



DISTRICT OF METCHOSIN

AGENDA

BUFFER LAND WORKING GROUP MEETING
JULY 11, 2023 at 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL

- 1. Agenda, Additions, Approval**
- 2. Presentations**
- 3. Public Participation**
- 4. Adoption of Minutes**
 - a) Buffer Land Working Group Meeting, June 6, 2023..... 1
- 5. New Business**
 - a) Buffer vision/concept statement
 - b) Discussion of options and input into the tracking table 3
- 6. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment**

District of Metchosin

Minutes

Buffer Land Working Group

June 6, 2023 at 4:30 P.M.

Council Chambers

Metchosin Municipal Hall

Present: Councillor Jay Shukin (Chair), Councillor Shelly Donaldson (Co-Chair), Bonnie Bouveur, Brian Grant, Karen Hoffman, Richard Simpson, Gary Smirfitt, Bailey Spiteri.

Regrets: Anna Hall

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

1. Agenda, Additions, Approval

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Presentation

Nicole Shukin, LaBonne Road, presented on a concept that may address issues related to stormwater management from the Centre Mountain Residential development. The title was Trail and Swale and Nature-based Stormwater Solution for Centre Mountain. This presentation was well received by the working group, with considerable interest in the concept of a “green fence.” Discussion followed.

Councillor Shukin will check with Metchosin Engineer on Thursday regarding when we may expect a stormwater plan from Langford and when our CAO may approve same.

Councillor Shukin will request our CAO to write a letter to Langford's CAO with a copy to the Developers and Langford's Approving Officer and possibly their Engineer to find out if they are interested in learning more about Bio-swale and Trail system on the Buffer Land/Langford border. (Trail on Langford side and Swale on Metchosin side). Nicole noted that she had presented the concept to several Langford councillors already. Key question: can the concept be fit into the developer's plans. This letter should indicate a reply deadline so the working group knows what they are dealing with. There was also interest in whether the concept could apply to the Centre Mountain Business Park.

3. Public Participation

Peggy Jervis, Woodruff Road.

Peggy discussed her involvement with the Capital Regional District in connection with the “sale” of the Buffer Land as considered in 2021.

Action Item: Councillor Shukin will arrange for the Working Group to do a site visit.

4. Adoption of Minutes

- a) Buffer Land Public Input Meeting, May 9, 2023 – **Approved**
- b) Buffer Land Working Group Meeting, May 17, 2023 – **Approved**

5. New Business

a) Buffer vision/concept statement

Bailey provided her vision statement of the Buffer Land: “Land (space/area) that is preserved as a protective ecological buffer to minimize the impacts of land use, urban sprawl, and other negative external pressures. It acts as a compromise between conservation needs and local inhabitants.”

The vision statement was discussed, which also covered the vision statement that Brian Grant provided at the May 16 meeting: “The buffer lands will remain a greenspace that conserves the area’s ecosystem, protects the water quality in the Bilston Creek watershed, and allows an enjoyable outdoor experience for a limited number of users. The lands will be managed effectively with strategic and operational plans that maintain and inspire environmental stewardship even with the future increases in nearby in population density.”

Any benefit/value given to trail should promote physical and mental health. Brian and Bailey to send out to the members of the working group. Richard recommended that the statement should reflect our principles as well as our visions.

b) Review of the option tracking table

Discussion took place.

c) Identification of options and input into the tracking table

Due to timing constraints, it was decided that we would identify the options and work with the tracking table as a next step. Using a draft list of options provided by Bonnie, Councillor Shukin listed the options that we know of so far. The following were identified for further evaluation by the Working Group:

- The “Do Nothing” option
- Re-zone the Buffer Land to park status or a new zone to support conservation goals.
- Develop a Metchosin-owned and managed park or greenspace. Once concept could be a park similar to Blinkhorn Nature Park. Consider a range of uses (pedestrian only; multi-use).
- Involve a conservation-oriented Land Trust.
- Consider sale of the Buffer Land (in whole or part of).
- Assess different options for the North Lobe and the South Lobe
- Assess how the stormwater detention pond and planning would fit into future planning.
- Undertake a “re-wilding” effort.
- Look at various options for managing access (fencing, parking, providing amenities-or not providing amenities). Access Management.

It was decided that some of the options could be “bundled”and Brian Grant offered to assist in this task. The in-depth tracking table would be used for selecting options.

6. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

Councillor Shukin will email the next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Buffer Land Working Groups – Concepts for Discussion

