

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO**

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2012  
7:00 PM**

***(RDN Board Chambers)***

**A D D E N D U M**

**PAGES**

**LATE DELEGATIONS** (requires motion)

- 3                    **EnidMary Sangster-Kelly**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.
- 4                    **Brian Sangster-Kelly**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.
- 5                    **Mr. Moore**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.
- 6                    **Phil Makow**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.
- 7                    **Mike Delves**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.

**COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE**

- 8 - 12              **Correspondence – November, 2012**, re Island Corridor Foundation Request for Funding.
- 13 - 15             **Ron and Wendy Hill**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149 – Ken Tanguay – Redden Road, Electoral Area 'E'.
- 16                   **Daphne and Ron Davis**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149 – Ken Tanguay – Redden Road, Electoral Area 'E'.
- 17 - 18             **Geoffrey and Patricia Relph**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149 – Ken Tanguay – Redden Road, Electoral Area 'E'.
- 19 - 21             **Michael Jessen**, re Development Variance Permit and Frontage Relaxation Application No. PL 2012-146 – Shepheard – 853 Miller Road, Electoral Area 'G'.
- 22                   **Lee-Ann Kelly and Bruce Fong**, re Development Variance Permit and Frontage Relaxation Application No. PL 2012-146 – Shepheard – 853 Miller Road, Electoral Area 'G'.
- 23                   **Louise Watson**, re Development Variance Permit and Frontage Relaxation Application No. PL 2012-146 – Shepheard – 853 Miller Road, Electoral Area 'G'.

24

**Lorelei Birchett**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-147 – Gray – 1815 Settler Road, Electoral Area 'F'.

**O'Halloran, Matt**

---

**From:** EnidMary Sangster-Kelly <enidsk@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2012 7:48 AM  
**To:** O'Halloran, Matt  
**Subject:** ICF

Dear Sir,

I am requesting permission to address the RDN Directors at the Nov. 27,2012, Board Meeting re: the ICF's request for funding.

Thank-you so much,

EnidMary Sangster-Kelly

(PO Box 604, PV, V9P 2G7)  
1234 Grafton  
Errington

250 248 2928

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** Brian Sangster-Kelly <briansk1@telus.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2012 8:24 PM  
**To:** ;  
**Subject:** request to speak on Nov. 27

Hi Mat, I would like to speak, on Tuesday Nov. 27, at the Regular Board Meeting, addressing the ICF issue.

Thank you and God bless,

Brian Sangster-Kelly  
1234 Grafton Ave.  
Errington, BC  
V0R 1V0

250-248-2928

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** O'Halloran, Matt  
**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2012 11:05 AM  
**To:** 'terrynm@shaw.ca'  
**Subject:** RDN Delegation Nov 27

Hello Mr. Moore

As discussed I have added your delegation regarding the Island Corridor Foundation to the meeting addendum for November 27, 7PM, for a 5 minute presentation.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch if you have any further questions.

Thank You

Matthew O'Halloran  
Legislative Coordinator  
Regional District of Nanaimo  
250-390-6569  
[www.rdn.bc.ca](http://www.rdn.bc.ca)

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** philmakow@shaw.ca  
**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 1:24 PM  
**To:** O'Halloran, Matt  
**Subject:** RDN Meeting Nov. 27th

Hi Matt, I request an opportunity to speak as a delegate to the issue of funding for ICF by increasing property taxes at the RDN Meeting on November 27, 2012. Please, confirm and provide any details (time + place) in this regard by e-mail. Thank you, Phil Makow (250-228-7735).

Sent on the TELUS Mobility network with BlackBerry

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** O'Halloran, Matt  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 27, 2012 12:09 PM  
**To:** 'mike.delves@mnpc.ca'  
**Subject:** Delegation - Nov 27 Board

Hi Mike,

As per your phone call I have added your delegation request for a 5 minute presentation regarding the Island Corridor Foundation to the agenda for November 27, 7pm. Please confirm receipt of this message.

Thanks

Matthew O'Halloran  
Legislative Coordinator  
Regional District of Nanaimo  
250-390-6569  
[www.rdn.bc.ca](http://www.rdn.bc.ca)

**O'Halloran, Matt**

---

**Subject:**

FW:

---

**From:** Bill & Margaret [<mailto:millerm-2@shaw.ca>]

**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 8:14 AM

**To:** Nohr, Tamie

**Subject:**

Good Morning Mr. Stanhope: I am definitely NOT in favour of using any tax dollars for the E&N Railway.  
PLEASE give this matter serious consideration before you vote on Tuesday.

