

CVRD INTERNAL REFERRAL RESPONSES



COWICHAN VALLEY REGIONAL
DISTRICT

175 Ingram Street, Duncan, B.C. V9L 1N8
Tel: 250.746.2620 | Fax: 250.746.2621

CVRD File No.:	RZ23A03 (Stonebridge)
Application Type:	Rezoning & OCP Amendment
Subject Property:	PIDS: 010-208-089, 025-942-310, 000-278-131, 009-488-286, 009-487-247, 009-487-221, 009-528-601, 004-173-287, 029-533-601, and 009-497-803
Proposal:	This application is a request that the CVRD Board consider approving an application to consolidate and modernize existing zoning for the Stonebridge Lands in Mill Bay and several adjacent parcels.
Utilities Division (Louise Knodel-Joy & Vanessa Thomson)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application supported subject to the recommendations outlined below.</p> <p><i>With respect to our Division's goals/interests, we offer the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Stonebridge developers are working with the CVRD and other developments to join the Mill Springs Wastewater system and upgrade the collection system.</i> <i>The proposed development will require an eventual upgrade of the wastewater treatment plant, but the anticipated timeline for the development of 10-15 years, so therefore not an issue at this time.</i> <i>Consolidation of this site, has no bearing on the sewer system expansion at this time and Utilities division will refer to Land Use Services for their expertise.</i> <i>Provision of potable water, is Mill Bay Water District, an Improvement District.</i> <i>Further CVRD has no drainage systems in the area.</i>
Building Inspections and Bylaw Enforcement Division (Sonny Bryski)	<p><i>With respect to our Division's goals/interests, we offer the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Continued discussions will take place with the applicants through the rezoning process regarding the Building Inspection and Bylaw Enforcement Division interests pertaining to options for show homes.</i> <i>If the Board wishes to provide options to show homes, Building Inspections recommends that the CVRD provide a zoning regulation that allows multiple homes on a larger lot. This would provide an option to construct show homes which could receive an occupancy permit.</i> <i>Building Inspections & Bylaw Enforcement Division has also flagged concerns with respect to Spatial Separation as it relates to small narrow lots. The proposed 300m2 lots increase the likelihood that the side elevations of each dwelling will not be</i>

	<p><i>permitted to have unprotected openings (which significantly limits building design options).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bylaw Enforcement is not supportive of a workforce housing use that does not include a housing agreement; however, zoning provisions for a hotel with flexibility for long-term stays could be supported.</i>
Parks & Trails Division <i>(Tanya Soroka)</i>	<p>☑ Application supported subject to the recommendations outlined below.</p> <p><i>With respect to the Parks & Trails Division's goals/interests, we offer the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continued discussions will take place with the applicants through the rezoning process regarding the Parks and Trails Division interests per the registered section 219 community amenity covenant.</i> • <i>The Parks and Trails Division will work with Development Services Division to finalize the new replacement covenant ensuring the needs of the community are met per the adopted 2015 Electoral Area A Community Parks & Trails Master Plan.</i> • <i>The application should be referred to the Electoral Area A Parks Advisory Commission for comments on the amended covenant.</i>
Environmental Services Division <i>(Keith Lawrence)</i>	<p>☑ Application supported subject to the recommendations outlined below.</p> <p><i>With respect to our Division's goals/interests, we offer the following comments:</i></p> <p><i>We understand that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Based on the land area and existing zoning – the total number of dwelling units that could be built today is approximately 929 units.</i> • <i>Despite the zoning allowance for 929 units (plus commercial buildings), the developers estimated that the potential build-out is 561 units based on the infrastructure constraints that exist today.</i> • <i>The development is presently anticipated to have a 15-year build out, and the constraints that exist today could change tomorrow.</i> <p><i>Our concerns regard the potential increase in density that this application could enable. With no density cap on some of the proposed areas and the possibility of a significant increase in density, the current watershed condition would be unable to accommodate the added stress of this high demand.</i></p> <p><i>On review of the proposal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No density caps are proposed for Areas 1 and 4.</i> • <i>A density cap is proposed for Area 5</i> • <i>For Areas 2 and 3 the developer notes that their intent is to have a mix of single-family, duplex, and multi-family lots</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Under existing zoning, Areas 2 and 3 currently have a density cap of 605 units (single-family or duplex).</i> ○ <i>The proposed zoning for Areas 2 and 3 would potentially result in a density of 942 Single-Family Lots, or 565 duplex lots (1,131 units), or 282 multi-family lots (each multi-</i>

family lot would be capable of accommodating a 6-storey building under the proposed zoning). We understand that the developer intends to build a mix of single-family, duplex and multi-family lots.