Updated: July 10, 2023

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>C.1 “Do Nothing” / Status Quo (short term)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>The Buffer Land is a natural parkland with a simple trail system, primarily alongside Metchosin Creek. The trails are rarely used by hikers, likely due to lack of awareness, limited parking and amenities, and no connection to other walking/hiking routes (e.g., Galloping Goose). The Buffer Land is currently zoned “Commercial Recreation).</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 113 acre parcel (Buffer Land) is adjacent to the Langford business park and Centre Mountain Estates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows time to gather additional CME information and complete a thorough assessment of the Buffer Land options. Allowing time to complete the transfer of Section 95 as park to Metchosin following the completion of the Treaty process may enable a consistent, long-term strategy for both Section 95 and the Buffer Land. May provide additional time for Council to establish a collaborative relationship with Langford, and the CME developers to develop a better long term solution Little or no financial cost to the District 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be seen by the Public as the Working Group and Council not being able to make a decision. May be seen by Langford, industrial park and CME developers as Metchosin not concerned about the protection of the greenspace or having a sense of urgency May provides less opportunity for input into the construction of stormwater detention ponds in the Buffer Land The current zoning is not consistent with the planned use. This option may delay better options that would preferably be in place prior to additional construction and residents 	<p>This may not be a good long-term (5+years) solution, but there may be some benefits in the near-term (1-2 years)</p> <p>The option to maintain the status quo (do nothing) can be considered for the time being while the business park and the CME subdivision is under construction.</p> <p>The demand for increased access to the Buffer Land is unlikely in the near future (<2 years).</p> <p>The lack of key information and discussion with Langford and CME developers limits the ability to do a comprehensive assessment of the Buffer Land which is required for a more robust long term decision for the land.</p>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>(CME), which are currently under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.1 Status Quo assessment is focused on the next one to two years. • The CME first phase is proceeding with 44 homes (200+ residents), with subsequent phases totalling 300+ homes (1200+ residents). CME has planned for 35 acres of parkland within their development. However, the desire to access to the Buffer Land by the growing population in the Western Communities will undoubtedly increase. • There are no known assessments (environmental, water quality, biodiversity or land usage) of the Buffer Land. The CME developers are likely to have completed some assessments to support the support the stormwater detention ponds to be established within the Buffer Land, but not fully shared with Metchosin Council or working group yet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not restrict volunteer efforts to address removal of invasive species (rewilding) <p>Does not limit current level of recreational use of the Buffer Land</p>	<p>moving into CME or activity in the industrial park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may currently be safety hazards for users (also potential liability issues) that may not be discovered and mitigated without a more proactive solution • There may currently be environmental issues that that may not be discovered and mitigated without a more proactive solution • May be increased wildfire danger from fuel load (downed trees and branches) directly adjacent to CME 		
--	---	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assume that this Status Quo option will still include the costs to repair access gates (Neild Rd and existing CME trailhead) and signage about this is Metchosin Buffer Land. 					
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>C.2 Do Nothing / Status Quo (longer term)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>That the District keeps the Buffer Land in the state it currently is. Other than the legally required actions (i.e. the Stormwater Covenant), no action is taken by the District to maintain or preserve the lands. This concept would essentially be a passive approach to the Buffer Land that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short term fiscal impacts to the District are likely to be low, given the “do nothing” approach. District staff time managing the BL would be minimal. This would avoid the political and administrative complexities of re-zoning the Buffer Land to “Park”, another more conservation oriented designation, or the potentially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the scale of the Centre Mountain residential development (up to 312 homes) there is a high likelihood of the Buffer Land being used as an ad hoc park. As an ad hoc park, a spectrum of impacts could be expected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Best case:</u> the existing trails are used by a limited number of people and the trails are 		Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	

<p>would include no trail development, no fencing, no monitoring (other than legal requirements), no working amenities (parking, bathrooms), no patrolling, no action on invasive species, no garbage collection.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District would continue to own the Buffer Land. • All legal requirements would be met (likely at minimal levels). • The Buffer Land would remain Commercial Recreation 2/3. • The timelines considered are at least 5 to ten years. 	<p>contentious issue of a sale to the CRD.</p>	<p>respected (i.e. new trails are not created).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Worst case:</u> the area is used extensively by the nearby residents and others in a range of ways: the area becomes a de facto off-leash area; new trails are created, including trails that lead toward the ‘back yards’ of residences along Neild Road; the area becomes a “party place;” campfire spots are created; bike trails are created. • With limited enforcement, there will be significant challenges to ending habitual unauthorized use of the area. • As District-owned land, Metchosin will continue to have liability-exposure, which may materialize in terms of safety from natural hazards, general safety, fire risk, stormwater issues, riparian impacts, and other issues. • In a “worst case” scenario, the Buffer Land could, on a perceptual basis, may cease to be viewed as Metchosin land, 		<p>Recreational value</p>	
---	--	--	--	---------------------------	--

		<p>based on the users and uses of the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With extensive ad hoc use, the value of the land could drop, while the costs of managing impacts could increase. • With the Commercial Recreational zoning designation, there remains the potential of residential development; a future Council that has development aspirations may be open to selling the Buffer Land to developers or even allowing annexation to Langford (the property being steeped in hassle, expense and legal risk). 			
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>D1 – Re-zone to Park Land</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> That the District of Metchosin rezone the Buffer Land to Parks and Greenspace (P3) from the current zoning of Commercial Recreation 2/3.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District retains ownership (i.e. this is a municipal park). Park status is applied to the full parcel. <i>[NB: per option H, consideration may be given to designating a portion of the BL park (north lobe, south lobe)]</i> The Buffer Land is re-zoned using the District's current 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-zoning to Park will protect the parcel from development. Zoning to Park essentially enshrines this land as a public asset, as any decision to sell park land requires public approval, and, if approval is granted, the assets from a sale must be put into a parkland acquisition fund. Although rezoning comes with complexities, the change could occur within the District's established administrative processes. Park land zoning allows for the possibility of ecological / environmental protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning to Park has the potential of opening up the area to more visitors and activity (i.e. the BL becomes a "public" park). The District has limited resources to manage additional park land. Changing this situation may have fiscal (i.e. municipal tax) implications. The Description of "Park and Greenspace (P3)" in Metchosin's Land Use Bylaw does not necessarily reflect the conservation goals/desires that have been expressed about the Buffer Land. For example, P3 allows for 4 ha (9.88 ac) subdivisions and a dwelling on each. <i>[NB (Jay): this could open up the discussion of an</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would involve a re-zoning process, which would include a public hearing; it may also involve a minor OCP amendment (which has its own process). Rezoning to park land may be an important consideration given the provincial government's housing initiatives, which includes an inventory of provincial lands that could be used for affordable housing. Consideration will have to be given as to what kind of "park" this will be. This will be further discussed with the other "E" options. The OCP (section 5) describes four types of park, including "lands designated 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>description of “Park and Greenspace (P3)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is Council and public support for the change. <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a new Park Zone (say Park – Buffer, or Park – Sensitive Environment) may be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, this adds new greenspace to Metchosin, which is consistent with the District’s rural character and values. • Would aid in the increased demand for outdoor recreational use (such as hiking, etc). • 	<p><i>additional park zone; perhaps, “Park – Sensitive Areas”]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There’s the potential of complexities (i.e. legal matters; public input; differing views among Council) with the rezoning process. (likely a lower risk) • Potential for required parking, and increased vehicular traffic • Neighbourhood buy-in 	<p>as Sensitive Environment”; however, this description is not further developed beyond that sentence and is not described in Metchosin’s Land Use Bylaw.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there’s a desire for stronger environmental protection, a conservation covenant may be considered, potentially in partnership with a third party land trust. • In terms of the “disadvantages,” steps can be taken to manage access opportunities (i.e. limited parking); however, the District won’t be able to limit access only to Metchosin residents. 		
					Total