Thank you

Margaret Miller.

**O'Halloran, Matt**

---

**Subject:** FW: Proposed Train Service

---

**From:** ron [<mailto:ronmorrison100@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 11:24 PM

**To:** Nohr, Tamie

**Subject:** Proposed Train Service

Gentlemen,

The train service on Vancouver Island while a lovely pipe dream is doomed to certain failure. The ridership from local people does not exist anymore.

The service as it was, was useless, it all went the wrong way and had a lousy schedule. What is currently proposed is just as ridiculous and will never be ridden by any locals for any extended period of time, it is not capable of of going anyplace useful or staying there for a time frame that makes shopping or theatre or events possible . The stupid idea that it will haul freight and coal in the future has already proven not viable and the tracks and trestles are not improving with age. This is certain to bring on horrendous expense as well a myriad of legal challenges. Perhaps it has some tourist interest but I imagine the ridership will never ever pay for the service. If you vote for Graham Bruce's ego trip you will be condemning us to a constant drain of dollars that could be better spent. The railway bed would make a fabulous linear park , it already is a great game trail, would be terrific for the horsey crowd, could be used for biking, hiking, quads, dirt bikes and dog walkers.

Lets use some common sense for a change and see this proposal as the supreme boondoggle it is.

Ron Morrison

3201 Brooklin Lane

Qualicum Beach

V9K 1X5

**O'Halloran, Matt**

---

**Subject:** FW: NO to ICF funding

---

**From:** Ruth Morrison [<mailto:ruthannemorrison@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 11:27 PM

**To:** Nohr, Tamie

**Subject:** NO to ICF funding

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal from the Island Corridor Foundation, that the Regional District supply some of the funding to get the rail line re-established.

I do not believe the estimates presented by the ICF are realistic. I do not believe the passenger rail service would be financially viable, and the rail line would be "forced" to proceed with freight rail service. Again, with taxpayer subsidies. My property backs on to the old railway line. I used to enjoy seeing the little train go by once or twice a day. I'm even one of the few who actually took the train in to Victoria. But I would not be happy to have a coal train rumble past my little house in the woods! Not just a case of NIMBY: I believe we have more urgent needs for tax dollars.

\$15 million from the taxpayers so Graham Bruce can have his dream job, his grown-up train set? No thank you!

Please vote NO.

Sincerely,

Ruth Morrison

3201 Brooklin Lane

Qualicum Beach, BC

V9K 1X5

**From:** Andy Pickard [<mailto:andy.pickard@nucleus.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2012 4:56 PM  
**To:** Nohr, Tamie  
**Subject:** CONSTITUENT INPUT FOR JOE STANHOPE

**Good day, Joe.** It's a few years since we have talked. I want to give you some 'constituent input' on several topics:

- Rail services on Vancouver Island – I do NOT support any funds, or a levy, going to rail services on VI. While the concept of rail is great, the very low population density on VI and the lack of any significant industry generating large volumes of freight means that rail will just continue to be a 'money pit'. I understand that the rail service has not been 'profitable' for several decades – and we have fewer large mills and plants producing freight now than years ago. No significant revenues can be expected from the passenger side. While there might be sufficient commuter traffic close to Victoria for a short commuter run, the number of people who commute daily from Nanaimo, Parksville or Courtenay to Victoria must be extremely low. [Even the Greyhound bus service is losing money – and a bus service has minimal infrastructure costs.] Based on the number of vehicles parked on Memorial Avenue between Qualicum Beach and the Inland Island Highway, there are perhaps a score of people who car-pool somewhere from Qualicum Beach – either north or south. Bottom line – support of rail service will require ongoing tax subsidy (and I don't care if it is RDN, provincial or federal money – it's all tax money), rail trestles are vulnerable to earthquake damage, and GHG emissions per passenger mile will be unacceptable high – not a 'green' solution.
- Whatever funds the RDN has for transportation should be directed towards building all weather (but not gold-plated) walking and cycling paths to allow for 'green transportation'. I wouldn't advise anyone to walk or cycle on the edge of the Old Island Highway (19A) – it would be positively dangerous. Building walking and cycling trails adjacent to the E & N railway line would be a good start – the right of way exists, and it is pretty level.
- Electric vehicle charging stations – would you spend your own money on charging stations? Again, this sounds like a 'great idea' – but the price of electric vehicles is still very high, and few people are buying them (aside from government agencies that are spending tax money, not their own personal money). One technical issue that is only just now being resolved is a standard charging plug and receptacle. It wouldn't be very bright (pardon the pun) to install charging stations with the wrong equipment that doesn't match up to new vehicle charging systems. Again, I don't support the expenditure of public funds on charging stations at this time. And if you do go ahead, I hope you don't waste charging stations at local parks – when they might be used 3 or 4 times a year (if at all). If charging stations are placed anywhere other than in people's garages, they should be placed in high usage areas, such as business sites, and designed so that one charging station can supply power to at least 4 parking stalls – otherwise you will have the situation of a charging station occupied by a single vehicle all day – preventing other vehicles from being charged (and guaranteeing

