

Subject: My follow-up comments to my correspondence regarding the RCS, from tonight's meeting.

From: Lori Waters <lori@watersbiomedical.com>

Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 22:14:14 -0700

To: Central Saanich Council <council@csaanich.ca>

CC: Ruby Shea <Ruby.Shea@csaanich.ca>

Dear Mayor Mar and Council,

As promised, please find below my signature a written copy of my comments from this evening's meeting, in follow up to my earlier correspondence regarding the Regional Context Statement Amendment.

Thank you.

Lori

--



watersbiomedical.com

MEDICAL & SCIENTIFIC

Design, Illustration & Animation

Lori Waters, MFA, MScBMC

250.652.1594

Lori Waters, 1179 Mount Newton Crossroad. Follow-up comments to correspondence re: RCS Amendment. Council meeting, September 8, 2008

First, there are a number of supporters here in the audience tonight I'd like to acknowledge by having these people stand with me for a moment, as we are here together to advocate protection of the integrity of the Regional Context Statement, and the urban containment boundaries within the OCP and Regional Growth Strategy.

I'd like to begin by thanking this Council, as this District has consistently, since 2004, voted to uphold the principles of the RGS, and has consistently voted against any expansion of the urban containment boundaries. Of particular note, Cllr Thompson moved, and it was carried unanimously at the Sept 12, 2005 meeting almost exactly three years ago, that a comment be sent to the Highlands indicating Central Saanich was of the opinion that the Highlands change was inconsistent with containing sprawl. In 2007, Councillor Mason seconded a motion that was carried, that Central Saanich was concerned with any proposed expansion of urban containment boundaries, and that any expansion of the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Area was not supported by this District. In October of 2007, the District sought to meet with the Tsawout and Tsartlip first nations to discuss changes to the RGS – this same courtesy does not appear to have been extended in the case of proposing urban services outside our urban containment boundaries.

In January of this year, the Planning committee carried a motion that a response be sent to the CRD that the proposed highlands amendment was, in particular:

- against public sentiment,
- that First Nations might be detrimentally impacted,
- that it violated the intent of the RGS, which is to (and I quote) "focus and concentrate development in geographic nodes"
- and that "permitting the proposed service expansion would, in Council's view, only increase development pressure in the area, and contribute to urban sprawl.

I would argue that all of these apply to our current situation, and I urge you to vote with integrity and maintain your positions as you applied them to another municipality.

If the RCS amendment goes ahead as in the planners memo, this change will not facilitate planning, but instead "ad hoc" servicing that will slowly but surely DESTROY our rural areas.

What is being proposed is death by a thousand cuts – like the degradation of the tree canopy and the spot zoning in this District that is currently occurring. We won't necessarily notice this all at once, but eventually, we'll have lost all of our rural lands, and DEVELOPMENT IS PERMANENT.

Waterline proponents keep saying this RCS change isn't about development, but consider the source of the comments. If you overlay the map that the water advisory task force drew up of the development companies listed at Senanus addresses from the phone book and the Internet, and people in this community who are KNOWN developers, you will CLEARLY see that this is about development. The areas where complaints have occurred overlay nearly exactly with addresses held by development companies or developers. Properties owned by developers and developers alone represent more than 25% of the assessed land values on Senanus Drive, and 23% of properties owned.

I have two short quotes that also illustrate this point:

The July 1999 Memo from Von Bishop to Gary Nason ,reads:

"The availability of water could encourage some property owners to either develop under the existing zoning, or to apply for rezoning."

Mr. Frank Towler, President of CSWVA's Letter to Municipal Administrator, February 15, 2001 states:

"It has been the norm in B.C. for Municipalities and communities to work together to solve water problems for existing communities. The existing Municipal and Provincial bylaws for water main extensions, however, have been created with land developers in mind. Through the creation of profit, land developers are able to pay for extensions to Municipal water systems."

So I ask you – are you prepared to let developers drive changes to the OCP that clearly states that it's values are to maintain our rural lands? The OCP is a democratic document, created over decades.

I strongly urge Council to either NOT change the RCS at all, as I believe it was very deliberately worded. If you MUST change it, please adopt very stringent language.

To reiterate:

1. Development is PERMANENT.
2. The OCP values do not seem to condone the RCS change, nor does the Regional Growth Strategy
3. You don't know what Councils will come after you
4. You have a DUTY to maintain the integrity of the RGS which Central Saanich ratified, and that means not making decisions that will degrade our urban containment boundaries over time, or that will seriously fetter the ability of future generations to make viable land planning decisions.

Thank you.