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>D.2a Create a new zone that can support conservation goals (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> That a new land use designation be developed that is focused on supporting conservation / restoration goals.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District retains ownership. • That an appropriate land use designation be developed by the District to support conservation. (i.e. comments in E.1 about the limitations of the current Park zoning). Also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is aligned with the goal of being the Buffer Land being a “greenspace buffer.” • Appears to be very much aligned with public input to date. • Concept is supportive of broader community values of protecting natural areas. • Supports other climate change mitigation goals of forest preservation (carbon sequestration) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present, Metchosin does not have a zoning designation that supports this concept. And developing such a designation may take time and have complexities. • Enforcing access limitations • Resourcing both around enforcing access limitations and monitoring for conservation outcomes. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other BC local governments (Bowen Island, ex) have land use designations to support conservation. • It’s likely that limiting access will be critical to supporting conservation goals, even if the limitation were to allow only pedestrian access. • The Provincial <i>Ecological Reserve Act</i> exists; however, this applies to Crown Land. • Alternatively, a conservation covenant be developed for the land. • A monitoring program could be established to ensure conservation goals are being met. This may be undertaken by a Friends of the Buffer Land group, which could be 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>see Points for Consideration: Ecological Protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is a clear articulation of the conservation goals. 			<p>authorized/appointed by the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New mechanisms to support conservation will likely be needed, given the development activity with the business park and residential development in the area. 		
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>D.2b Create a New Zone (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Rezone using a “new to Metchosin” zone that can support the conservation goals of the Buffer Lands.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the District retains full ownership (i.e. this is a municipal park). • The new zoning status is applied to the full parcel. • That there would be Council and public support for the creation of a new zone. <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts only require clarifying definition to what lands defined as Ecologically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be tailored to the Buffer Lands “needs” • Potential for added protection outside of a Parks and Greenspace zone • Discourages incompatible uses, for example can define specific areas for public access/use, but also include areas that are “off-limits” as ecologically sensitive/conservation/preservation areas • 	<p>In addition to those highlighted from D1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lengthy process within council, requires updating OCP (<i>Note: this is an assumption, I couldn't easily find the process for creating a whole new zone, but would look to Jay/Shelley to confirm</i>) • Zone could be changed from one council to the next • Would likely require an assessment for ecologically sensitive areas if that definition gets used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city of Kelowna has a “passive park” designation that includes Natural Area Parks, which keeps the land in their natural state for the most part. • May be a possibility for defining how storm water use can be managed within this zone, such as the use of bioswales or rain gardens 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>Sensitive means, in relation to Metchosins OCP</p> <p><u>Linkage to other concepts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All, potentially, except for C (Do Nothing). 					
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros)	Disadvantages (Cons)	Additional Comment	Overall Assessment
<p>D.2C Rezone the BL: Create new zone to support conservation goals. (NEW)</p> <p>Currently – CR2/3 Proposed zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological Reserve • Ecological Corridor • Wildlife Corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks / Recreation – health and wellness of residents. • Ecological Reserve – land used or intended to be used for the preservation of the environment or for scientific research and education pertaining to studies in the correlation between species and the behaviour of unique (changing) flora and fauna. • Ecological corridor of land and water that aim to maintain or restore ecological 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing costs of DoM to facilitate greenspace for large population of visitors from adjoining urban neighborhoods compared to benefit of local DoM residents. • Public recreation – high maintenance and costs for continual remediation of land erosion caused by cycling, hiking dogs; including trash, excrement and encroachment on sensitive ecosystems. • Washroom facilities and garbage receptacles for visiting public. An economic burden for DoM. 	<p>Currently all Parks and Recreation within the DoM are maintained intermittently by volunteers, not employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational benefits for the GVRD. A model example of urban/rural Buffers. 	<p>Environmental Protection</p> <hr/> <p>Neighbour impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Fiscal Impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Practicality / Feasibility</p> <hr/> <p>Land Use Complexities</p> <hr/> <p>Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)</p> <hr/> <p>Recreational value</p>

	<p>connectivity. This allows species to move and natural processes to flow freely across large landscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological corridors complement protected and conserved areas. • Wildlife corridor is a strip of natural habitat connecting wildlife populations that are separated by human activities or structures (roads/developments). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species may not exist due to displacement (BL). • Pollination may be interrupted with change of transporters (minimal/nil animals, birds, insects, wind patterns, species removal). • Costly to design, build, and maintain corridors over / under highways. 		
--	---	--	--	--