a parking spot to the owner of the electric vehicle). And the charging station should have an indicator to show the state of charge of a vehicle, so the charging system isn't left

- Does the RDN have a mission statement? I haven't been able to find one. It might come as a surprise to some staff that the purpose of the RDN should be to provide necessary services to residents of the Regional District, in an effective and efficient manner. Its mission is not to provide employment to staff, or to prevent residents from participating in district activities. Have you ever, or recently, conducted a resident survey to get feedback on how well the RDN is providing services to residents, and whether the RDN is providing value?
- While the RDN might be making progress in this area, I encourage the RDN to look at its practices to ensure that residents can conduct as much business as possible via internet or telephone, both downloading user-friendly forms (not true with the recent rain water harvesting programme) and submitting them via internet, rather than having to go to the RDN offices in person – which involves a long drive for many residents. Emissions from residents' vehicles required to do business with the RDN should count against the RDN's 'green audit'. It's not enough to have a 'green office building' and 'green fleet' - your business practices have to also be 'green'.
- Don't get sucked into supporting causes that are not truly regional district issues, such as banning plastic water bottles or plastic bags. If the causes are good, the logic of the cause will be sufficient to change people's practices. And if the causes are just the pet projects of some individuals, the RDN should not be supporting them by mandate and regulation.

And if you ever need to discuss any fuel or fuel-related technology issues, I'm glad to talk.

Best wishes.

Andy Pickard, Ph.D., PChem  
Consultant, Fuels & Technology Support  
3789 Island Highway West  
Qualicum Beach, B.C. V9K 2C7  
Canada  
[andy.pickard@nucleus.com](mailto:andy.pickard@nucleus.com)  
250-752-3364

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**Subject:** FW: Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149  
**Attachments:** To the Members of the Board of the Regional District of Nanaimo.docx  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Wendy Hill [[mailto:we\\_hill@telus.net](mailto:we_hill@telus.net)]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2012 2:57 PM  
**To:** email, planning  
**Cc:** 'Ron Hill'  
**Subject:** Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149  
**Importance:** High

As homeowners situated immediately above the proposed home for which this variance permit application has been made please find attached a letter outlining our concerns that we wish to be placed before the Board of the Regional District of Nanaimo for their regular meeting on Tuesday November 27, 2012.

We are not in favour of nor do we support this request for a variance for the reasons outlined in our letter.

Please advise by return email both receipt of this email and the attachment.

Ron and Wendy Hill  
3245 Redden Road  
Nanoose Bay, BC  
V9P 9H4  
(250) 468 1996

November 23, 2012

**Re: Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-149**

To the Members of the Board of the Regional District of Nanaimo:

We are the owners and full time residents of 3425 Redden Road (Lot 16), immediately above Lot 14, District Lot 78, Nanoose District, Plan VIP53134.

**We object to and do not support the request for the variance as stated in in the Notice of Development Variance Permit Application #PL2012-149 we received by regular mail on Nov 21 .** A variance request of nearly nine feet is substantively outside the RDN approved development guidelines for our neighbourhood and is not acceptable to us. We believe that the approval by the RDN of such a significant variance would:

- Set a precedent for the construction of an over height three story home in a neighbourhood of two story homes, most of which have been built on a similar slope, and setting precedent for the future construction of such three story homes on the remaining lots adjacent to the proposed home currently requesting the height variance
- Set a precedent for further erosion of the RDN approved architectural and development guidelines throughout the Fairwinds development
- If the variance should be approved, unreasonably impede our view of the Schooner Cove marina below us due to the extensive footprint of the roof, which is anticipated to also have a number of metal tubes installed on it to provide the solar assisted heating system (reference page 5, letter to the Members of the Board of the Electoral Planning Committee from Ken Tanguay of Structure Design)
- Reduce the value of our ocean view property

