Island Highway.

We note that in order to achieve a 4 lot subdivision the following is necessary:-

- 2 lots have to be panhandled in design
- the required legal minimum frontages of lots 2 and 3 are drastically reduced from as much as 10% to 2.3%
- covenant 215 is to be lifted to allow for vegetation and tree removal
- a QEP has reduced the SPEA from 30m to 10m
- the building envelope of lot 3 is extremely small and constricted and not in keeping with the neighbourhood. It is highly likely that a relaxation of the 15m watercourse setback will be sought to facilitate a home of even modest size.

We are also disappointed that MOT state that they have no traffic issues with this proposal. Reducing the legal minimum frontage of a panhandle lot is a safety issue and bringing more traffic to the Johnstone Road/Island Highway intersection is a community safety concern.

We note that staff is leaving the management of storm water to MOT. It would help if this plan was made public at the time of application, especially as adjacent properties have septic sewage systems.

We suggest that the application should return to staff for further review. We think that it is possible to achieve a 3 lot subdivision without relaxing the minimum lot frontage, having one panhandle lot instead of two, keeping covenant 215 in place, and adhere to Bylaw 500 watercourse setback of 15m.

Richard Dean, Director, FCRA

Burgoyne, Linda

From: Joe Stanhope [jstanhope@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 7:46 PM
To: Burgoyne, Linda
Subject: Fw: Area 'G' OCP

More 'late correspondence'

Joe

----- Original Message -----

From: Sandy and Robin

To: Stanhope Joe

Cc: [Sawatsky, Janet](#) ; [Coath Brian](#) ; [Cote Pierre](#) ; [Davidge Des](#) ; [Dean Richard](#) ; [Peacey Ceri](#) ; [Robinson Robin](#) ; [Thomson Jacquie](#) ; [Voth Janice](#)

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 12:16 PM

Subject: Area 'G' OCP

Dear Joe,

I do have to put it on record that The Friends of French Creek Conservation Society consider that the principal of opportunity for public input has been thwarted regarding the 3rd draft of the Area 'G' OCP. On the December 5, 2007 there was no indication on the RDN website of when the next steps in the Area 'G' OCP review process would take place and there was not enough time for public input or for our Society to address the issues between Draft 3 of the Area 'G' OCP being made available online on December 5, 2007 and the January 1, 2008 newspaper announcement that the draft OCP was being presented to the Electoral Area Planning Committee for forwarding to the Board meeting on January 22, 2008 for 1st and 2nd reading. Based on the December 5 announcement, we informed our membership on December 11, 2007 that the Executive would be working on our analysis of draft 3 of the OCP at our next Executive meeting on January 10, 2008.

We would like to have the process delayed by one month.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Robinson, President
The Friends of French Creek Conservation Society

1/8/2008

Burgoyne, Linda

From: Joe Stanhope [jstanhope@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 7:46 PM
To: Burgoyne, Linda
Subject: Fw: Area G OCP Review and Adoption Process

More 'late correspondence',

Joe

----- Original Message -----

From: "M Jessen" <mjessen@telus.net>
To: "Joe Stanhope, Dir." <jstanhope@shaw.ca>
Sent: Sunday, January 06, 2008 9:36 PM
Subject: Area G OCP Review and Adoption Process

- > Director Stanhope:
- > We hope to make this message short and hopefully substantive in order to
- > obtain a delay in the processing of the document at the EAPC and Board
- > level.
- > We appreciate that it seems the review process has taken a long time.
- > However, we need to remind ourselves that the community did not review
- > one OCP, we basically did three - any two of which may have been
- > unfamiliar to any individual resident.
- > Our society, among others, was surprised when we were notified of the
- > third draft on Dec. 4 and its website availability on Dec. 5 - just as
- > many of us were working on plans for the holiday season. Further, only
- > several days later did we realize, unlike previous notifications, we
- > were not given any indication as to what the next steps would be and
- > when they would occur. We anticipated timely notification of future
- > steps would be forthcoming from the RDN.
- > The FCRA board met on its scheduled date of Dec. 6 with a full agenda of
- > items other than the OCP with the intention of dealing with the OCP at
- > what was to be its next scheduled meeting on January 3. In the meantime
- > the FCRA board asked Planner Keller for the resource material that
- > precipitated and supported the RDN's interest in secondary suites as a
- > way of dealing with the problem of affordable housing. On or around
- > Dec. 19 we learned we could not have the room for the next FCRA board
- > meeting until January 10.
- > On Dec. 31 we learned by newspaper advertisement that the next step in
- > the review process was presentation of Draft 3 to the EAPC and then
- > first and second reading at the Board in January.
- >
- > The staff report in the January 8 EAPC agenda package is substantial and
- > deserves to be considered in detail by the FCRA board - never mind by
- > the other dedicated citizens who worked on the review and by the
- > residents of the broader community. A quick examination of the staff
- > report suggests that there may be some weaknesses in what is being
- > presented to the RDN directors.
- >
- > We would like to suggest that the RDN EAPC delay processing the
- > presentation from staff until February, or just accept the staff report
- > for information.
- >
- > FCRA has at a minimum three areas of major concern in the third draft
- > that need to be reviewed:

- > 1. French Creek harbour area
- > 2. Secondary suites policy
- > 3. Wembley Neighborhood and Church Road
- >
- > Regarding (1), the changes made to Draft 2 appear to be significant and
- > because they may now become permanent, deserve serious community
- > review. The implications for the entire French Creek estuary and its
- > development have been an overriding concern of both our society for many
- > years and for the dedicated review participants during this review.
- > Draft 3 does not seem to reflect the expression of those who attended
- > the numerous workshops and public meetings, the written submissions by
- > individual ratepayers, and the formal response by the directors of this
- > society - and may at the extreme even exacerbate the problems they worry
- > about. We seriously believe that we need a "sit down" with you and RDN
- > staff so that we might better understand how or if the draft addresses
- > community concerns about the French Creek and Morningstar Creek estuary.
- >
- > (2) The FCRA offered a survey at its Nov. 14 general meeting regarding a
- > secondary suites policy. The expression of community concern reflected
- > in that survey does not seem to have been addressed in the third draft
- > even though the survey results and summary were presented to RDN
- > representatives on November 23. Further, FCRA directors may need a
- > meeting with you and staff to achieve a level of comfort that was not
- > achieved by Planner Keller's letter of Dec. 19. There appear to be
- > several other development and subdivision activities going on in our
- > community that are of concern and should possibly be of greater concern
- > to the writers of the OCP - and which should be addressed in the
- > document much before secondary suites policy.
- >
- > (3) Our examination of all the written submissions compiled by Mr.
- > Keller has raised a number of concerns about the Wembley area -
- > unfortunately we only completed the analysis of the submissions that
- > were of interest to us on January 1.
- >
- > We look forward to an opportunity to have meaningful dialogue with you
- > before the new Area G OCP is entered into the formal acceptance process.
- >
- > Sincerely,
- > Michael Jessen, P.Eng.
- > Secretary, French Creek Residents' Association
- > 752-4579