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>E.1 Create a nature park, similar to Blinkhorn Nature Park</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Create a park with similar uses / amenities as Blinkhorn Nature Park</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be re-zoned to become Parkland Greenspace (P3) or a new zone that better reflects conservation goals. Metchosin retains ownership. The park would be planned with the dual goals of limited recreational use (mainly pedestrian) and ecological conservation. The park would have limited amenities (as in limited parking, washrooms, signs). There would be low (but not “no”) expectations of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept appears to be supported by resident input received to date. With the correct zoning, conservation goals would be supported. Costs / resource allocations would be low(er), based on expectations of having minimal amenities to develop and maintain. The Buffer Land generally appears suited to a “nature park” (existing natural values, rudimentary trail). Expectations of opening up greater access would be lower (i.e. established trailheads, additional parking). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metchosin’s lack of “parks and recreation” resources means that, on a day to day basis, there is likely to be a “hands-off” approach taken to trail maintenance and enforcement of park provisions. The key challenge will be the level of use by CME residents. As this will be a park, residents will be free to access the area. Given the number of people (and dogs) expected at CME, the level of use from those residents is likely to be the biggest factor in the state of and health of the nature park. Once non-permitted uses become established (Mountain Bike Trails, newly formed trails off the main trail) these will be difficult to address (i.e. shut down; repair). 	<p><u>Background on Blinkhorn Nature Park</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blinkhorn Nature Park is approx. 20 ha (49.4 acres). It features a 1.1 km trail around Blinkhorn Lake. A parking lot off Kangaroo Road provides access for ~5 cars. There is also access off Lindholm Road, but no parking. Maintenance is usually undertaken by volunteers, mainly through PTASC. <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even with limited maintenance expectations, consideration could be given to fencing or other steps to minimize access to sensitive areas (Neild Rd owners’ back yards or environmentally sensitive areas) 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>maintenance / patrolling of the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing a resident group (say, "Friends of the Buffer Land") will be helpful in supporting the broader goals of the park. <p><u>Other Considerations</u> (see Additional Comments for background on Blinkhorn Nature Park).</p>					
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>E.2 Develop an ecological conservation zone</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>That all, or a portion (North Lobe, say), is given a land use designation that prioritizes environmental conservation and protection.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metchosin retains ownership. • That an appropriate land use designation be developed by the District to support conservation. (<i>i.e. comments in E.1 about the limitations of the current Park zoning</i>). Also see Points for Consideration: Ecological Protection. • That there is a clear articulation of the conservation goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This step appears aligned and supportive of the Buffer Land being a “greenspace buffer.” • Appears to be very much aligned with public input to date. • Concept is supportive of broader community values of protecting natural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present, Metchosin does not have a zoning designation that support this concept. And developing such a designation may take time and have complexities. • Enforcing any access limitations may be challenging. • There will likely be resourcing challenges, both for enforcing access limitations and monitoring for conservation outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other jurisdictions have introduced land use designations to support conservation. • It’s likely that limiting access would be critical to supporting conservation goals, even if the limitation were to allow only pedestrian access. • The Provincial <i>Ecological Reserve Act</i> exists; however, this applies to Crown Land. • Alternatively, a conservation covenant be developed for the land. • That some form of monitoring program could be established to ensure conservation goals are being met. This might be done by a Friends of the Buffer Land group, which is authorized/appointed by the District. • New mechanisms to support conservation will likely be 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

			needed given the development activity with the business park and residential development in the area.		
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>E.3 A park limited to Pedestrian use</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> That all, or a portion (North Lobe or South Lobe, say), is limited to pedestrian access.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metchosin retains ownership of the Buffer Land. • That the trail itself would be kept in a natural, undeveloped state; Metchosin trail standards would not generally be followed. • There is some level of monitor or enforce the Buffer Land for pedestrian access only. • Dogs will be allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be a way of managing access into the Buffer Land, but limiting impacts from other multi-use activities, particularly mountain biking. • If the trails are kept in a natural, undeveloped state the budget impacts and resourcing expectations may be lower. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While signage will be helpful, maintaining this as a pedestrian-only park will be challenging without some form of 'enforcement.' • Dog use should be expected. If the trail area is not regularly monitored, it's likely the area will be viewed as an "off leash" area. • There may be fiscal / resourcing impacts if some of level of patrolling / enforcement is undertaken. 		Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>E.4 A park allowing for multi-use recreation</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> The Buffer Land is zoned “Park / Open Space” and a multi-use trail extends the entirety of the Buffer Land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is a significant investment in developing and maintaining a multi-use trail and the District undertakes this effort with an eye to developing a park that welcomes visitors. • “Multi-use” means pedestrian use, dog walking, biking (including electric bikes), disability access, and equestrian activities. • The District commits to the work of establishing and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the Metchosin Park example, the Buffer Land is suitable to a multi-use trail, with a rudimentary path already established. • The fact of an established path means that resourcing to create a multi-use trail is less significant if this were raw land. [NTD: unlike section 95, which does not have any established trails.] • There are interesting regional connectivity opportunities (which may see involvement by the CRD). • Clear, delineated trails will encourage users to stay on those trails 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A multi-use trail has the potential of introducing significantly more traffic into the Buffer Land. • Multiple access points (in terms of connectivity) could be opened. This may include direct access from the new residential development. • If the District of Metchosin were the sole owners of the Buffer Land, and were managing a multi-use trail, with multiple connections and access points, this would have significant fiscal and resourcing implications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In discussions with residents with deep experience with the District’s parks, it was noted that Metchosin Park (Section 25) would provide a good comparator to what a Buffer Land multi-use trail could look like. • The core value of a multi-use trail is that it welcomes and can support many users. In larger urban centres, significant investment is made in such trails to allow for a broad range of recreational activities. • A multi-use trail will require investment by the District or other parties, whether in developing and maintaining the trail. Connectivity with other trails or passages (roadside trails) is normally viewed as a reason for investing in multi-use trails. Some have pointed out interesting “connectivity” 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>maintaining these trails per the Metchosin standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership remains with Metchosin. • The “multi-use” is encouraged to be on established trails. • That connectivity with other trails or parks be explored and Metchosin remains open to extending the Buffer Land to these. <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Discussion:</p>			<p>opportunities with a Buffer Land trail, particularly a trail connecting the Galloping Goose Trail running along Happy Valley Road with the potential access (or near access) to Sooke Wilderness Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending an agreement with other parties (CRD, City of Langford, CME developers), the cost of establishing, maintaining and monitoring a multi-use trail would be up to the District of Metchosin. • Dog walking will likely be significant activity on the trail. 		
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros)	Disadvantages (Cons)	Additional Comment	Overall Assessment
<p>F(a) Involve a conservation-oriented Land Trust (NEW)</p> <p><i>(i.e. Habitat Acquisition Trust (HAT), Nature Conservancy, The Land Conservancy of BC, The Nature Conservancy of Canada)</i></p> <p>BC Conservation Covenant Handbook: https://www.wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/bc-conservation-covenant-handbook_2023.pdf</p> <p>BC Assessment Conservation Covenants: https://info.bcassessment.ca/services-and-products/Pages/Conservation%20Covenants.aspx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Covenant – protects the ecological or heritage values of land in regard to long-term preservation. • Preserving biodiversity, addressing invasive species, promoting native plant and insect growth, supporting riparian areas. • Care for habitat – help protect, restore, and enhance wildlife habitat. • Naturally functioning ecosystems play a central role in our economy by providing essential services such as clean water, fertile soil, carbon storage and a healthy habitat. • Critical need to stop the loss and degradation of sensitive, rare natural areas, to protect and restore biodiversity, and to safeguard ecosystem values. • Native plantings attract birds, butterflies and other pollinators. Native plants are drought tolerant and thrive in our region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous Conservation Agencies and Covenant agreements available – level of commitment of an agency compared to DoM residents (specific interest groups). • Many covenants are a three-way agreement between landowner, local gov't and conservation organisation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is this the best long-term protection? ○ Best use of resources to manage and monitor the land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation, Land Trust and Foundations are numerous. Would any arrangement with these organizations benefit DoM? • A three-way agreement may prevent one party disposing of the BL property as attempted Oct. 2021 as all three would need to agree and understand purpose. • Would amending our OCP and/or bylaws be sufficient for the management of the BL? • What would be the cost/benefit analysis for the DoM? If any? • Does DoM have other steward options already in existence? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What do they look like? ○ Are they sustainable with time, energy and funds? 	<p>Environmental Protection</p> <hr/> <p>Neighbour impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Fiscal Impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Practicality / Feasibility</p> <hr/> <p>Land Use Complexities</p> <hr/> <p>Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)</p> <hr/> <p>Recreational value</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">Total</p>