We have discussed this variance request with our immediate neighbours, \_\_\_\_\_ who live at 3429 Redden Road, Lot 15 immediately above Lot 14. They have shared with us a copy of the letter you have received from Mr. Tanguay. Mr. Tanguay's letter states that a significant slope would be required for the driveway should the variance not be granted (page 1). We believe that this significant slope could be alleviated by situating the house a further twenty or so feet further north on the property and wonder if this or other options have been explored with the due diligence required before requesting such a significant (nearly nine foot) variance.

It is our understanding from the architectural and development guidelines for the Fairwinds development, that variances from the approved guidelines must be approved not only by the RDN but in most cases by all of the residents of the neighbourhood where the variance is being considered or it cannot proceed. While we appreciate that the RDN has the final say in this matter, we do not agree to nor support this variance request.

We have always understood and expected that a home or homes would be built on the lots immediately below us, and are not objecting to this. What we are objecting to is the building of a home in excess and outside of the architectural guidelines for the neighbourhood, when the rest of us who built or bought here complied with those architectural guidelines in good faith.

We understand that this variance request will be considered at the meeting of the Board of the Regional District of Nanaimo on Tuesday, Nov 27.

Of note, we received notice of this variance request by regular mail on November 21, and if we had been away for a few days this week, we would not have known about it, nor would we have been able to register our objections in time for the Board meeting on November 27. We are further surprised that neither the builder nor the architect have been in contact with us to discuss the variance request prior to it being presented for a decision to the RDN Board, especially as we live immediately above the proposed new home.

We request that this written submission objecting to the approval of the request variance be included in the Board member's packages for their consideration, and we respectfully request to have our names added to the agenda so we have an opportunity to answer any questions from Board members should there be any arising from our correspondence.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by email for our records, and confirmation that we have a place on the agenda to speak to this issue should it be warranted. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Ron and Wendy Hill  
3425 Redden Road  
Nanoose Bay, BC  
V9P 9H4  
250 468 1996

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**Subject:** FW: Lot 14, DL 78, Nanoose,VIP 53134

---

**From:** Ron Davis [<mailto:rmdavis1@shaw.ca>]

**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 8:55 AM

**To:** email, planning

**Subject:** Lot 14, DL 78, Nanoose,VIP 53134

3429 Redden Road

Nanoose Bay, BC

V9P 9H4

24 November 2012

Regional District of Nanaimo  
6300 Hammond Bay Road  
Nanaimo BC

Re: Development Permit Application  
Lot 14, District 78  
Nanoose District Plan VIP53134

Dear Sirs:

We wish to register our objection to the Variance Application for Lot 14. We reside at Lot 15 which borders on and overlooks Lot 14. We feel the variance requested is excessive and that a useable and safe driveway, the main justification of the variance application, can easily be achieved with a much smaller variance.

The designer, Structure Design, in its justification letter to you claims that without the variance, driveway grades in excess of twenty percent are required. It appears that there may be other remedies such as: maintaining the twenty percent grade to the edge of the apron rather than constructing the last sixty feet using a fifteen percent grade (a reduction in required variance of three feet); and shifting the location of the house twenty feet to the northwest (an additional reduction in required variance of four feet).

We are concerned that approving such a large variation to the rules will set an undesirable precedent for Lot 13 and other building lots in the area. Previously granted variances are always cited as justification for new applications. The rules governing building heights were set with a purpose in mind, which is to not impede the line of sight or general views from surrounding residences. Our house and those of our neighbours were all constructed on steeply sloping lots but were required to be designed and built within the constraints that this variance application is trying to circumvent.

The justification letter also refers to solar heat collecting equipment which may be placed on the south facing roofs. This equipment could be unsightly and perhaps is another reason to reject the request to raise the house almost nine feet.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Daphne and Ron Davis

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**Subject:** FW: Lot 14 Redden Road application for Variance  
**Attachments:** Lot 14 redden.docx  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Patricia Relph [mailto:patrelph@outlook.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 4:09 PM  
**To:** email, planning  
**Cc:** Geoff  
**Subject:** Lot 14 Redden Road application for Variance  
**Importance:** High

Please find attached our comments re the variance application for Lot 14 Redden Road.