Our recommendations are as follows:

- A density limit should be included for each area within the proposed comprehensive development zone.*
- The Environmental Services Division notes that a density cap would not prevent the developer from applying for future zoning amendments when/if infrastructure and water supply constraints can be overcome and environmental impacts addressed in the future. The Division would prefer that requests for density increases be tied to available infrastructure and water resource capacity so that the true impacts of a development can be evaluated and understood prior to approvals.*
- Since the developer suggests that the density permitted under the existing zoning provisions cannot be achieved, the Environmental Services Division would support a reassignment of density.*
 - For example, since the existing RM-3 zone (proposed Area 4) allows for a maximum of 35 dwelling units per hectare (approx. 86 units for the subject lands). If the developer only plans to build 40 units in Area 4, the remainder 46 units could be transferred to Area 3. This would help to facilitate the intent of this rezoning (providing flexibility for a mix of multi-family building options) without increasing overall site density.*
- We understand that the province's Water Protection group is developing a hydrological model for surface and ground water. While the Ministry of Forests has previously communicated that the watershed model will not be a determining factor for future decision-making pertaining to water licensing, their model is intended to support decision making on water resource allocations.*
- If no density cap is proposed, or if a density increase is proposed, we recommend that further decisions on rezoning in the Shawnigan Creek watershed be postponed until after the establishment of the watershed model.*

Any additional density should be evaluated against the watershed Model.

Once this model is established, we recommend the following:

- The establishment of a water use plan for the Shawnigan Creek watershed which considers water supply and groundwater stresses, demand and availability for the long term.*
- Solutions outlined in the plan should include water conservation measures and the potential need for both community and site-specific water storage options.*

We also expect the following:

- A liquid waste management connectivity plan be put in place to reduce potential impact on the surrounding environment due to the increase in usage of the current system.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All measures be taken to protect the riparian areas of Shawnigan Creek and Handysen Creek during all development. • A rainwater management plan be completed by a professional due to the increase in impervious area that would result in less groundwater absorption and increase the risk of flooding and debris run off into the surrounding watershed. • The habitat of Edward's Beach Moth that is noted on the property not be affected during development. • The environment of the mature forest that is noted on the property not be affected during development.
Emergency Management Division (Robb Schouler & Chris McInerney, Mill Bay Fire Department Chief)	<p>The Fire Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on this application at this preliminary stage. We understand that further engagement with external agencies will include the Mill Bay Fire Department. We offer the following preliminary comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department would like to see the traffic plan (if any) on the Barry rd., Deloume rd., and TCH intersections. That area already gets very congested and would become much worse with the proposed development if not mitigated in some way making it difficult for us to get our trucks to calls. • BC building code must be followed, specifically the codes on building construction on building in close proximity to other buildings and the codes on fire hydrant spacing. • Fire hydrants should be tested as per NFPA and fire department shall be consulted on pumper connection thread type. • Fire hydrants shall be operational before construction starts. • If street parking is allowed the road shall be wide enough for fire apparatus when vehicles are parked on both sides. • If additional density is proposed, we would request that the developer consider identifying a percentage of new housing for local first responders (to have first right of refusal) as part of any additional Community Amenity Contribution package.
Community Planning Division (Mike Tippet & Lauren Wright)	<p>☑ Application supported subject to the recommendations outlined below.</p> <p>With respect to our Division's goals/interests, we offer the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing density in a fully serviced core area like the Stonebridge lands would be a good thing; however, the applicant indicates that the changes proposed are not largely intended to achieve higher densities; but rather, to enhance flexibility. Flexibility is also a good thing. • Stonebridge is a large, inward-focussed site within a basin and using it as a test site for innovative and alternative forms of residential development would be consistent with adaptive management protocols. • Would note that as proposed parcel sizes get down to 300 square metres it becomes very difficult to have larger homes and sufficient off-street parking. • On the other hand, smaller lots means less yard, which in all likelihood means less water demand for landscaping, though a landscape devoid of (deciduous) trees may not be ideal from a microclimate perspective. • Would suggest that a density cap in terms of units/ha or over all as per the present CD-8 Zone should perhaps not be necessary

	<p>so long as other proxy regulations are sufficiently well developed (for example, regulating density indirectly through building massing regulations like floor area ratio; off-street parking; parcel coverage; minimum setback of garage door from road right-of-way).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workforce housing concept is good and I would make a pitch for totally flexible MFR/hotel occupancies combined and have the owner/developer regulate occupancies as needed. • Show homes should be accommodated if at all possible and staff seem to have found a suitable way to do this. • If secondary suites are permitted within single residential dwellings, parking for both the suite and dwelling should be required on each parcel. Sufficient parking spaces should be shown on the site plan for each parcel. The driveways should be long enough to ensure large sized vehicles (such as large trucks) do not overhang onto the road. • Driveway lengths should be at least 6 meters to accommodate large trucks and other large vehicles so they do not overhang onto the road. • Garage parking should not be considered a parking space (all required parking should be able to be accommodated in the driveway). Many times, in such dense developments on smaller parcels, garage space ends up being used as storage areas. This pushes parking to the driveway and/or street. • The covenant should be amended to require any financial contribution to the CVRD to be adjusted for inflation on the date the contribution is eventually received, starting in 2016 (the year of the current covenant was registered). • Minimum parcel widths should be carefully considered in terms of providing adequate parking for single residential dwellings and suites. • Consider adding further regulations that pertain to drive-thrus, including minimum drive-isle widths, RV parking areas (as this is a tourist commuter hub in summer months), etc. • Definitions are being reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Land Use Bylaw development process. Any definition is subject to change. • The Comprehensive Land Use Bylaw will also include new/updated parking provisions. The parking for this CD zone should follow the parking regulations proposed in the new bylaw.
--	--