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>F(b) – Land Trust (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Develop a land trust/land conservancy strategy for the Buffer Land</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> A Land Trust option is viable within the legislative framework in BC, or with effort, can be made to work.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u> A land trust is a non-profit charity designed to protect privately held land. BC had two land trust organizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature Trust of BC • The Land Conservancy <p>Conservation Covenants are agreements with property owners and their local government to help conserve their land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preserves and protects the ecological integrity of the Buffer Land • protects habitats for the future sustainability of the ecosystem • may impact positively the development of the stormwater detention ponds, as trusts are designed to protect watershed areas, riparian areas, streams and other water sources • maintain control over Buffer Land and natural resources at the community level • places land and water in trust for the common benefit of future generations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a land trust option may not be an option (legally) for the Buffer Land • if a trust is legally possible, it may take considerable time and expense to develop and implement • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1 should be for the Working Group to determine if a land trust or conservancy is a legal option. • Extensive knowledge of land trusts by District Staff may be required 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>A recent example is the Metchosin Foundation's – Bilston Conservation Corridor Project</p> <p><u>Linkage to other concepts</u></p> <p>A the District of Metchosin owns the Buffer Lands; appropriate rezoning of the land by the District may achieve a “land trust” like result.</p> <p>There may be some potential through a vehicle like the Habitat Acquisition Trust which offer land protection instruments such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Covenants, • Land Acquisitions, and • Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas. <p>(Note: a meeting with a HAT representative is scheduled for late July)</p>					
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>G.1 Sell to the CRD for Park Options</p> <p><u>Basic Concept</u></p> <p>The concept is that Metchosin would sell the Buffer Land to CRD for use of the land as Park.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fair sale price is negotiated between the CRD and Metchosin. • Via a sufficient public engagement process, there is public support for a sale. • There is a clear understanding of the CRD's goals for the Buffer Land. • Steps are taken to protect environmentally sensitive areas. • The Neild Road residents are provided assurance on the continued "buffer" aspects of the land, per the referendum outcome and the vision of this area as a "greenspace buffer." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRD has significant more experience and resources (funds and staff for maintenance and technical studies) to manage parks compared to Metchosin. • CRD parks support health and wellbeing, offering social connections, and improving quality of life. CRD parks provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, experiencing and learning about natural and park stewardship. • CRD parks receive routine maintenance and improvements to address public safety, such as waste removal, vegetation clearing, and hazard assessments. • The CRD offers interpretive programs that deliver education and outreach about natural and cultural values in regional parks • CRD delivers a compliance and enforcement program emphasizes use of education to gain voluntary compliance leading to better protection of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of most vocal community feedback has not supported CRD Parks concept. An effective stakeholder management plan would be needed to further discuss a sale with the community. • Loss of local control; concern that the CRD's goals would not reflect Metchosin specific goals/interests with the Buffer Land • A CRD park would attract more publicity and users than a Metchosin-owned park. The additional users may increase the risk to the environment and vagrancy. • Perception by some in community (may or may not be true) that CRD would not be as effective at protecting the environment compared to Metchosin resources 	<p>The sale of the BL to the CRD was recently (2021) considered for a purchase offer of ~\$275k. However, there was community pushback about the lack of transparency and study so a decision was made to put the sale on hold until the option could be further evaluated.</p> <p>CRD currently manages 5 other Metchosin area parks and the Galloping Goose Regional Trail.</p> <p>The classification of a potential new CRD park on the BL is still TBD, but would likely fall into the Conservation classification (e.g. Devonian) but possibly Wilderness (more isolated)</p> <p>CRD Park concept would have many users from around CRD; open access points at Neild Rd and 2-4 on CME side; all of which would likely with have garbage bins.</p> <p>CRD park would likely require new parking and a bathroom on the CME east access point.</p> <p>An upgrade to the trail system is likely (either repair existing and/or build new) with the trail likely having a connection into Galloping Goose.</p>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<u>Other Considerations</u>	<p>park, safer and more enjoyable experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRD has a Strategic Plan in place to manage the parks in the face of a rapidly growing region. • CRD had funding for land acquisition like BL • Selling would provide Metchosin with infusion of capital and eliminate the need for resources (funds and staff) in the budget to manage BL • Adding more access points to BL will allow safe access for anticipated users and garbage bins will minimize waste pollution. • New parking and bathroom for the anticipated users would be a benefit otherwise there would likely be unsafe parking on the streets and users potentially forced to go to the bathroom in the woods. 				
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>G.2 Sale to the landowners adjacent to the Buffer Land</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>The District of Metchosin sells to the Neild Road landowners immediately adjacent to the Buffer Land that portion of the BL that adjoins to their properties.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus would be on the near-neighbours, so likely the Southern Lobe where eight to nine neighbours back directly onto the BL. • A reasonable sale price would be negotiated. • That the landowners could organize themselves for a collective purchase and then collective management of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option has the potential to create significant “protections” for this section of the Buffer Land. For example, private ownership will allow for a clear “no trespass” status, if the owners chose to do so. Fencing could be undertaken at the landowners’ cost. • As long as effective restrictive covenants were in place, this option is not necessarily inconsistent with the “greenspace bufferland” concept. • The “greenspace buffer” could be supported with a covenant (and other protections). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public land would move to a private holding. The spirit of the discussion to date indicates a desire to see the full Buffer Land as a community asset. • Maintaining the land would be a collective responsibility of the landowners, which may prove challenging to organize. • While lifting a restrictive covenant conditions is not easy (and steps can be taken to make such a process more challenging), these can be removed. • The legal structures to enable a collective purchase are likely to be complicated and take time and funds to form. • This would offer no public oversight or control over how the ecological values were being maintained, unless there was a condition of the sale or a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legal structures through which such a transaction would occur require much more work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could the land be surveyed so that each landowner has a clear section of Buffer Land they acquire? ○ Could the landowners establish a specific Land Trust for the acquisition? ○ Could a “Bare Land Strata Corporation” be established assume ownership and management of the lands? ○ Is there another structure/mechanism that might be suitable? 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate steps would be taken to ensure that any land sold would be protected from development in perpetuity, ensuring that the land remains a “greenspace buffer” 		<p>Section 219 Covenant condition put on].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing off private property would limit wildlife movement. 			
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>H.1 Different options for North Lobe & South Lobe – <u>South Lobe focus</u></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Look at zoning the South Lobe as a type of Greenbelt / Green-space / ecological conservation area. New zoning to be determined.</p> <p>This option should be viewed as a companion to H.2</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Buffer Land remains under the ownership of the District. The appropriate zoning is developed (can be developed) to support conservation outcomes. [NB: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making this an ecological conservation area will help keep the South Lobe natural, and parts of it untouched. Natural state forest will provide water retention to assist with the steep downward slope water seepage/flooding for homes close to the border and therefore vulnerable Neighbours' privacy will be maintained. Natural state forest will provide a wildlife sanctuary Natural state forest will provide protection of flora and fauna – particularly those that are endangered. There is funding available through Environment & Climate Change Canada – for conservation protection – a complete “hands-off” holding with carbon sequestering and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No financial gain for the district – no tax revenue and no sale means no one-time income Safety concerns Fencing may be required, particularly around highly sensitive areas. Enforcing “no go” areas could be challenging. Forest will NOT provide a wildlife or plants sanctuary especially if people are permitted to roam A Metchosin Parkland can be sold by the District when they want to – public hearing required and funding restrictions apply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are differences in topography, hydrology and potential land use between the North and South Lobes. <p><u>South Lobe:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent to the Centre Mountain Residential Development Adjacent to Neild Road property owners There is a significant distinction in land use with the CME border, the existing trail, and the area between the Neild Road homes and the trail, which is largely unused/untouched. At this point, it appears that the stormwater detention pond would be located primarily in the South Lobe. Storm water management will be an important consideration of those living adjacent to the South Lobe. 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>this does not appear to be in the Land.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key reason for exploring this option is the potential of trail access through the Buffer Land, is the reason for exploring this concept. • Looking ahead, there will likely be an access requirement (vehicle size) related to the stormwater detention pond. 	<p>wildlife corridor perpetually [Chris Moehr – Dec. 12/22 council mtg.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metchosin Creek runs through a portion of the South Lobe, but also connects to several wetland areas which some distance off the current unofficial trail 		
					Total