Sent by email November 26, 2012

Dear Sirs Re: Lot 14 District Lot 78, Nanoose District, Plan VIP53134

We are currently out of town and are submitting our comments by email. We are against the application by the owners of Lot 14 for the following reasons.

- . The change in height by 2.7 meters is in effect adding a third story to the whole house which is against RDN bylaws and against Fairwinds architectural guidelines. The application does not seem to be needed to accommodate a minor design need for the house, but to deliberately add a story to raise the height of the whole house.
- . The resulting house will be out of character with the neighborhood and will be a dominating structure.
- . If approved this change would set a precedent for the street, neighborhood and the whole of Fairwinds.
- . In particular, an approval would set a precedent for the adjoining Lot 13 that has similar terrain.
- . An application in March of 2006 by the owners of Lot 13 for a variance of 4.9 meters was denied by the RDN and we believe the same criteria should be applied to this application.

Thank you, Geoffrey and Patricia Relph. 250-468-9598

**Geoffrey and Patricia Relph**

**3420 Redden Road Lt 52**

**Nanoose Bay BC V9P 9H4**

Regional District of Nanaimo

Board Members

Sent by email November 26, 2012

Dear Sirs Re: Lot 14 District Lot 78, Nanoose District, Plan  
VIP53134

We are currently out of town and are submitting our comments by email. We are against the application by the owners of Lot 14 for the following reasons.

. The change in height by 2.7 meters is in effect adding a third story to the whole house which is against RDN bylaws and against Fairwinds architectural guidelines. The application does not seem to be needed to accommodate a minor design need for the house, but to deliberately add a story to raise the height of the whole house.

. The resulting house will be out of character with the neighborhood and will be a dominating structure.

.If approved this change would set a precedent for the street, neighborhood and the whole of Fairwinds.

. In particular, an approval would set a precedent for the adjoining Lot 13 that has similar terrain.

. An application in March of 2006 by the owners of Lot 13 for a variance of 4.9 meters was denied by the RDN and we believe the same criteria should be applied to this application.

Thank you, Geoffrey and Patricia Relph. 250-468-9598

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** M Jessen <mjessen@telus.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 2:42 PM  
**To:** Keller, Greg  
**Cc:** Holm, Jeremy; Joe Stanhope; O'Halloran, Matt  
**Subject:** Development Variance Permit & Frontage Relaxation App. No . PL2012-146

Mr. Keller:

First, please ensure all RDN directors receive a copy of this submission, as it is unlikely that we will be attending the Board Meeting to respond to the application and please provide same to the meeting as an addendum to the agenda.

**Subject: Development Variance Permit & Frontage Relaxation App. No . PL2012-146 — Shepherd Lot 19, District Lot 28, Nanoose District, Plan 26472 - 853 Miller Road Electoral Area `G`**

As we have mentioned several times French Creek Residents' Association does not find that the use of panhandle lots to be a feature of well-designed and attractive communities. Just because there are minimum MoTI standards for panhandle lots does not make them good design. For that and the reasons below we recommend that the Board of Directors **not approve** this application.

1. Barclay Crescent is indeed a well-established residential neighborhood with characteristics that were sought by many homeowners in the area, some going back thirty or more years. The turnover in the community apparently is very low and several residents want it to stay that way. Presumably they believe the large-lot concept upon which the community was founded is a significant factor in its stability.
2. Contrary to the staff report, French Creek watercourse is not immediately to the west of the parent parcel. A portion of another private property is to the west of the parent parcel. There is the possibility that the introduction of another dwelling with its residents "closer to water" could impinge on the neighbor's enjoyment of his streamside land.
3. Given that panhandle lots do not contribute to good community design, then relaxing already minimum standards even more seems to make a questionable design practice worse.
4. We are glad to see that the size of all three resulting parcels will preclude further subdivision. That is unless zoning standards are relaxed (again?) in the future.
5. We see little difficulty in providing the required 6 metre width for both required panhandles for their required lengths. Depending on side yard setback requirements a variance for the existing dwelling may be required or modify the deck. With minimum required 6 metre width Lot C may not comply with the so-called 700 sq. metre minimum lot size as presently shown, but could qualify under lot size averaging. This design tool has been used on much smaller parent parcels elsewhere in French Creek.
6. On the larger question of whether subdivision is encouraged one has to ask whether the OCP supports densification with respect to raw lands put into development or existing communities. It would be the position of the Association, and its representatives who attended most of the OCP review meetings, that densification was basically intended to be an attitude with respect to the development of new communities where all properties would be contextually similar or at least very compatible. Any suggestion that those attending the

OCP review meetings agreed to densification of existing communities without sensitivity to contextual implications we would say is wrong.

7. Densification can't be considered a goal just for the sake of densification. Too often planning is done without consideration of other factors. We suggest that this community is not a good candidate for densification. The whole of French Creek is poorly served by public transit and this community is unlikely to have good access to public transit for a very long time. We appreciate that the question could be asked "What should come first, the housing with its residents or the transit?" The trend nowadays is "Transit seems to come first" - witness real densification happening around rapid transit stations.

8. Our association has made numerous comments with respect to the practice of designing and building communities incorporating panhandle lots. We are glad to read in this report that the RDN recognizes there are many questions that need to be considered and policy set. Developers and land consultants/agents appear to be driving the process right now.

9. The report says changes to the minimum panhandle standard may be needed to "facilitate further subdivision". We question whether such a statement should be made in a basic report on an application. Is this a marketing exercise on the part of staff to encourage more subdivision, more panhandle lots? We would certainly like a more complete explanation of why staff believes that the existing standard provides a good argument for reducing the minimum panhandle widths even more.

10. If it were impossible to design a three-lot subdivision that complies with the minimum requirements, we would support a two-lot subdivision that does.

11. We are incredulous that the report would state with respect to this parcel which is in the French Creek floodplain, "In addition, there are no significant constraints impacting the use of proposed Lots A and B such as water courses, environmentally sensitive features or natural hazards." With all the news of watercourse flooding in Canada and the U.S., some attributed to climate change; we find the statement somewhat out of touch with how professionals should be serving the public.

12. And after all consideration of the issues of topography, elevations, flood levels we are advised that building height will in all likelihood be a problem for a couple of the resulting parcels and a variance application is anticipated and even seems to be encouraged. Height variances are also something that come up regularly and in most cases not understood by the general public. Perhaps it is time for the RDN to study this subject as well and develop an understandable policy.

13. Getting back to the encouragement of densification, possibly we could consider the condition of the roads in and serving communities before we casually approve further subdivision. Lee Road serves this community and its surface and substrate are in very poor condition (as is Miller Road fronting on the subject property). In the process of subdivision are any development cost charges applied against the new parcels to reflect the extra burden that the people and their vehicles will place upon the roads? While on the subject of infrastructure, does subdivision of parcels in existing communities ever make any direct contribution to parks - considering more people put more load on existing facilities?

14. Lastly, and maybe most importantly, consideration should be given to the cost effects of adding new parcels to the community sewage collection system. The existing residents of this community were subject to a significant charge for the installation of community sewer. A uniform levy was applied to all parcels regardless of size and potential eligibility for subdivision. Those property owners with larger lots are now receiving significant monetary benefit from the subdivision of their parcels without an equitable contribution to the system versus those owners who may never be able to subdivide. It is our view that there should be a "latecomer" fee of something like \$9000 as an equitable contribution toward the capital cost of the existing

system and toward the cost of upsizing to meet inevitable added load. We believe that no further subdivision should take place until a thorough and community-reviewed policy for a latecomer contribution fee is put in place.

Michael C. Jessen, P.Eng.  
Secretary, French Creek Residents' Association.

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**Subject:** FW: RDN Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-146 853 Miller Road

**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Lee-Ann & Bruce [<mailto:leebruce@shaw.ca>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 3:03 PM  
**To:** email, planning  
**Cc:** Joe Stanhope; Holm, Jeremy  
**Subject:** Re: RDN Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-146 853 Miller Road  
**Importance:** High

Dear RDN Board,

Further to discussions with Electoral Area 'G' Official representative Mr. Joe Stanhope as well as RDN Manager of Current Planning Mr. Jeremy Holm, we wish to make known our concern and displeasure regarding the issuance of a Development Variance permit for the parcel located at 853 Miller Road, legally described as: Lot 19, District 28, Nanoose District, Plan 26472.