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>H.2 Different options for North Lobe & South</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will provide parkland, but with limited allowed uses. This concept will depend on what happens in the South Lobe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No financial gain for the District (as in no land sale revenue or tax revenue). 	<p><u>North Lobe:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to the Centre Mountain Business Park 	<p>Environmental Protection</p>	
				<p>Neighbour impacts</p>	

<p><u>Lobe – North Lobe focus</u></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>Zone North Lobe as Greenbelt or Metchosin Parkland, with pedestrian access.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Buffer Land remains under the ownership of the District. • The appropriate zoning is developed (can be developed) to support conservation outcomes. [NB: this does not appear to be in the Land. <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key reason for exploring this option is the potential of trail access through the Buffer Land, is the reason for exploring this concept. • Looking ahead, there will likely be an access requirement (vehicle size) related to the stormwater detention pond. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbours' houses are not close to the Northern Lobe border, so privacy is not a significant concern. • North lobe is in an upward slope so residences are not in jeopardy re: seepage and flooding issues • Water retention issues are probably minimal for the most part, but keeping forest will assist. • Section 95 (if/when Metchosin receives it through the FN treaty process) will be Zoned Metchosin Parkland – meaning there is continuity with the North Lobe. [NTD: there is access to Section 95 at other points in the Neild Road area] • Other land acquisitions could be considered to add to the overall connectivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety concerns • Fencing may be required (depending on the status/goals for the South Lobe) • Will need to enforce limits on activities. For example, there are examples of people developing ad hoc mountain bike trails in sloped terrain. • Fencing not required but if it is needed, the Industrial Park can be approached to build and maintain. • A sale to the CRD of the North Lobe is risky as they can sell whenever they want to and use the land whichever way they want once purchased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 95 serves as a buffer to the residents in the Upper Neild Road area • The land on the Metchosin side of the Buffer features numerous steep areas, particularly around section 95. • Metchosin Creek runs the full length of the North Lobe. • 	Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

	Total	
--	--------------	--

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>I.1 Swale and Trail Stormwater Detention</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>This is an alternative to a more 'standard' stormwater detention pond. Stormwater is collected, detained, and filtered in a man-made 'creek' system. The system would be located uphill (away to existing creek) closer to the BL boundary and would likely include a parallel hiking trail.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>CME developers, Langford and Metchosin have agreed upon, valid Easement and Covenant in place. The developer must follow Metchosin Bylaws and Regulations and ensure slope and soil stability.</p> <p>The appropriate land title surveys, deposits and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per N. Shukin presentation. Moving stormwater system further way from Metchosin Ck. will reduce risk of overflow of high rate water and sediment into creek. A Swale and Trail SW detention systems may be better at collecting SW from those other areas where SW proceeds directly into watershed. The uphill trail in the STSWD system can divert hikers / users away from the more environmentally sensitive area near Metchosin Ck (location of existing trail). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is very late in the CME development schedule to make substantial changes to the SWDP plans. Discussions between Metchosin, CME developer, and Langford are happening at extremely slow pace considering that many of the decisions are urgent. There has been no technical studies done to validate if a swale and trail option at CME and BL is even feasible. It is likely that the Swale and Trail option will be more costly to construct and operate compared to the proposed CME SWDP system in the Plan, however, construction and maintenance not been accessed yet. Final decision to make change will be by the CME developers and they will be hard to convince if there is significant 	<p>CME developer has indicated they would be open to discussing natural options for the stormwater detention pond. Their SW Engineer has received a copy of the Swale and Trail concept.</p> <p>An approved erosion and sediment control plan should have been completed by a professional engineer prior to beginning of construction activities, in accordance with existing Bylaw and regulations (unknown if this was done). In addition, the SWDP study provided many best practices for storm mgt. during construction (unknown if developer is following any of the recommendations).</p> <p>Impact on any additional sediment / pollution from CME during construction or post development is not addressed in CME SWDP plan.</p>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>indemnifications should be in place.</p> <p>Metchosin has a role in the final approval of designs, location, and construction. However, the District must permit and not obstruct access to the BL by the developer or the work during the construction.</p> <p>CME developer is responsible for safely constructing a detention pond within the BL. The developer only commenced construction at CME once it constructed and installed the required remote stormwater monitoring station.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Developer provided CME Stormwater Management Plan for review in April 2023, however, land clearing activities at CME gave already begun. The current plan includes a system of storm sewers, swales, on-lot detention ponds and BL detention pond that will handle 200 year flow rates. Current plan only collect SW into BL Detention pond (SWDP) from portion of CME. Other areas' SW</p>		<p>added costs or risks to the schedule.</p>	<p>Responsibility for maintenance of the STSWD will require substantial discussion.</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

<p>proceeds into watershed as pre-development (although at lower rates).</p> <p>Discussions on the CME SWDP between Metchosin, CME developer, and Landford are in the works.</p>					
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>J(a) Re-wilding effort (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Undertake a focused re-wilding effort on the Buffer Land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Buffer Land has lost a significant portion of its environmental values and needs “re-wilding attention”. [NB: reality says that this is not likely the case] <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Bonnie: “As it stands now the Bufferland does NOT need "re-wilding" - it needs to be conserved as to never need "re-wilding". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recommendation is to not pursue this option further. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recommendation is to not pursue this option further. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Re-wilding is a fairly recent term generally meaning to restore an area of land to its natural state and possibly reintroduce species that have been driven out through human activities. Rewilding is gaining popularity worldwide as a means of mitigating climate change and restoring natural habitat." This was specifically considered by Highlands District (there was a forum in March 2022) for the "two properties in the south entrance to the Highlands - one property includes current and former toxic waste sites that have been capped and the other is under excavation as a bedrock strip mine. Currently these two properties are either wholly or partially zoned Greenbelt". 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonnie's recommendation is to not pursue this option further. <p><u>Linkage to other concepts</u></p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting, expanding and connecting ancient woodlands to enable a diverse range of wildlife to establish and disperse, and increasing carbon storage. Reducing high populations of grazing animals to help trees and other vegetation grow. Re-wilding is a progressive approach to conservation. 		
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros)	Disadvantages (Cons)	Additional Comment	Overall Assessment
<p>J.B Undertake a “re-wilding” effort. (NEW)</p> <p>The destruction of hundreds of acres of land which has eliminated forests adjacent to BL, including the removal of native soils and plantings, destroyed habitats, obliterated bedrock and potentially contaminated water sources at the hands of humans.</p> <p>An initial assessment of the BL is required to identify the scope of remediation.</p> <p>Local Example – Swan Lake Nature Sanctuary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational Studies – engage local institutions: Camosun College – UVic – RRU. Annual curriculum studies involving environmental/ecological assessments and data collection pertaining to ecosystems, biodiversity, species at risk, etc. Rewilding is adaptive and dependent on monitoring and feedback. Ongoing environmental studies / stewardship providing recommendations to DoM. Ecosystems are dynamic and constantly changing. Plans should identify core rewilded areas, how to connect them and ensure outcomes are to the mutual benefit of people and nature. Rewilding uses wildlife to restore food webs and food chains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local engagement and community support are required. Commitment and cost. Re-wilding can be harmful to conservation as it could replace traditional protection of rare species on small nature reserves or further disrupt habitats and risk species loss. Success is dependent on plans of rewilded area and ways to connect them to ensure beneficial outcomes. i.e. – pine trees are currently growing in place of fir trees due to logging (protective forest cover) drought conditions, disease, and climate change. Due to the level of destruction, previous habitats may not be resurrected/replaced. Reintroducing wildlife – need sufficient and quantifiable food source. 	<p>Focus on the recovery of ecological processes, interactions and conditions based on similar healthy ecosystems.</p> <p>Anticipate the effects of climate change and act as a tool to mitigate its impacts.</p> <p>Rewilding is a paradigm shift in the coexistence of humans and nature.</p> <p>Conservation efforts to be sought out for the preservation of the BL acreage!</p> <p>Restriction of human activity in the sensitive environment of BL will be imperative for its recovery as a</p>	<p>Environmental Protection</p> <hr/> <p>Neighbour impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Fiscal Impacts</p> <hr/> <p>Practicality / Feasibility</p> <hr/> <p>Land Use Complexities</p> <hr/> <p>Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)</p> <hr/> <p>Recreational value</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">Total</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replanting species appropriate for the area with the guidance of experts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invasive species interfere with the ecological value of the environment. i.e. – scotch broom (also a fire risk)	buffer between urban and rural neighbors.	
--	---	---	---	--