Of the five properties adjacent to this parcel, my husband and I own two: 1386 Lee Road and 1388 Lee Road respectively; properties "16" and "1" as shown on Attachment 1 of the Notice of Development Variance Permit Application dated November 13, 2012.

We find it unnecessary for the board to approve the application and vary "Bylaw 500, 1987" given that this bylaw currently supports the ability to subdivide the subject property into a 2-lot subdivision without applying any variance.

Looking at the representation of our neighbourhood and this parcels' immediate neighbours it is noticeable that the standard and common property size is that of a large, suburban residential community with the smallest bordering property measuring .32/acre. Also, we believe it is worth the Boards' consideration that my husband and I were the last real-estate transaction in this neighbourhood ~ over 16 years ago. Many of our neighbours have had homes here for upwards of 20 years. We do not live in a 'typical' high-turn over residential area. Our neighbours enjoy the peace and quiet the current bylaws support.

We feel that this proposal could very well be precedent setting and an example referred to in future Development Variance Applications and as such careful consideration is necessary.

In closing, we would appeal to the Board to revisit the necessity of varying the current by-laws to allow a 3-lot subdivision on a property well within bylaws to support a 2-lot subdivision.

Thank-you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Lee-Ann Kelly  
Bruce Fong  
[leebruce@shaw.ca](mailto:leebruce@shaw.ca)  
250-248-2848

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**Subject:** FW: RDN Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-146 853 Miller Road

---

**From:** rue watson [<mailto:ruewatson@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 27, 2012 12:02 PM  
**To:** email, planning  
**Cc:** Joe Stanhope; Holm, Jeremy  
**Subject:** FW: RDN Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-146 853 Miller Road

---

**Subject:** Re: RDN Notice of Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2012-146 853 Miller Road

Dear RDN Board,

Further to discussions with Electoral Area 'G' Official representative Mr. Joe Stanhope as well as RDN Manager of Current Planning Mr. Jeremy Holm, we wish to make known our concern and displeasure regarding the issuance of a Development Variance permit for the parcel located at 853 Miller Road, legally described as: Lot 19, District 28, Nanoose District, Plan 26472.

Of the five properties adjacent to this parcel, I own 861 miller rd, ( next door) and dont want to be financially responsible for a fence between us or for a culvert in the ditch, both on his side of property.

We find it unnecessary for the board to approve the application and vary "Bylaw 500, 1987" given that this bylaw currently supports the ability to subdivide the subject property into a 2-lot subdivision without applying any variance.

Looking at the representation of our neighbourhood and this parcels' immediate neighbours it is noticeable that the standard and common property size is that of a large, suburban residential community with the smallest bordering property measuring .32/acre. Also, we believe it is worth the Boards' consideration that my husband and I were the last real-estate transaction in this neighbourhood ~ over 16 years ago. Many of our neighbours have had homes here for upwards of 20 years. We do not live in a 'typical' high-turn over residential area. Our neighbours enjoy the peace and quiet the current bylaws support.

We feel that this proposal could very well be precedent setting and an example referred to in future Development Variance Applications and as such careful consideration is necessary.

In closing, we would appeal to the Board to revisit the necessity of varying the current by-laws to allow a 3-lot subdivision on a property well within bylaws to support a 2-lot subdivision.

Thank-you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Louise Watson

-  
[leebruce@shaw.ca](mailto:leebruce@shaw.ca)  
250-248-2848

## O'Halloran, Matt

---

**From:** Lor B <sharkalor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 26, 2012 4:19 PM  
**To:** O'Halloran, Matt  
**Subject:** Variance for 1815 Settler Road

Matt, here is my request for the board meeting tomorrow night in regards to the Variance at 1815 Settler Road.

Could you please confirm you received this?

Thanks.

Dear Board Members,

I live at 1799 Settle Road. I share a property line with 1815 Settler Road.

To accommodate the new driveway for the Variance at 1815 Settler Rd, I will lose the privacy I currently have on the unfenced portion of my yard as they will need to clear all the trees currently there. I welcome the trees being removed further up as this will give me more sun in my yard. The portion I'm concerned about is along my front yard.

Is there some way to request the current owners, The Grays, to commit to doing something with the portion of the driveway that will now be running beside my front yard. My fence extends my backyard only. I did not extend it down to the very end of the front yard as this would have looked strange.

If the Grays do not commit to doing something we both agree upon, then I will be forced to do something that will cost me money, and that I feel is unfair.

Thank you for your time.

Lorelei Birchett