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>K.1 access management – fencing (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept</u> Fencing the entire Buffer Lands parcels to manage access.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Fencing would be paid for and maintained by the district of Metchosin</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u> Type of “fencing” could be explored (natural, green fencing)</p> <p><u>Linkage to other concepts</u> Potentially all of K</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would deter public entrance to the lands, lower risk for fires, abuse, refuge dumping • Less maintenance of paths, cleanup • Allow the land to essentially remain as it is without change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on wildlife habitat, corridors (particularly large mammals) • Cost/expense • Maintenance of the fencing used • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If using a green fencing material, the impact on wildlife may be decreased. 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>K.2 access management – Partial (or strategic) fencing (NEW)</p> <p><u>Basic Concept</u> Use strategic fencing within the Buffer Lands parcels to manage access.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Fencing would be paid for and maintained by the district of Metchosin</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u> Type of “fencing” could be explored (natural, green fencing)</p> <p><u>Linkage to other concepts</u> Potentially all of K</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control Led/strategic entrance to the land Less costly than fencing in entirety Less impact on wildlife habitat/corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost/expense Maintenance of the fencing used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My initial thought would be to fence along the new development to deter entrance from that border, and steer the public to wherever is a more “ideal” entrance. 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
K.3 Assess different approaches to access with the North and South Lobes ** SEE H.1 and H.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	
				Total	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p>K 4-6 Access Management Options</p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> This describes potential options for the number and amenities at each access point to the BL.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> This in itself is NOT a specific concept, but that the ideal solution on access points would depend on other land use decisions for the Buffer Land. The access point numbers/ amenities should be 'right-sized' to maximize safety, health and environment for the anticipated number of users.</p> <p>In all concepts, at any potential access point there should be appropriate signage about access use and environmental</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting access points in the Wilding and Status quo cases will limit / discourage number of unwelcome users. No amenities or interpretive signs would be required for service users. In the Metchosin owned parks cases, adding more access points will allow safe access for anticipated, local users. Enough users will have garbage/ poop bags so that garbage bins will minimize pollution. Since users are primarily local, there would be little need for additional parking or bathrooms (saves costs). There would be enough new users that they would likely appreciate interpretive/ direction signs. In the CRD Parks case, as above with the following 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional access points and amenities cost money/ staff to install and maintain. Additional access points may encourage more users than wanted (for safety or environmental reasons) Much of most vocal community feedback has not supported broader, multi-use Parks concepts with additional access points and amenities. We would need an effective stakeholder management plan to better assess advantages / disadvantages and support further planning. 	<p>The ideal situation will be to right-size the access point number and amenities based on the number of anticipated users, however, that user numbers are not certain, and variable through time as CME expands and season.</p> <p>The access point numbers and amenities could be phased as well, expanding as the number of users grows</p>	<p>Environmental Protection</p> <p>Neighbour impacts</p> <p>Fiscal Impacts</p> <p>Practicality / Feasibility</p> <p>Land Use Complexities</p> <p>Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)</p>	
				Recreational value	

<p>features, particularly if an area is environmentally sensitive).</p> <p>Rewilding or conservation-focused concepts would likely result in lower levels of human traffic/activities; likely remove any access point(s) except where required to operate / service BL (locked).</p> <p>Status Quo concept would have a few local Metchosin users per day; repair Neild access point and locked CME service access point(s) as above.</p> <p>Metchosin owned / managed park concepts would likely see more local users per day from both Metchosin and CME: access points would be open with at least a garbage bin. Likely an east and west CBE access point. All access points would have limited parking and no bathrooms.</p> <p>CRD Park concept would have many users from around CRD; access point at Neild Rd and 2-4 on CME side. There is the potential for connection into Galloping Goose. Likely new</p>	<p>additions. Since many of the users would be driving to the BL, new parking would be required otherwise there would likely be unsafe parking on the streets. Bathrooms would also be preferred otherwise those traveling from a distance may have to go in the woods.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

parking and a bathroom on the CME east access point.					
				Total	

